



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

Wednesday, May 18, 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
Jennie Gwin
Carmela Hamm
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Robert Meden
Rebecca Meyer
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff, Chair

MEMBERS EXCUSED:
Robert Dudka

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.

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. Gwin moved to approve the consent agenda. Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and

the motion passed 11-0-1, with Mr. Wenchel abstaining due to his pending reappointment by the County Board.

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

Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 22-14, 2317 N. Kenmore St.

Ms. Bolliger presented the project at 2317 N. Kenmore Street to replace an existing rear addition with a larger one-story addition, add a 6.6' x 5.6' rear stoop, and expand an existing rear slate patio. Ms. Bolliger explained that the Design Review Committee (DRC) had considered placing this item on the consent agenda, however the project would require a zoning variance for the addition to encroach 1'9" into the 25' setback and for the stoop and stairs to encroach 4'2" into the 21' setback. Thus, this would require further discussion by the HALRB given that the applicant had asked for the HALRB to consider using its setback modification power to approve the plan.

Ms. Bolliger stated that to move the location of the kitchen and build a kitchen counter at the required height in the interior of the house, the applicant proposed to raise two existing windows in the northeast corner of the dwelling. She then explained the project details. The top of the window opening would match the height of the other windows on the façade, but the sill height would match an adjacent existing window around the corner on the east elevation. The reduced window opening would be infilled with original brick from the demolished rear addition. The existing one-over-one windows would be replaced with six-over-one windows to match those in the addition. An existing, small six-over-six window on the south façade would be replaced with a six-over-one window with tempered glass. Two other openings on the north façade, with only storm windows, would get four-lite casement windows. All the proposed windows would be solid wood. The addition itself would have 5" Hardie plank lap siding, 5/4" solid millable Azek trim, and Certainteed Landmark roof shingles to match those on the existing home. Finally, the applicant proposed to remove a brick flue and boiler vent which would be non-functioning once the new forced air system was installed. This system would vent to the exterior through penetrations in the south elevation close to the ground.

Ms. Bolliger followed that the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff recommended approval of the subject application based on the following rationale. The proposed addition would be a modest enlargement of the original addition to the rear of the house and still would retain the one-story bungalow character from the street. The proposed materials were appropriate in Maywood per Appendix C: Cement Fiberboard Siding Materials, Appendix D: PVC Trim, and Appendix G: Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Wooden windows are considered appropriate in the Maywood Local Historic District (LHD). The installation of six-over-one windows would more closely mimic the six-over-six sashes installed on the sister homes at 2311 and 2315 North Kenmore Street while differentiating them enough to indicate new construction. While the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not recommend infill of original window openings, the proposed sill height would match an existing sill in the same room of the house, and the top line of the windows will remain unbroken on the north elevation. Further, these windows are located in the rear half of the property, behind the historic chimney, and would not be highly visible from the street. Staff appreciated the goal of reusing the original brick from the demolished addition to infill the window openings.

Ms. Bolliger outlined that in the last two years, there had been several requests to enlarge existing patios to expand outdoor living spaces in the Maywood LHD. She said the proposed patio request was an appropriate way to add usable living space to a contributing home. Given the small size of the original dwelling, she stated staff believed that the setback modification request was not inappropriate. If the HALRB chose to use its setback modification authority, Ms. Bolliger explained that this would streamline the permitting approval process for the property owner.

Finally, Ms. Bolliger stated that the HALRB had approved several CoA requests to remove unused chimneys in the LHD (e.g., CoA 18-04 at 2330 North Jackson Street) if they were not considered character-defining features. She said the applicant proposed to remove a utilitarian structure in the rear that was not a character-defining feature, while retaining the main historic chimney structure visible from the right-of-way. Thus, she concluded that staff believed the utilitarian structure in the rear would be appropriate to remove, and the proposed vents would be inobtrusive and close to grade.

The Chair asked Ms. Bolliger if staff made a finding about the setback modification. Ms. Bolliger replied that staff had elected not to make a recommendation but found that it would not be inappropriate for the HALRB to make this finding.

The Chair invited Ms. FitzHarris, representative of the applicant, to offer any additional information. She explained that the Schmitts, the homeowners, were undertaking this project to allow a family member to age in place.

The Chair opened the discussion to the HALRB members. He asked staff to clarify whether the board had legal authority to decide about the setback or if it would be only making a recommendation. Ms. Bolliger clarified that the HALRB could make a finding that the setback was appropriate and would have the legal authority to approve the setback.

The Chair asked for comments or concerns. Upon hearing none, he made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 22-14 with the proposed set-back and to install a new rear addition, expand the patio, and replace select windows at 2317 N. Kenmore Street, and further that the proposed project meets the requirements of the *Maywood Guidelines*. The HALRB finds that the requested set-back is appropriate.

Ms. Gwin seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 11-0-1, with Mr. Wenchel abstaining.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF

Since the agenda was running ahead of schedule, Ms. Bolliger suggested hearing the reports of the Chair and Staff next to allow members of the public to join the meeting who hoped to hear or speak about the upcoming Maywood Window Replacement item.

Chair's Report

The Chair invited the Vice Chair to speak about a recent County Board meeting about the Joyce Motors project within the Clarendon Sector Plan Update. Mr. Davis explained that he had advocated on behalf of the HALRB that the Joyce Motors building should be preserved in situ rather than being moved as proposed. He said the developer planned to take the building apart and affix it to a new building, which went against the recommendations of both the HALRB and the Planning Commission. He stated the County Board had sided with the developer to allow the piecemeal installation of the historic building on and around the new building.

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Liccese-Torres informed the HALRB that the General Assembly recently passed an electronic meetings bill which would go into effect on September 1. She continued that based on the information disclosed, the HALRB would no longer be able to exclusively meet remotely and that an in-person quorum would be required, although the hybrid meeting system would be retained. She said more details would be forthcoming.

Mr. Laporte asked if commissioners would be allowed to vote if they attended meetings virtually more than the allotted 25% of meetings. Ms. Liccese-Torres offered to get clarification on the matter.

Ms. Liccese-Torres updated the commission on the status of the Historic Preservation Master Plan Update. She explained that staff received the draft from the consultant, and it is being reviewed by the interdepartmental staff team. She said she hoped the draft would be available for public review in July and invited the commissioners to volunteer for the summer outreach opportunities emailed to them by Ms. Tawney.

PROPOSED MAYWOOD WINDOW REPLACEMENT GUIDANCE

The Chair invited Ms. Bolliger to present the staff report for this agenda item. Ms. Bolliger explained that in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*, the list entitled ‘When is a CoA or ACoA Required?’ (p. ii) states that “Repair or replacement of roofs, siding, external doors and windows, awnings, trim, and other features with different materials and/or a different design” requires a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA). Further, the guidelines state that “Original windows should be repaired and restored.” (Chapter 5: Exterior Renovation, p. 19). She followed that historically, the HALRB had chosen to interpret this statement to mean existing windows must be repaired and restored rather than replaced, unless in such poor condition that they could no longer function.

Ms. Bolliger continued, stating that based on both the *Maywood Design Guidelines* language and *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, the policy of the HPP staff had been to discourage window replacements in the Maywood LHD. She noted the relevant *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards*:

Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.ⁱ

In addition, Ms. Bolliger noted that *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*ⁱⁱ lists treatments that are and are not recommended.

Recommended:

“Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows and their functional and decorative features that are important to the overall character of the building. The window material and how the window operates (e.g., double hung, casement, awning, or hopper) are significant, as are its components (including sash, muntins, ogee lugs, glazing, pane configuration, sills, mullions casings, or brick molds) and related features, such as shutters.”

Not recommended:

“Removing or substantially changing windows or window features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished. Changing the appearance of windows that contribute to the historic character of the building by replacing materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of the reveal, and muntin configurations; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.”

“Replacing windows solely because of peeling paint, broken glass, stuck sash, or high air infiltration. These conditions, in themselves, do not indicate that windows are beyond repair.”

Ms. Bolliger explained how in the last few years, the HALRB had received several replacement requests for wooden windows and vinyl windows in both contributing and non-contributing houses in the Maywood LHD. Typically, the HALRB had allowed the replacement of vinyl windows in-kind and required the restoration of wooden windows, particularly in original contributing buildings. However, in December 2021, the HALRB approved new in-kind replacement wooden windows on the non-contributing dwelling at 2329 N. Edgewood Street (CoA 21-28). Upon further research, the HPP staff found records of window replacements having been approved by the HALRB in the early-1990s (e.g., 3213 23rd Street North in July 1993), indicating that shortly after the creation of the LHD, the HALRB approved in-kind replacements of historic wooden windows if the new windows were identical; and that therefore at the time the HALRB found this action not inconsistent with the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Over time, as the design review process in the LHD became more established, the HALRB adopted a narrower interpretation which discouraged in-kind window replacements in favor of retaining historic windows; it might be that the periodic changing of HALRB members and differing preservation ideologies had contributed to this stricter interpretation.

Ms. Bolliger continued, that upon receiving formal direction from the HALRB at its April 20, 2022, virtual public hearing, the HPP staff drafted new clarifying language for window replacements which would allow the HALRB to consider requests for replacement windows in Maywood. This proposed language includes standards for consideration and had been developed in response to an increasing number of requests from the community for replacement windows, as well as to changing national sentiment in the historic preservation field in support of allowing the replacement of windows in historic districts. Ms. Bolliger explained that upon future approval by the HALRB, the finalized language would become Appendix H of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Bolliger stated the staff’s recommendation. She explained that the dimension, texture, and materiality of historic windows embody the character of each construction era and style. Historic wooden windows were constructed from old-growth trees with hard, rot-resistant wood and when allowed to age in place, further solidify over time and become even more rot and disease resistant. With regular maintenance, historic wooden windows can be retained indefinitely. In combination with storm windows, curtains, blinds, and/or appropriate weatherstripping, historic wooden windows also can be extremely energy efficient. In the interests of both historic preservation and sustainability, she stated that the HPP staff advocates that historic windows should not be replaced when they can be repaired and complemented with other technologies such as storm windows and curtains.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Ms. Bolliger further stated that the HPP staff recommended approval of the proposed window replacement guidance for the Maywood LHD. While staff agreed that keeping historic wooden windows could be feasible and rewarding, staff was receiving increasing numbers of window replacement requests in the district. The HPP also understood that to some owners or tenants of historic properties, window restoration might seem more daunting and costly than wholesale window

replacement. Yet, staff wanted to encourage historic preservation, where practicable, to be more accessible to the community.

At the time in the Maywood LHD, Ms. Bolliger explained the HALRB and HPP staff allow the in-kind replacement of deteriorated roofing, siding, decking, and other exterior construction materials without review. Until now, the stated practice of the Board and staff had been to identify the actual material of the existing windows as character-defining, including the wavy glass and the old-growth wood. Based on this new interpretation of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standard #2* (“The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.”), combined with the *Maywood Design Guidelines* language, the HPP staff recommends that for non-character-defining windows, the overall material of wood is character-defining to Maywood, rather than the extant historic old-growth wood. Therefore, if applicants were to replace wooden windows in-kind with identical wooden windows, the character-defining nature of the windows would be retained in the LHD. Further, retaining the size of existing window openings would not impact either the historic openings or the traditional fenestration patterns of Maywood homes.

Ms. Bolliger followed that while the National Park Service had not changed its recommendation regarding the treatment of windows, some municipalities, including nearby local communities, have chosen to allow window replacement in historic districts. Based on similar preservation pressures to those faced in Arlington, New York Cityⁱⁱⁱ, the City of Alexandria^{iv}, and Washington, D.C.^v recommend window restoration but allow in-kind window replacement based on certain parameters.

In summary, Ms. Bolliger stated the following HPP staff recommendations:

- Typical, standard existing wood windows could be replaced in-kind;
- Decorative, non-standard windows (i.e., stained or leaded glass decorative windows; non-standard dormer, gable or staircase windows; decorative transoms; curved sashes) will be considered character-defining to the LHD and must be considered by the HALRB for restoration rather than replacement;
- A record of window replacements being undertaken in the LHD must be tracked through the CoA process (with required review and approval by the HALRB);
- A conditions assessment of existing typical, standard windows will not be required since such analysis could be considered subjective (and a lack of consistency in the outcomes of decisions after conditions assessments would be unfair and could be questioned in a court of law); and
- The policy language should not differentiate between contributing and non-contributing houses in the LHD since the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not generally make such distinction for other design elements.

Lastly, Ms. Bolliger cited the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance (ACZO) language in Section 15.7.9.B which gave the HALRB the authority to make this type of minor clarifying language update to the *Maywood Design Guidelines* without County Board review. She explained that the HPP staff considered this proposal a “minor amendment” to the ACZO because it would not change or reverse any existing language in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*, nor would it transfer approval power from any entity to another. Rather, this is a policy clarification to enable the HPP staff to make consistent recommendations to the HALRB regarding window replacements in the Maywood LHD. Likewise, this policy clarification would set clear expectations for Maywood property owners while also allowing the HALRB the ability to make consistent decisions regarding future window replacement requests in the district.

Ms. Bolliger stated that three public comments had been submitted in advance and shared with the commissioners (included here.)

Comment #1:

Regarding the proposed window replacement guidelines in the Maywood Design Guidelines:

1. Replacement of windows should permit replacement with energy efficient insulated windows, provided the replacement windows conform to existing styles and materials (i.e. six-over-six design with wood frames, mullions and trim). Sustainability and energy efficiency should be permitted provided the design guidelines can be met. Residents and visitors will appreciate consistent design over the nuance of single-pane vs. insulated glass.

2. The design guidelines should specify the required material for replacement windows as wood to fit historic design. Energy efficient or other replacement windows should be permitted provided they meet design approval, and the guidelines should specifically exclude vinyl, aluminum, composite, etc.

3. "Typical window" section should specify that other configurations are permitted, provided they match typical design standards seen in Maywood. The design of replaced windows should be permitted to be reconfigured in order to match the design aesthetic of the overall home, not simply what was in place prior to replacement. Replacements that move the design aesthetic of the home closer to the intentions of the historical designation should be encouraged.

Comment #2:

I live in Maywood (2911 23rd Street N.) but am out of the country and won't be able to join the discussion on the possible new guidelines.

I welcome alternatives for addressing original windows that have deteriorated beyond the point when repairing is financially viable. As a person who has recently had almost all of our historical windows restored I can confirm that this is a costly undertaking. Personally I was happy and willing to restore our original windows since I believe the design, fit and material of original windows are critical to the character of a house

Replacement windows that replicate the details of the original window should be an option. The standard for what is a replication window should be high but it should not be a barrier. Replacing any 6 over 1 double hung wood window with another 6/1 window could result in muntins, lights, or sashes that are different from the originals and thus alter the character of the house. But windows that truly capture the design, material, and fit of the original windows could also maintain the character.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Good luck with the meeting. I very much appreciate HALRB looking for ways to build in options for Maywood home owners.

Best, Scott Pietan

Comment #3:

I support the proposed draft language—especially being able to use double paned glass which will assist homeowners in keeping airplane noise in check and lowering heating bills.

Ms. Bolliger next read into the record comment #4 in support of the appendix and that was received shortly after the public comment deadline:

Hello Ms. Bollinger -- I am writing to support the adoption of Appendix H: In-Kind Window Replacement Guidelines into the Maywood Design Guidelines. Unfortunately, I will not be able to join the virtual meeting tonight.

I am now a 36-year Maywood resident. (Last year you helped me with approval of a handrail for my house; thank you again). I appreciate all the thought by your office that has gone into development of these guidelines, as well as the work of my Maywood neighbors. The Maywood Design Guidelines have kept Maywood from an influx of, to my mind, inappropriate IKEA looking designs for new homes in Cherrydale, Lyon Village and other close-by neighborhoods. I am glad that Appendix H guidelines will allow Maywood residents to update their windows, in a manner that preserves the special character of our homes.

Sincerely, Janet Barsy

The Chair thanked the staff for their work and next asked members of the DRC to speak. Ms. Bolliger explained that the language had not been submitted to or discussed by the DRC in advance. Ms. Gwin stated she thought it was a good draft and asked how to make edits. Ms. Bolliger offered to share the document via her computer screen and insert edits in real time. The Chair agreed and invited the two public speakers before opening the discussion to the commissioners.

The Chair invited Mr. Andrews to speak. He stated his sympathy for the Greenes' situation given the poor condition of their windows. He supported the approval of the language in Appendix H and expressed his sadness that their project had not been approved previously as a measure of health and safety for the family. Mr. Andrews ended by stating he hoped this would trigger further amendments allowing additional replacements, such as replacing porch decking and railings with composite materials.

The Chair thanked Mr. Andrews for his comment and informed him that the HALRB had approved the Greenes' request in April.

The Chair next invited Maywood Community Association President Amanda Davis to speak. Ms. Davis thanked the staff and HALRB for their work. She recalled the work of the Maywood Design Guidelines Committee where the idea of in-kind [window] replacements had been proposed and tabled. She asked for further clarification of 'special' and 'typical' windows as the language was too vague. Ms. Davis further noted that language in the staff report had not been reflected in the [proposed appendix] language and she wanted to confirm that residents would be able to replace their windows for any reason without discrimination. Overall, she stated that the Maywood Community Association supported the amendment.

The Chair invited the commissioners to speak. Ms. Gwin suggested specifying that measured drawings and product data sheets be submitted as part of applications. She also recommended specifying that clear glass was required but that it could be insulated or double-glazed. She voiced concern that it would not be possible to list all the options for 'special' windows. She welcomed any suggestions for how to clearly state that 'typical' windows that matched identically could be replaced in-kind.

Mr. Laporte expressed his confusion over the proposed language. He recommended clearer definitions of ‘typical’ and ‘special’ windows as the layout presented definitions in multiple places, suggesting more than two types of windows were being discussed.

Mr. Davis agreed that a clearer definition of ‘typical’ should be developed to allow residents to understand which windows in their homes were ‘typical’ or ‘special.’

Ms. Lawrence recommended including clear language about identical matching windows and suggested including “special windows original to the house that have character defining features.” She said she understood the desire to replace windows for any reason but was not sure she felt comfortable with that level of indiscriminate approval at this time.

Ms. Garner suggested inserting the language “windows that it considers typical” to allow the HALRB a greater range of control over the types of windows that it would consider. She also suggested avoiding the word “will” in “The HALRB will permit in-kind, identical window replacements” so that the commission would be covered in the instance of any exceptions.

Mr. Turnbull thanked staff for their work. He agreed with Ms. Garner that if using the word “will,” then an introductory clause first encouraging the restoration of existing windows should be included to be in keeping with the precedent set by staff and HALRB over the years.

Mr. Aiken agreed with both Mr. Turnbull and Ms. Garner that a preamble would help contextualize the change in stance and retain continuity between the precedent decisions and the amendment language.

Ms. Meyer agreed with the comments, particularly those about the dimensioned drawings and product material data and asked if there would be a clarification between contributing and non-contributing buildings. Ms. Bolliger replied that since the *Maywood Design Guidelines* have never distinguished between non-contributing and contributing dwellings, staff felt it was most appropriate to continue that treatment and include all buildings in the language.

Mr. Meden agreed with his colleagues and expressed concern about allowing ‘carte blanche’ approval of replacement.

Mr. Wenchel expressed his support for the language and recommended allowing the DRC to place window [replacement] projects on the [HALRB’s] consent agenda.

Ms. Liccese-Torres thanked everyone for their comments. She asked the Chair to confirm that it seemed that the draft language was not quite ready for approval and should be revised and then return for review at the June HALRB hearing.

Ms. Gwin asked if an editable version could be shared for the commissioners to edit offline. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that legally that would not be possible as Board work needed to be managed in a public setting.

The Chair added his comments that he also generally approved of the draft but supported additional definition of the terms ‘typical’ and ‘special.’

Mr. Laporte noted that the legislative drafting required in this instance might not be most suited to the DRC’s strengths and that it would be best to return the revisions to the full Board for a second review instead. Ms. Gwin agreed that she thought the document did not need to come to DRC first.

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that staff would work on revising the draft language. Additionally, she said staff would mail another post card to Maywood residents to alert them of the ongoing guidelines update process and how they could review and comment.

FORM BASED CODE: 2801 COLUMBIA PIKE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Ms. Sara Mariska, the legal representative for the applicant, introduced the proposed project at 2801 Columbia Pike (the Elkins Building). She explained that the project was under 20,000 s.f. in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Columbia Pike and South Walter Reed Drive, and that the building was identified in the Commercial Form Based Code as historic, that it is a significant commercial façade, and is ranked in the top-third of the Important category in the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). Ms. Mariska noted that in addition to the redevelopment desired above the historic façade, the County [the Department of Environmental Services (DES)] was requesting some transit-oriented improvements around the base of the building which would require the façade to be moved away from its current location and setback. The desired transit center also would require the entire sidewalk and façade to be raised 6-8 inches; this, in combination with the setback, meant that the applicant was suggesting removing and storing the façade to allow for the construction of underground parking before re-installing the façade in its modified and raised location. Ms. Mariska showed updated designs for the addition based on preliminary feedback from the April DRC meeting with reduced setbacks based on that discussion; it was a streamlined design more in keeping with the Moderne style of the historic façade.

Ms. Jane Kim of DES explained that after examination of the site, DES had identified that their top priority was the vertical height, which, if raised only 4 inches, would allow buses to move up and down to load and unload passengers. Ms. Kim explained that 12 buses passed through that intersection every hour, meaning traffic was slowed on average every 5 minutes, thus the push to make the corner more efficient. She explained that the 15' setback that had originally been proposed by DES to the applicant came from exploring what would need to be installed for a typical transit station. However, when the applicant talked to DES, the applicant was informed that the second priority behind the raised curve was to accommodate additional seating for the approximately 600 riders seen at this stop daily.

The Chair asked for a summary of what was being requested. Ms. Sheila Borkar of DES' transportation planning team explained that they were proposing to remove and protect the façade, then move it 2½' from Columbia Pike instead of the 15' originally proposed for a smaller 10' transit stop. Mr. John Regan, the developer and applicant, stated that they hoped to have a 10' setback from the Walter Reed Drive side of the project area and to dig underground for the parking lot before the façade was rebuilt. Finally, Mr. Regan stated they planned to raise everything 4-6 inches as required for the transit station.

Ms. Farris provided additional context and noted that the County could not require the applicant to move their project to accommodate a County project. She also stated that if the façade were set back, then the historic façade would need to be shortened to remain on the existing parcel. Ms. Farris explained that the key term in the [Commercial] Form Based Code regarding preservation was the understanding of the "intent" of the redevelopment and whether it met the "intent" of preservation. She said the HALRB had the authority to decide whether or not this proposed project met the intent of the preservation of the building façade.

Mr. Aiken asked whether the applicant was considering how floors 3 to 7 would fit with the other buildings on Columbia Pike. He also asked if the entrance to the underground parking garage would be from Columbia Pike or Walter Reed Drive. The applicant replied that access would be from Walter Reed Drive and the rear alley.

Ms. Lawrence asked if it would be possible to relocate the proposed transit station or other proposed improvements to anywhere else along the Columbia Pike route where there might not be a protected historic façade. Ms. Borkar replied that this corner had been selected since Walter Reed Drive was also a major transit route.

Ms. Lawrence stated that the extent to which this building was being proposed to be moved, manipulated, and shortened was yet another example of the County choosing to prioritize redevelopment over

preservation. She expressed her support for access to transit but recommended finding another location [for a transit station] that would not affect a historic structure.

Ms. Gwin asked if the applicant had a response to her question posed during the DRC meeting about whether the façade could be preserved in-situ during the underground excavation. Ms. Angela Kostelecky, the architect for the developer/applicant, explained that the design team was exploring beginning the parking garage four feet inside the façade to allow it to be retained in-situ, but some engineers were still concerned about the structural integrity of the structure if this path was chosen. Mr. Regan explained they had planned to remove the façade so it could be cleaned and preserved and returned in better condition.

Mr. Laporte stated he believed the design had improved between the preliminary design and this second proposal. He also recommended finding additional ways to remove the verticality of the proposed development. He stated support for the increased setback of the addition and noted that he did not think the initial 2' proposed setback was appropriate but that the 4' setback was more appropriate.

Mr. Matt Mattauszek from the County Planning staff explained that there needs to be a certain distance between transit stations throughout the corridor to achieve the level of efficiency and enhanced bus ridership sought by the improvements planned for Columbia Pike. Additionally, he noted the consideration of the safety of riders getting to and from the transit stop, meaning that keeping transit centers close to transit stops was important for safe ridership. He said that with the need for a transit stop, the required setback already would begin to cut into the [potential] development space for the applicant. Further, he said that combined with the HALRB's desired deep setbacks, this could make the project financially unfeasible for the applicant.

Mr. Aiken stated that as a long-time Columbia Pike bus rider, he understood the issues of traffic. He asked that the next time the HALRB reviews this project that a rendering of the proposed transit shelter in front of the building be provided. He recognized that such a transit shelter might noticeably impact the historic façade from the right-of-way.

The Chair agreed with the HALRB's comments, stating that he agreed that the County had not been proactive in protecting historic buildings in the last few years. He recognized the subject property as one of only a few protected buildings on Columbia Pike and therefore preservation should be prioritized.

PARK NAMING: SOUTH EADS STREET AND ARMY NAVY DRIVE

The Chair invited Mr. Max Ewart, a planner in the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), to introduce this item. He said that as part of the master planning process for the Eads Street and Army Navy Drive park, staff had included questions related to the future park name during the first community engagement and had provided participants an opportunity to suggest the name. In the second engagement, staff identified the most popular suggestions and participants selected their preferences. Mr. Ewart explained that the criteria for naming and renaming County-owned facilities and parks required that the name have a geographical, historical, or ecological relationship with the site.

Mr. Ewart stated that based on the feedback, the three most popular choices were: Teardrop Park, recognizing the colloquial name for the parcel shape; Canal Park in reference to the historic Alexandria Canal, which flowed just past the park location; and Pentagon Park relating to the neighboring federal Pentagon building. A commissioner from DPR had suggested Cottonwood Park for the existing Cottonwood tree that DPR staff were working to preserve on site. Mr. Ewart explained that after the HALRB meeting, DPR staff next would take the recommendations from the Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Committee (NCAC) and the HALRB to the Parks and Recreation Commission in June or July for the formal vote before taking it to the County Board in the fall.

Ms. Bolliger noted that the HARLB had received one public comment (included here), which had been shared in advance with the commissioners and that the same person had signed up as a public speaker.

Comment #1:

Please vote to support the naming of the new park at S. Eads Street and Army Navy Drive as “Arlington Junction Park”. This park is located on the former site of Arlington Junction, a major feature of the Washington, Alexandria, and Mount Vernon Electric Railway (later a part of the Washington-Virginia Railway).

At the Junction, electric trolleys traveling on the Washington-Alexandria-Mount Vernon line of the railway along the former towpath of the defunct Alexandria Canal met those of the railway’s East Arlington branch. That branch traveled between Rosslyn, Arlington National Cemetery and the Junction.

The Junction contained a station and a triangular set of tracks. The triangle permitted trolleys to quickly transfer between the lines. The new park is located on the former site of one of the triangle’s sides.

This was the railway’s most important junction. Constructed between 1896 and 1900, the Junction remained in operation until 1939. At the railway’s peak, trolleys from Fairfax City, Vienna, Falls Church, Ballston and Clarendon and from Rosslyn and Fort Myer met those from Mount Vernon, Alexandria, and Washington at the Junction.

When it opened, Arlington Junction was within Alexandria County, near the former Civil War site of Fort Runyon. It received its name from Arlington National Cemetery, which some of its trolleys served.

References:

Tennyson, E.L. (1984). The History of Arlington’s Electric Railways. The Arlington Historical Magazine. Arlington County, Virginia: Arlington Historical Society (<http://arlingtonhistoricalsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/1984-6-Railways.pdf>) (See map of trolley line routes on page 47)

Merriken, John E. (1987). Old Dominion Trolley Too: A History of the Mount Vernon Line. Edited by LeRoy O. King, Jr. Dallas, Texas: L. O. King, Jr,

Northern Virginia Trolleys. Wikipedia (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Northern_Virginia_trolleys)

Maps:

“Map of Alexandria County, Virginia for the Virginia Title Co”. Alexandria, Virginia: The Company. 1900 (<https://www.loc.gov/resource/g3883a.ct002287/?r=0.404,0.84,0.223,0.105,0>)

“Map of electric railroads, steam railroads and streets in Washington and vicinity”. Rand McNally & Co.’s Pictorial Guide to Washington. New York and Chicago: Rand McNally & Company. 1904 (<https://archive.org/details/randmcnallycospi03rand/page/n8/mode/1up>)

Marshall, R. B.; Sutton, Frank (1915). “Topography: Maryland - District of Columbia - Virginia, Washington and vicinity.” Washington, D.C.: United States Department of the Interior: United States Geological Survey.
(<https://www.loc.gov/resource/g3850.ct004480/?r=0.486,0.705,0.077,0.037,0>)

“Washington-Virginia Railway System Map”. Washington-Virginia Railway Company. 1916. (<https://www.facebook.com/photo?fbid=2287086504889619>)

Aerial photographs and topographical maps (1900-2018) (S. Eads Street and Army Navy Drive, Arlington, VA): Historic Aerials (<https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer>)

The Chair invited Mr. Berne to speak. Mr. Berne reiterated the points from his written comment and urged the HALRB to support the naming of the park after the historic junction. Mr. Ewart noted that the DPR staff was not opposed to [this suggested] name, it had just not been selected when it was offered to the community participants as a suggestion during the planning process. Mr. Ewart said DPR staff would be happy to present the selection to the NCAC if the HALRB preferred it.

Mr. Aiken asked Mr. Ewart to discuss the proposed interpretation at the park. Mr. Ewart replied that the interpretation had not been detailed but the location had been identified. Mr. Aiken reiterated his prior comments to the Site Plan Review Committee for Pen Place that some interpretation should be included in the park regardless of the name selected.

Mr. Turnbull said he believed the name Pentagon Park would disappear into the neighborhood, Canal Park would be confusing with the better-known Canal Park in D.C., and that of the proposed names, he believed Teardrop Park would be most appropriate. However, he stated that he believed Arlington Junction Park was an appropriate nod to the County’s transit-oriented development.

Ms. Lawrence agreed with Mr. Turnbull and Mr. Berne’s comments that this was an opportunity to provide some more specific identification to a site with a lot of [transportation] history.

Mr. Laporte, Ms. Hamm, and Mr. Meden also agreed that Arlington Junction Park was the most appropriate name for the park.

The Chair asked for final questions and upon hearing none, made a motion.

I move that the HALRB, for the purposes of the park naming at S. Eads and Army Navy Drive, prefers the name Arlington Junction Park.

Mr. Turnbull seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 11-0-1, with Mr. Wenchel abstaining.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:03 pm.

ⁱ Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, Accessed May 6, 2022.

<https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehab/stand.htm>

ⁱⁱ The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, ‘Rehabilitation’ p.102, Accessed May 6, 2022.

<https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf>

ⁱⁱⁱ New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, ‘Repairing, Retrofitting, and Replacing Windows’, Accessed May 6, 2022.

https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/lpc/downloads/pdf/pubs/fact%20sheet_Windows_2117-2.pdf

^{iv} City of Alexandria Historic Preservation Window Replacement Guidelines, Accessed May 6, 2022.

<https://www.alexandriava.gov/sites/default/files/2022-02/Historic-Preservation-Parker-Gray-Window-Guidelines-2016.pdf>

^v Washington D.C. Historic Preservation Review Board, ‘Window Repair and Replacement Preservation and Design Guidelines, Accessed May 6, 2022. <https://planning.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/op/publication/attachments/HPO%20Window%20Guidelines.%2010%202011.pdf>