



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT  
Neighborhood Services Division

Courthouse Plaza One 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, October 20, 2021, 6:30 PM**

*This was a virtual public meeting held through electronic communication means.*

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Aiken  
Omari Davis  
Sarah Garner, Vice Chair  
Carmela Hamm  
Gerald Laporte  
Joan Lawrence  
Robert Meden  
Rebecca Meyer  
Mark Turnbull  
Andrew Wenchel  
Richard Woodruff, Chair

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Robert Dudka  
Jennie Gwin

**STAFF:** 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. Farris called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

**EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES**

The Chair explained the virtual Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures and stated that the virtual meeting format was necessitated as a precaution to protect the Board, staff, and community members from the spread of COVID-19. He communicated the legal authority under which the County was able to hold virtual public hearings, citing the Governor's Executive Orders, legislation adopted by the Virginia General Assembly, and the County Board's Continuity of Operations Ordinance adopted in March 2020. The Chair then described the logistics of how the virtual meeting would proceed via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number.

**APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2021, MEETING MINUTES**

The Chair asked for questions or comments on the draft September meeting minutes. Hearing none, Ms. Lawrence moved to approve the minutes as submitted and Ms. Meyer seconded. The Chair asked for further questions; upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Farris to call the roll. The motion passed 9-1-0 with Mr. Woodruff abstaining (Mr. Davis joined the meeting after the vote).

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

- 1) Conte (Connie) Spriggs  
1961 North Culpeper Street, CoA 21-24  
Mount Salvation Cemetery Historic District  
Request to install replacement headstone.
  
- 2) Shari Ciccotelli on behalf of Cherrydale Volunteer Fire Department  
3900 Langston Boulevard, CoA 21-25  
Cherrydale Firehouse Historic District  
Request to install signage directing visitors to social hall.
  
- 3) John Moses  
1005 South Quinn Street CoA 21-26  
Harry Gray House Historic District  
Request to install pavers on south side of property.

The Chair called for any questions or comments on the Consent Agenda and there were none. Vice Chair Garner moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Meden seconded, and the motion passed unanimously 11-0 (Mr. Davis joined the meeting before the vote).

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

**Discussion Agenda Item #1-4: CoA 21-20 at 3550 Wilson Blvd., CoA 21-21 at 2411 24<sup>th</sup> St. N., CoA 21-22 at 5711 4<sup>th</sup> St. S., CoA 21-23 at 2133 N. Taft St.**

Ms. Bolliger relayed that on September 12, 2020, the Arlington County Board had adopted an amendment to the Code of Arlington County, Virginia Chapter 13, Missiles, to add Title II Sections 13-11 through 13-15 “relating to firearms, to prohibit the possession, carrying or transportation of any firearms in County buildings, facilities and certain public rights of way.” DES staff was tasked with installing signs on all County facilities, including four County-owned LHDs, banning firearms on County property. The County Board report language stated that “the ordinance requires the County to post signs at the entrance(s) to all buildings, parks, and park facilities.” Per these guidelines, DES staff installed temporary signs on properties at the Clarendon School, Fort C.F. Smith, Carlin Hall, and Dawson Terrace immediately and studied the properties and the ordinance before proposing permanent recommendations for the sign locations.

The Design Review Committee (DRC) heard this application at its October 6, 2021, virtual meeting. The Committee had some concerns about attaching signs to the exterior of the historic buildings. Therefore, all the items were placed on the discussion agenda for review. Given the DRC feedback, DES staff had since agreed to install the signs on the interior of the glass, which would not require HALRB approval.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the Historic Preservation Program staff recommended approval of the installation of the proposed signs as they were required by County Ordinance, and they would increase safety in the historic building. As the signs were made to be visible and are required to be at every entrance, there were few unobtrusive solutions for sign placement on the historic buildings and in the cultural landscapes. Staff appreciated that given their purpose the signs would need to be more visible than they might be if they were being installed for a different use and could adhere to the visibility recommendations of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*.

However, at the same time the proposals conformed with Rehabilitation Standard #10 specified in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* as they would be an alteration which could easily be reversed without an adverse effect to the property.

Standard #10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The Chair asked if any speakers had registered, and Ms. Bolliger stated that they had not. The Chair asked the DRC to give their opinion. Mr. Wenchel stated that he did not have issues with the signs now that they had been moved to the interior of the glass.

The Chair invited any other members of the board to comment. Ms. Lawrence thanked Mr. Connell for the rectification of the sign placement because she had been at an event at Fort C.F. Smith and a firearm sign had been prominently placed on the front of Henley House. The Chair asked Mr. Connell to confirm that no signs would be installed on the historic structures themselves. Mr. Connell confirmed that the signs would either be installed on posts on the property or inside the glass of the buildings.

The Chair thanked Mr. Connell and proposed to make motions for each item. For CoA 21-20 the Chair made the following motion:

I move that HALRB approve CoA 21-20 to allow placement of the signs as proposed at 3550 Wilson Blvd. as recommended by County staff.

Mr. Meden seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Farris to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0.

For CoA 21-21 the Chair made the following motion:

I move that HALRB approve CoA 21-21 to allow placement of the signs as proposed at the property located at 2411 24<sup>th</sup> Street North as recommended by County staff.

Mr. Davis seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Farris to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0.

For CoA 21-22 the Chair made the following motion:

I move that HALRB approve CoA 21-22 to allow placement of the signs as proposed as located at 5711 4<sup>th</sup> Street South as recommended by County staff.

Ms. Garner seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Farris to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0.

For CoA 21-23 the Chair made the following motion:

I move that HALRB approve CoA 21-23 to allow placement of the signs as proposed at 2133 North Taft Street as recommended by County staff.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Farris to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0.

**Discussion Agenda Item #5: CoA 21-08 at 2206 N. Nelson St.**

Ms. Bolliger outlined the staff report for 2206 N. Nelson Street, explaining that the dwelling at 2206 N. Nelson Street was a red brick ranch house constructed in 1966. The property had one visible story from the right-of-way with a second level built beneath the street grade into the slope of the land. Typical of homes from the era, the house is four-bays in width and has a front facing gable. From left to right, there is a one-car garage door opening, two pairs of metal sash windows, the main entrance, and a pair of metal sash windows. The rear of the home has a front gable over a doorway and porch, and a central balcony. There is vinyl siding on the gables and attached garage.

Ms. Bolliger continued that the property is not listed in the *Maywood National Register Nomination* and is considered non-contributing to the Maywood Local Historic District (LHD), however the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not differentiate between contributing and non-contributing houses; therefore, all homes within the LHD are subject to the design guidelines.

Ms. Bolliger recapitulated that the applicant had presented preliminary drawings to the commission for general feedback and direction in November 2020, April 2021, and July 2021. The applicant had now submitted a full packet for consideration as a CoA application. The applicant was requesting to modify the existing dwelling by adding a second story and a finished attic. The applicant proposed to demolish the attached garage and build an inset entrance in its place to mimic the garage opening, although with less width to allow for a driveway. The applicant was proposing to remove the center-bay windows and replace them with a trio of larger windows; the windows and door in the right bay were proposed to be removed, their openings enlarged, and new Pella aluminum-clad windows and a painted mahogany Trustile door inserted. All previously unpainted brick on the original dwelling would be painted with KEIM mineral paint. The new second story addition would have a front gable roof to mimic the front gable on the original

first story. The siding on the second story would be Boral Truexterior 1x10 channel gap siding and detailing such as the front door surround and rear dormer would feature Boral Truexterior nickel gap siding. All trim would be Boral Truexterior

The rear addition would include a rear gable to mimic the rear gable originally on the house, and a shed dormer. Projecting from the left elevation would be a chimney bumpout with nickel gap trim and on the rear elevation there would be a bay window bumpout. The applicant proposed to construct a rear screened covered deck with custom steel rail and a staircase to the yard. A bioretention planter would be banked into the landscape towards the rear of the property.

The applicant also proposed to demolish an existing screened pavilion at the rear of the property and construct a one-and-one-half story, two-car 24' x 23'4" garage behind the house and a new asphalt driveway along the southwest side of the house that would lead to the proposed garage. The lofted garage would have Boral Truexterior 1x10 channel gap siding on the majority of the structure, as would the main house, with nickel gap siding repeated on the front and rear dormers. The windows and doors would match the style of those on the house. There would be a stucco retaining wall and custom steel rail on the south side of the driveway approaching the garage. Another bioretention planter would be constructed on the rear of the structure. Overall, the applicant planned to remove 1,120 s.f. of hardscape (including the concrete driveway, walkway, and rear pavilion) and planned to add 2,114 s.f. of hardscape (driveway, walkways, and pavers). The applicant planned to remove two trees greater than 15" in diameter- one mulberry tree and one black walnut.

The DRC resumed meeting in May 2021 and first heard this application at its July 2021 and October 2021 virtual meetings. At the October 6 DRC meeting, the committee suggested that the applicant consider a mineral coating instead of paint for the unpainted brick. Since this would be the first time that the HALRB would be reviewing the complete CoA package, the DRC recommended this application be placed on the discussion agenda for the October 20, 2021, virtual HALRB hearing. The applicant then revised the plans to list KEIM mineral paint on the brick instead of traditional paint.

Ms. Bolliger summarized that the Historic Preservation staff is grateful to the applicant for the continual revisions to their original preliminary designs. Although attached garages are considered a character-defining feature of architectural forms/styles of the era, staff found that the proposed inset entrance design was a thoughtful edit to mimic the original garage feature to be demolished. Although clad windows are not acceptable per the *Maywood Design Guidelines* (p.15), staff found that the use of clad metal windows were acceptable in this case since the original windows on the house were metal. Similarly, the overall window type was proposed to be changed from predominantly double-hung sash to casement windows. Again, this proposed window type was considered in keeping with the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century design aesthetic.

The new construction portions of the project included the use of modern channel and nickel gap siding which would provide substantial differentiation from the original brick material. Further, the material contrast would meet the intent of Standard #9 of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. Given the finish and the construction, staff found that the proposed siding material, which had not been used in the Maywood LHD before, conforms with the *Maywood Design Guidelines* on siding:

The following siding materials should not be used in the Maywood Historic District: Aluminum siding; Vinyl siding; Vertical siding; Imitation brick or stone; Reflective glass or tinted glass (stained glass is acceptable); Unpainted, brushed, or clear anodized aluminum finishes; Stainless steel finishes; or Artificial stucco, such as exterior insulating and finishing system (EIFS). (p. 14)

On Existing, Non-Contributing Houses and Later Additions to Contributing Buildings: Original siding on existing, non-contributing houses and later additions to contributing houses may be replaced with substitute and alternative products, excluding vinyl and aluminum siding and any simulated wood grain product. (p. 15)

Substitute materials must meet three basic criteria before being considered: they must be compatible with the historic materials in appearance; their physical properties must be similar to those of the historic materials or be installed in a manner that tolerates differences; and they must meet certain basic performance expectations over an extended period of time. (p. 40)

Ms. Bolliger explained that while some improvements had been made during the preliminary proceedings, staff wanted to enter into the record outstanding concerns with the project which did not conform with the *Maywood Design Guidelines* or *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. The proposed design changed the massing, proportions, materials, fenestration, and overall feeling of the front façade of the original dwelling. The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* recommend that all such original features be respected. In particular, staff noted that the applicant proposed to transform the massing from a horizontal ranch style house (which read as one-story from the right-of-way) to a more vertically oriented, two-story style on a large lot where there appeared to be adequate space for less conspicuous horizontal expansion at the rear. The design also proposed to alter the window and door openings on the original house although the number and approximate location of the modified fenestration appeared to remain the same. This suggested to staff that the original openings could be preserved at least on the main facade. The location of the original front doorway opening was proposed to be changed with the door replaced with one of very modern style; staff saw this as an opportunity to retain the original main door opening and install a more appropriate styled door.

Ms. Bolliger continued that the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* do not recommend painting brick. The original dwelling was unpainted, and staff strongly recommended respecting the original material especially given the level of alteration being proposed to the main façade. However, she followed that there was precedent in the Maywood LHD for painting unpainted brick on non-contributing brick dwellings (i.e., CoA 12-19 at 2305 N. Kenmore St. and CoA 13-10 at 2821 23<sup>rd</sup> St N.). Both of these prior CoA approvals for allowing the painting of unpainted brick were considered on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Bolliger further expressed aesthetic and safety concerns about installing composite siding on a chimney on a façade that is otherwise brick-clad.

Lastly, Ms. Bolliger stated that staff believed that the proposed detached garage was of a scale and style that read as a traditional bungalow form rather than a secondary accessory building. The bungalow styling contrasted with the modern aesthetic of the renovated dwelling. The proposed garage also measured more than 550 s.f. To accommodate the applicant's preference for an ample two-car garage with storage space,

staff recommended removing the front dormer thereby allowing the rear dormer for extra height but making the garage appear as a simpler accessory structure from the right-of-way. Staff also recommended reducing the amount of fenestration to communicate a non-habitable space.

The Chair invited the applicant to speak and Charles Moore spoke for the design team. Mr. Moore summarized the design team's move away from Victorian styling to more mid-century stylings, based on input from the commission, increasing the horizontality of the design, differentiating the original brick from the second story addition, and the addition of the recessed entrance space to echo the attached garage.

The Chair asked Ms. Bolliger if there were any public speakers and she replied that there were none. The Chair invited the DRC to speak. Mr. Davis expressed his concern about the flat dormer on the garage, as he believed it looked too modern for the aesthetic of the structure. Mr. Wenchel stated he was glad to hear that the mineral coating was acceptable to the applicant. He followed that it was a strong piece of architecture and would be an obviously modern addition to Maywood and that the board should be aware of how modern of a structure they could be approving.

The Chair called on Mr. Laporte to comment, who asked about whether the HALRB had the authority to specify paint and whether a future owner would be tied to using mineral coating rather than paint and would need to receive future HALRB approval to use paint. Mr. Laporte stated that if the motion included the specification of mineral coating then he believed any future owners would be tied to mineral coating because paint itself had not been approved.

Ms. Lawrence stated that the project had come a long way. She asked if the pitch of the gable end was the same as the gable on the original house. Mr. Moore explained it was a little higher than the pitch of the original. Ms. Lawrence stated she thought a lower pitch would have added to the horizontality. She then stated that they were adding a fair amount of hardscape including asphalt for the driveway and asked if the driveway were directly adjacent to the house. Mr. Moore explained that there would be a strip of grass between the driveway and the house. He also explained that the material had not been definitively chosen. Ms. Lawrence was concerned that rainwater would flow down the driveway directly into the garage and Mr. Moore explained that they planned to install flat drains in front of the garage. Ms. Lawrence agreed with staff's comments that the front dormer should be removed and that the front door should be of mid-century styling and contain glass in the door.

Ms. Garner thanked the applicants for their efforts to make the appearance more modern. She stated concern about painting the brick as she considered it character defining for ranch houses but given the non-contributing status she accepted the proposal. Mr. Aiken echoed the points made by the HALRB. Mr. Meden abstained as a newer member of the HALRB. He noted that he had trouble interpreting the drawings to the site, as the images of the landscape seemed wooded but the renderings were sparse. Mr. Moore explained that existing trees were in the way of the proposed driveway and that per County requirements there would need to be a landscape plan developed for the property. This would include the installation of more native species as many on the property were invasive species, meaning that non-native trees and smaller trees would be removed and replaced with all new plantings to achieve the 20% tree canopy within 20 years. He explained that the property was already beyond the 20% coverage, but

they would remove and replace the plantings. The Chair asked what would happen to all the trees in the yard beyond the land disturbance line. Mr. Moore explained there should not be any impact on the trees in the rear.

Ms. Meyer echoed Mr. Meden that she had not seen all the iterations, but voiced concern about the dormer on the garage making it appear to be a habitable structure.

The Chair thanked Mr. Moore for meeting with the commission over the past year. The Chair stated that the original house had 3 sets of windows and a small front door, whereas the new house had 5 windows in 2 ribbons and a larger front door, making it disingenuous to claim that the window and door placement mirrored the original house. He stated it was not a “dealbreaker” for him but that it did not do the original design any justice. Regarding the driveway, he voiced concern that the retaining wall at the bottom of the driveway would create a steep drop to the neighboring property. Mr. Moore explained that the garage had already been lowered and that the retaining wall was not on the property line so there would be some land before the adjacent property line. He stated that where it was higher than 30 inches there would be a horizontal steel rail. The Chair asked for the maximum drop. Mr. Moore stated he believed it was about 2.5’ to 3’ and that the retaining wall would be 6 inches above grade in order to collect water and provide safety for drivers and the neighbors. The Chair asked if it would require a Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Runoff Plan due to the land disturbance and Mr. Moore said it would. Mr. Laporte asked what the retaining wall was going to be faced with, what would happen in the space in between the wall and the property line, and if there would be plantings, and what was visible from the neighboring property. Mr. Moore stated that there were no plans to landscape in this area but if plantings were needed the owner would consider the option. The Chair voiced concern that given the slope of the land of the adjacent house that this would be at the height of the garage and retaining wall. Mr. Laporte asked if there had been communications with the neighbor. Mr. Moore stated that the architecture firm had not notified neighbors but assumed that staff had notified neighbors. Ms. Bolliger clarified that per the hearing requirements the neighbors had received a mailing about this project, there had been placards posted in the neighborhood, an advert put in the Washington Times, and a letter emailed to the civic association. The previous hearings, having been preliminary, had no advertisements or notifications attached.

The Chair moved to approve the project specifying the use of KEIM mineral coating or equivalent on the brick and Mr. Laporte seconded. The Chair asked for final comments and Ms. Lawrence proposed to amend the motion to exclude the proposed front dormer on the garage. The Chair reworded the motion as follows:

I move that HALRB approve CoA 21-08 at 2206 N. Nelson Street that HALRB approve the project as proposed in the staff report provided that the front dormer on the garage is removed from the project. Further that the KEIM mineral coating, or its equivalent to, be used on the brick surfaces proposed to be painted.

Ms. Meyer seconded the amended motion. The Chair asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, she asked Ms. Farris to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 9-0 (Ms. Hamm and Mr. Turnbull had left the meeting.)



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

### **Chair's Report**

The Chair summarized a meeting with Claude Williamson, the Director of the Department of Community Housing, Planning and Development, scheduled in response to the HALRB concerns about recent outcomes for LHD applications. The Chair explained that his position was that the HALRB should not change the current process of allowing citizens to nominate, but wanted an analysis of the County's legal authority to halt or delay the demolition process for properties nominated for Local Historic District status.

The Chair discussed setting up subcommittees, one to help with public information and outreach issues and a survey subcommittee to build on existing surveys of historic buildings and sites in the County. The Chair asked for volunteers for the committees; Mr. Aiken and Mr. Meden volunteered to work on the survey subcommittee and Ms. Garner volunteered to work on the public information and outreach committee. The Chair thanked them both for volunteering.

### **Staff and Other Reports**

Ms. Bolliger informed the commission that they had been invited by the Department of Parks and Recreation to attend the ribbon cutting for the newly renovated and renamed Zitkala Ša Park on Oct. 23 at 11 a.m.

Ms. Tawney shared information about the Arlington County Naming Centennial Celebration at the Lubber Run Community Center and invited the commission to attend. Ms. Tawney also announced the upcoming Outreach Week in November to spread the word about the Master Plan Update process and invited the commission to attend any of the many events that would be held. The Chair urged the commission to engage with the Master Plan Update process.

Ms. Farris recognized the HALRB members representing the commission in ongoing and upcoming site plans. She thanked the Chair and Ms. Lawrence for attending a walking tour for the Marbella Apartments site plan, Ms. Meyer for representing the commission for the Wendy's site plan at 2025 Clarendon Boulevard, Mr. Aiken and Ms. Garner for their representation in the PenPlace site plan, and Ms. Lawrence for her continued involvement in the Clarendon Sector Plan Update.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:38 PM.