



**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE  
HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD**

**Wednesday, April 20, 2022, 6:30 PM**

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Aiken  
Omari Davis, Vice Chair  
Sarah Garner  
Carmela Hamm  
Gerald Laporte  
Joan Lawrence  
Andrew Wenchel  
Richard Woodruff, Chair

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Robert Dudka  
Jennie Gwin  
Robert Meden  
Rebecca Meyer  
Mark Turnbull

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

**CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

The Chair called the meeting to order. Ms. Liccese-Torres read the roll and determined there was a quorum. Ms. Bolliger mentioned that the draft minutes from the March 16, 2022, virtual public hearing would be delayed and presented for review at the following hearing on May 18, 2022.

**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.

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

The Chair asked for any concerns or questions on the consent agenda. Hearing none, Ms. Lawrence moved to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 8-0.

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

**Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 22-02, 2204 N. Kenmore St.**

Ms. Bolliger presented the project at 2204 North Kenmore Street, a request to replace 14 wood windows in the contributing dwelling. At its March 16, 2022, virtual public hearing, the HALRB asked the applicants to return with evidence that the proposed replacement windows would look identical to the existing windows from the street, as well as requested drawing specifications with construction information. Ms. Bolliger thanked the applicants for compiling this additional information. She then explained that because the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff's recommendations are based on multiple factors (specifically the HALRB's interpretation of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*, the National Park Service Rehabilitation guidelines, and precedent from previous HALRB decisions regarding windows), the staff recommendation on window replacements could not change unless Federal sentiment, HALRB precedent, or guideline interpretation changed.

Ms. Bolliger followed, that if the subject application were approved, staff recommended that new language for the *Maywood Design Guidelines* be drafted then adopted by the HALRB at a future public hearing, to address updated parameters for window replacements in the Maywood Local Historic District (LHD). This would be necessary to help clarify the requirements for future window replacements for applicants and to offer specific guidance to the HALRB and HPP staff when reviewing such requests.

The Design Review Committee (DRC) considered this application for a second time at its April 6, 2022, virtual meeting. Mr. Wenchel stated that he believed the proposed windows were of good quality and suggested placing the item on the consent agenda. Mr. Davis suggested that since the item had caused a lot of conversation during the March HALRB meeting that the HALRB should have the opportunity to discuss it in committee. The DRC placed this item on the Discussion Agenda for the April 20, 2022, virtual HALRB public hearing.

Ms. Bolliger explained that Ms. Gwin was unable to attend this evening's meeting, but she shared her comments in support of the proposed window replacement in this instance. Per Mr. Laporte's recommendation during the meeting to keep record of her comment in the minutes, Ms. Gwin's comment is provided below:

*"I do support allowing the replacement of windows in this instance, but I think the motion should be as narrow as possible because had the window restoration been undertaken at the time of the full house reno a few years ago the issue of having to live in a house without windows would be a non-issue and I do think that when larger renovation projects come before us in the future restoration should be pursued as opposed to replacement. I also think replacement in this specific instance is acceptable only because the owners have located windows that will look and operate like the historic windows.*

*That being said 1) In the photos provided it looks like the height of the meeting rail on the existing double hung windows is less than the proposed replacement. There is no overall photo of the existing meeting rail, but one photo shown the bottom rail of the upper sash is only 1.5” and it appears that bottom rail of the proposed upper sash is just over 2”. Figure 4 and figure 5 in the package show the replacement windows in place do have a taller meeting rail than the historic windows. I would be curious to know if Marvin makes a window that has a meeting rail that better matches the existing.*

*I very much appreciate that windows are a character defining feature and every effort should be made to retain historic fabric, but I think we are facing a climate crisis that requires us to balance this with energy efficiency and given the specific character of these windows I think replacement is acceptable. I also think exterior storm windows as an alternative would conceal and detract from the historic fabric.”*

The Chair invited the applicants to speak. Mr. Greene asked the commissioners to evaluate the submitted photos showing a proposed replacement window compared to an existing window, presented the evidence of the effect of the windows on the interior of the home, and mentioned the DRC’s support at the April meeting.

The Chair next invited the commissioners to speak. Ms. Lawrence asked for confirmation that the windows in the photos were those that the applicant was talking about and that they were the same type as would be used in the replacement. Ms. Greene responded that they were; she explained that the sample replacement window was a new insert, so it had come pre-hung in new casing, whereas the actual replacement windows would be inserted into the existing openings.

Mr. Wenchel voiced his support for the window replacement, particularly given that the existing openings would remain and only the sash system would be replaced. He believed the proposed replacement windows to be of good quality, would appear identical from the street, and would be quick to install. The Chair agreed with Mr. Wenchel’s comments and commended the residents of Maywood for their efforts to retain the historic integrity of their homes.

The Chair made the following motion:

I move that HALRB approve CoA 22-02, to allow replacement of the windows as proposed in the subject application given that the proposed in-kind, replacement windows are of matching materials, dimensions, and profile and therefore match the existing windows from the street.

I further move that the HALRB request staff to present findings about window rehabilitation and replacement parameters for future consideration by the HALRB as an appendix to the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

The Chair explained that the second clause of the motion was necessary to provide staff and the community with guidance and consistency about future window replacements and would allow input by the community into the process. Mr. Wenchel seconded the motion. Ms. Lawrence asked to amend the motion to specify that the wood windows in the application would be replaced with wood windows. The Chair amended the motion to include Ms. Lawrence’s change, and Mr. Laporte seconded the amended motion.

Ms. Tawney read the amended motion as follows:

I move that HALRB approve CoA 22-02, to allow replacement of wood windows as proposed in the subject application given that the proposed in-kind, replacement wood

windows are of matching materials, dimensions, and profile and therefore match the existing windows from the street.

I further move that the HALRB request staff to present findings about window rehabilitation and replacement parameters for future consideration by the HALRB as an appendix to the Maywood Design Guidelines.

Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 8 to 0.

### **HISTORIC MARKER REVIEW: MOUNT SALVATION BAPTIST CEMETERY**

Ms. Bolliger presented a draft historic marker for the Mount Salvation Baptist Cemetery, the County's most recent LHD approved in 2021. She explained that the church trustees had requested a marker, reviewed the draft, and expressed their support. Ms. Bolliger thanked Mr. Laporte for his suggested revisions submitted in advance of the meeting.

The Chair asked if the church trustees were present; staff confirmed they were not. Ms. Lawrence agreed with Mr. Laporte that while she did not approve of the use of passive voice in marker text, she wanted to respect the trustees' preferred marker language. Ms. Bolliger said she would ensure that the trustees were comfortable with any changes.

Mr. Laporte stated that since the HPP staff had written the marker and not the community, the HALRB should have a greater opportunity to review text in advance. He referenced the HALRB's marker sub-committee which had existed in previous years. Ms. Liccese-Torres agreed that there had been a very active marker sub-committee in the past and that staff could work on re-establishing that committee, along with the others requested, if it was a priority for the commission. She further explained that marker requests originate from different sources, from community groups or individuals to inter-departmental staff requests, and thus the development of proposed marker language could vary widely from one request to another.

The Chair recommended reconvening the marker sub-committee of the HALRB to review proposed markers to help ensure smoother approval at full Board meetings. Mr. Laporte expressed interest in participating on the marker sub-committee [Ms. Hamm later volunteered via email to staff]. Ms. Liccese-Torres mentioned the eagerness of the church trustees to install this particular marker, and therefore asked to confirm if any final minor changes to the language could be approved by staff without returning the marker to the HALRB for review. The Chair agreed and asked if a motion needed to be made. Ms. Liccese-Torres replied that since HPP funds would be spent on the marker, the HALRB needed to make a motion to approve the marker. The Chair asked for final questions and upon hearing none, made a motion:

I move that the HALRB approve the Mt. Salvation Baptist Cemetery marker as submitted with additional technical and conforming changes that have been suggested during the HALRB meeting and request that those changes be circulated at a later date once the marker has been so revised and further subject to final approval by the marker sponsors.

Ms. Hamm seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 8 to 0.

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

#### **Chair's Report**

The Chair relayed news about the Joyce Motors building and the proposed Clarendon Sector Plan Update. He felt that the planning staff and County Board still did not seem concerned about the preservation of the

building. He restated his support for the retention of the building in situ and expressed his disdain for the proposal to demolish the building and use panels to decorate new on-site construction.

**Staff and Other Reports**

Ms. Liccese-Torres informed the HALRB about the progress toward updating the *Historic Preservation Master Plan* and invited members to participate in the outreach effort at the planned open houses and farmers market events this summer. Ms. Lawrence asked when the draft plan would be available. Ms. Liccese-Torres replied that it should be available for public review in July and that an HALRB public hearing regarding the draft plan would be scheduled likely in August or September.

The Chair asked staff to elaborate on the process for the Maywood window replacement guidance language. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that the HPP staff planned to develop draft language for the HALRB to review at its May public hearing, either for immediate approval or consideration for a vote in June. Staff would advertise the hearing to the community as usual and also send a postcard mailout to all property owners in the LHD to increase community engagement. Mr. Wenchel asked if the language first would come to the DRC in May and also recommended the inclusion of language permitting insulated or double-paned glass. Ms. Liccese-Torres replied that attending the May DRC meeting would be too short of a turnaround for staff to have the language ready; plus, the DRC does not allow for public comment. She said that the draft language could be available two weeks in advance of the May HALRB hearing, allowing for review and public comment, and then could return for the entire June review cycle, allowing the DRC to provide specific comment prior to the June HALRB hearing. The Chair and Mr. Wenchel supported this proposed timeline. The Chair also noted that this could give staff time to confer with the County Attorney's Office on who had the authority to approve the language.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:43 pm.