



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

Wednesday, January 19, 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
Jennie Gwin
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Robert Meden
Rebecca Meyer
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff, Chair

MEMBER EXCUSED:
Robert Dudka

STAFF: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Program Manager
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)
DISCUSSION AGENDA**

Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 21-31 at 3421 21st Avenue N.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the property at 3421 21st Avenue North was constructed circa 1933 and was one of five documented Sears mail-order kit homes in Maywood (most likely an example of the Wexford

model). The applicant submitted preliminary drawings for review at the October and November 2021 Design Review Committee (DRC) meetings, and in December 2021 attended both the DRC and HALRB meetings as a preliminary review item.

Ms. Bolliger summarized the details of the proposal as follows:

The applicant requests to modify the existing dwelling by demolishing an 1980s-era rear addition and constructing a two-and-one-half-story rear addition and detached two-door garage. On the original house, the applicant proposes to replace the existing front door with a glass double pane wooden door replicating that which would have been on the Wexford model. On the rear, the applicant requests to infill an existing doorway to the demolished addition. The applicant also proposes to screen the existing side porch, remove the existing handrail around the side porch, and restore an infilled window into the home from the porch with a solid wood six-over-six window matching other original windows in the house.

The proposed addition would be separated from the massing of the main house by a stepped-roof set-back hyphen which would allow for a courtyard patio area. Due to COVID-19 shortages, the applicant had not finalized the window manufacturer but was proposing fiberglass-clad wood or wooden windows for the primarily six-by-six casement windows. The addition's east elevation would be set back three inches from the original dwelling. The basement level cladding would be brick with smooth Hardie fiber-cement lap siding and PVC trim on the first and second stories. The existing roof would be replaced to match the asphalt architectural shingles on the new roof.

The proposed detached garage would be a 21' x 22' two-car structure with two paneled wooden garage doors in the front and a single egress door in the rear. A permeable paver driveway would connect a new curb cut in the street to the garage. After the DRC meeting, the applicant requested a 2' to 5' setback modification from the north parcel boundary to retain the garage in its current location.

Ms. Bolliger next summarized the feedback given at the most recent January 5, 2022, virtual DRC meeting: Mr. Wenchel thanked the applicant for the garage setback in response to concerns about the massing from the right-of-way and suggested perhaps it could be set back even further, given its size. Mr. Wenchel and Mr. Dudka recommended replacing the metal balustrade on the courtyard patio with a wooden balustrade more typical of porches in Maywood, which the applicant did. Mr. Davis suggested further differentiation of the new and existing construction. The DRC placed this item on the Discussion Agenda for the January 19, 2022, virtual HALRB public hearing

Ms. Bolliger then presented the staff recommendation as follows:

The Historic Preservation Program staff recommends approval of the subject application. The applicants and their architect followed the recommendations to reduce the height of the addition to make it secondary to the original dwelling and not visible from the 21st Avenue North right-of-way. They likewise stepped and set back the hyphen connecting the original dwelling with the addition to differentiate the two masses. The proposed vertical six-by-six casement windows are reminiscent of, but not identical to, the six-over-six wooden windows in the original dwelling. These techniques, along with the use of brick in the foundation story and lap siding in the top two stories of the addition, create harmony with the original dwelling while

differentiating the new construction, which complies with Standard #9 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.

In the original home, the applicant chose to restore several known historic features, including the original front door style and a window opening in the side porch. It was not inappropriate for a side porch to be screened; and the screening would be installed behind the mid-point of the columns as required by the HALRB in previous screened porch and deck projects in the local historic district (LHD).

Staff recommends solid wood windows in the addition as outlined by the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Staff explained that the guidelines categorized clad windows as inappropriate (p.19) and historically clad windows had not been approved in projects at contributing dwellings in the LHD. Otherwise, staff finds that the materials proposed for the addition, garage, and landscaping were appropriate per Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Such materials had been approved and used in the Maywood LHD, as well as meet the intent of Standard #9.

Based on DRC and HALRB feedback, the applicant reduced the size and height of the detached garage and set the garage back further to reduce the impact of the massing from the right-of-way. Since the January 2022 DRC meeting, the applicant had asked the HALRB to consider whether a setback modification would be appropriate for the garage. However, the DRC did not discuss this aspect of the project nor was the setback modification request advertised. Therefore, staff recommends that if the HALRB chooses to consider including the setback modification in its motion, that the CoA be separated into two parts and that the garage portion of the application return to the HALRB in February.

Ms. Bolliger noted an e-mail in support of the project from a member of the public; this had been shared with the commission in advance of the meeting. The Chair invited the applicants to speak and project architect Mr. Matt Lee thanked the commissioners for their time. The Chair invited the DRC to present its comments. Mr. Davis echoed Ms. Bolliger’s comments about the garage setback and the wooden balustrade on the hyphen patio. Mr. Wenchel added that he had recommended a wooden picket fence between the house and the garage. He applauded the applicants for their design.

The Chair then invited the remaining commissioners to speak. Ms. Gwin said the addition was a complement to the existing house. She supported the findings of the staff report, including the requirement of wood windows in the new construction. Mr. Laporte asked if the patio doors would have muntins. Mr. Lee replied that it could be considered. Ms. Lawrence wanted to correct a note in the staff report about her question in the previous meeting. Her concern had not been whether the commission had approved two-car garages, which they had, but whether they had approved two-car garages this close to the street, which she believed they had not. She stated support for the design of the addition but said she was struggling with the garage because of the sheer volume of built size on the lot. Ms. Lawrence directed attention to the HB07 perspective drawings to demonstrate the proposed garage volume. Mr. Lee explained that the Board of Zoning Appeals would review the garage setback, so the HALRB did not have to consider it as part of its motion.

The Chair stated he would make a motion which included the requirement of wooden windows. Ms. Gwin asked to include Mr. Laporte’s recommendation to include muntins on the patio doors. The Chair proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-31, permitting the remodel and new addition proposed in the subject application for 3421 21st Avenue N., provided that all new windows be constructed of solid wood without cladding in accordance with [the] *Maywood Guidelines* and further that muntins be included on the patio doors. HALRB finds that the home project complies with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standard #9*: new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction by creating harmony with the original dwelling while differentiating the new construction.

Ms. Meyer seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 12-0.

Discussion Agenda Item #2: CoA 21-33 at 315 N. Glebe Rd.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the Buckingham Shopping Center was built as a component of the planned Buckingham residential community between 1937 and 1946. The complex consisted of numerous commercial buildings at the intersection of North Glebe Road and North Pershing Drive. The commercial complex, inspired by the Garden City movement, evoked the idea of a traditional village center and was one of the final examples in the D.C. area of separating stores by a street which was a popular design among planners in the 1920s.

Ms. Bolliger summarized the application as follows:

The applicant proposed to modify two existing neon signs which conformed with the *Buckingham Design Guidelines* on the existing black light boxes for the vacant Cassianna Spa.

The first sign, 34' 10" long on the south façade (side A per the drawings), has four possible options:

1. Replicating the 8' 4" length of the green neon horizontal tubing with "Burn Boot Camp" spaced evenly in the middle.
2. Extending the green neon tubing to allow "Burn Boot Camp" to replicate the narrower spacing on the southwest façade.
3. Retaining the 8' 4" length of the green neon tubing with the addition of four graphic geometric white shapes on either side of the text to fill the remaining space.
4. Retaining the 8' 4" length of the green neon tubing with the addition of a graphic white line on either side of the text to fill the remaining space.

The second sign on the southwest façade (Side B per the drawings) was 16' 6" long and the applicant proposed three options:

1. Removing the sign entirely and leaving only the awning.
2. Retaining the existing light box and adding a conforming sign reading "Burn Boot Camp" in white neon with the typical green neon decorative element.
3. Retaining the existing light box but removing all neon and leaving the sign box blank.

Ms. Bolliger said the DRC considered this application at its January 5, 2022, virtual meeting. The commissioners voiced a concern about the kerning and spacing of the signs and asked for them to be evenly spaced. The applicant then submitted three additional options for the longer sign based on the DRC recommendations. The DRC placed this item on the Discussion Agenda for the January 19, 2022, virtual HALRB public hearing.

Ms. Bolliger noted the staff recommendation as follows:

The Historic Preservation Program staff recommends either Option 1 or 2 for the longer sign on the south façade (Side A) as the proposed graphic images on the light boxes in Options 3 and 4 had not been used in the commercial district previously. Staff believed Option 1 or 2 was a simpler, cleaner design more in keeping with the existing commercial signage throughout the LHD.

On the southwest façade (Side B), staff recommends Option 2 with retention of the existing sign box and installation of new sign tubing as that option maintained the character of the existing signage. The removal of the sign entirely (Option 1) would interfere with the symmetry of the existing signs on the building and installation of a new sign box in the future might require additional hardware which could damage the brick. Further, a blank sign box (Option 3) would be atypical for the district.

Staff stated that the materials, colors, and overall design of the proposed signs are all consistent with the other signs in the LHD. Further, staff found that the proposal meets the intent of Chapter 11: Guidelines for Commercial Areas: Signage of the *Buckingham Design Guidelines*.

Since the applicant had no comment, the Chair invited the DRC to give feedback. Mr. Davis thanked the applicant for the additional options and said staff had adequately summarized the DRC feedback. Ms. Gwin recommended the full sign Option 2 for the shorter side and Option 2 for the longer side. Mr. Laporte agreed, stating that it looked more like a unified title with this spacing. Ms. Lawrence stated she supported Option 2 for both signs. The Chair asked for any contrary points of view. Upon hearing none, he made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-33 to allow replacement of the signs located on the building at 315 N. Glebe Road, provided that the applicant uses Option 2 as indicated in the subject application for the sign on the south façade, and Option 2 indicated in the subject application for the sign on the southwest façade.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0 (Mr. Turnbull left during the discussion and was not present for the vote).

Discussion Agenda Item #3: CoA 21-30 at 2415 Shirlington Rd.

The Chair recognized the substantial public interest in this project, stated his support for the preservation and revitalization of this building, and outlined the legal scope of the HALRB's review.

Ms. Bolliger described the Green Valley Pharmacy, originally built in 1942 as a grocery store, as a one-story commercial building faced in textured stucco. She explained that the building's simple design had minimal architectural ornamentation, with the most distinctive feature now being the prominent corner entrance. She described the minimal changes made to the building over time:

The HALRB approved CoA 18-13 in July 2018 for: 1) the demolition of the false mansard roof (built ca. 1983) and restoration of the building's roofline to its original minimalist design; and 2) removal of an American elm abutting the rear of the building. The HALRB later approved CoA 18-13A in September 2018 for the installation of a metal cap on the parapet and 18-13B in December 2018 for the

installation of a new HVAC system. In September 2020, the HALRB approved the expansion of the existing service door on the southeast façade (to code standards).

Ms. Bolliger detailed the application as follows. The applicant, in partnership with the property owner, was applying for several exterior changes to convert the building into an operating restaurant:

- Installation of a new opening in the building's east (rear) elevation measuring 42" x 92" and gasket sealed to a new free-standing cooler;
- Installation of a new 29'9" x 8' walk-in cooler;
- Removal of the existing rear chimney and patching of the wall to match;
- A 12'-wide concrete driveway around the building for car access to parking (four parking spaces were outlined within the LHD parcel, including two ADA-compliant spaces in front of the building and two parallel spaces along the north side of the building. The remaining parking spaces were on the adjacent parcel outside the LHD parcel boundaries);
- Installation of nine concrete-filled bollards along the north elevation of the building;
- Installation of a grease container, a cardboard dumpster, and a trash dumpster on a concrete pad at the northeast corner of the building;
- Installation of ADA-compliant curbs and ramps throughout; and
- Installation of movable planters and outdoor seating which were exempt from design review as they were removable (they were included in the packet since they would be part of the landscape for longer than six months).

Ms. Bolliger recounted that the DRC first considered this project at its December 1, 2021, virtual meeting. She noted that Mr. Wenchel had several concerns: 1) placing new parking in front of the storefront instead of alongside it; 2) inserting a new opening into the building when commercial buildings often have varying needs as businesses change; and 3) placing the cooler close to the building without an air gap. Mr. Wenchel advocated for a separation between the rear of the building and the proposed cooler so there would be minimal impact to the original building. He said this would also help indicate the cooler as newer construction and reduce potential impacts on the rear elevation from moisture and mold. Mr. Davis suggested that the coloring of the cooler match that of the building. He stated that such an addition could be appropriate given the service nature of the building. Ms. Bolliger explained how the DRC originally recommended that this item be placed on the Discussion Agenda for the December 15, 2021, virtual HALRB public hearing. However, the HALRB Chairman requested on the day of the scheduled hearing that the item be deferred due to a written request by the Green Valley Civic Association to have more time to review the proposal.

Ms. Bolliger stated the DRC reviewed the project again at its January 5, 2022, virtual meeting and shared the DRC members' concerns about the removal of the chimney given that it was one of the few original architectural elements on a simple commercial building. Mr. Dudka considered the proposed cooler to be a removable feature of the building and asked for a drawing of the proposed rear elevation. Mr. Wenchel expressed concern about the potential lack of maintenance of the rear elevation once the cooler was installed. The DRC members recommended that the applicant seek alternate customized cooler constructions which would allow the retention of the chimney, then placed this item on the Discussion Agenda for the January 19, 2022, virtual HALRB public hearing.

Ms. Bolliger summarized the staff recommendation as follows:

Staff recommends the approval of the subject application. Staff hopes that the proposed restaurant use would return life to a vacant building whose pharmacy business served as the center of the Green Valley community for decades. Staff understands the secure interior space legally required for medication storage for the

building to return to its pharmacy use was beyond the capacity of the existing building footprint. Further, staff appreciates the owner’s pursuit of a new business to fit the existing space which conforms with the intent of Standard #1 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the Green Valley Pharmacy was designated as a LHD based on three qualifying designation criteria (as per §11.3.4.A.6 of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance):

- Its character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county, state, or nation;
- Its association with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the county, state, or nation; and
- Its suitability for preservation or restoration.

The *Local Historic District Designation Form* describes the Pharmacy’s “Significant Features” as “its historic, cultural, and social significance and the building’s prominent location in the heart of Nauck [now Green Valley] at the intersection of Shirlington Road and 24th Road South.”

Further, the *Green Valley Pharmacy Local Historic District Design Guidelines* states the following about the building: The original massing of the building and arrangement of fenestration remains unchanged. Stylistically, the Green Valley Pharmacy is of non-descript architectural design and is a simple, mid-20th century commercial building without architectural detailing. The significant features of the site include the rectangular-shaped commercial building, the adjacent paved parking areas, and the building’s prominent location at the corner of Shirlington Road and 24th Road South. The priority for preservation of the site will involve maintaining the historic and architectural integrity and character of the entire building, mainly as a one-story commercial building with a corner entrance.

Although the standing brick chimney on the east (rear) elevation was original to the building based on the construction drawings stored with the Center for Local History (at Central Library), the chimney is non-functional and is not listed as a character-defining feature of this commercial building in either the LHD designation form or the design guidelines. A utilitarian chimney is not characteristic of commercial architecture nor typical to the function of the building as a grocery store (original use) or a pharmacy. The HALRB has allowed the removal of non-functioning chimneys in the past, even in residences where the chimneys were typical to the construction.

The proposed installation of an exterior cooler would allow the adaptation of the existing building footprint without a major impact on or expansion of the historic building, which complies with Standard #1 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*. A walk-in cooler was approved by a County building permit in October 1944 (removal date unknown), showing that the proposed cooler addition is in keeping with the use of the building and landscape. Furthermore, the surface of the cooler would be parged to match the building’s existing wall treatment. The applicant had also offered to paint the cooler white so it would blend into the existing building for minimal visual impact. The cooler would be set two inches away from the rear building wall to create an air gap and thus would not damage the historic fabric of the elevation. The cooler would allow for the addition of usable square

footage with minimal alteration to the historic massing and materials, as per Standard #9 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

While staff would prefer not to introduce a new door opening on the historic building, they believe it would not be inappropriate for a commercial building to have a second rear service entrance. Also, this new opening would help maximize the efficient use of the building as a restaurant. In response to Mr. Wenchel's concern, Ms. Bolliger explained that pull-in parking spaces are preferred for ADA parking since parallel parking is less accessible. Historically, there had been parking in front of the building. As none of the proposed outdoor seating or planters would be fixed, they comply with Standard #9 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Bolliger informed the Chair that architect Ms. Pat Snyder was on the call for the client and that two members of the public had signed up to speak: Mr. Ezra Moore, speaking for J. L. and M. Homes and Ms. Robin Stompler speaking for the Green Valley Civic Association (GVCA). The Chair invited the applicant to speak first. Ms. Snyder expressed their excitement to be part of the Green Valley community and their willingness to work with the limitations of the small building. She explained that since [owner] Ms. Al-Amin owned both the Pharmacy parcel and the neighboring parcel, they were able to do a site plan which made the most of both. She explained that the new sidewalk would connect the streets toward the [town] square and felt it would be a wonderful addition to the area.

The Chair invited the DRC to speak. Mr. Wenchel said he agreed with the comments in the [recent] letter from the Green Valley Civic Association. He raised a concern that much of the building's character had been stripped when the HALRB had allowed the removal of the mansard roof, and as a consequence thought that the removal of the chimney from an already plain building would be of detriment. He stated that often disused chimneys were capped instead of removed. Mr. Wenchel also recommended finding a way to retain the tree, and voiced concern about placing the cooler close to the building wall and recommended keeping the chimney and placing the cooler past it, connecting the cooler to the building by a walkway.

The Chair next called the public speakers. First was Ms. Stompler. She asked if Portia Clark was on the call, but Ms. Clark was not able to speak. Ms. Stompler expressed interest in the success of the Pharmacy building. She cited the LHD nomination form and the stated importance of retaining the building's physical form. Ms. Stompler said the building had been compromised by the removal of the mansard roof and signage. She believed that the removal of the chimney and the addition of the door would further degrade the integrity of the building. Ms. Stompler explained that the GVCA letter also had commented on parking, outdoor dining, the roof deck, and the retention of the tree, understanding that it was not within the purview of the HALRB. Ms. Stompler noted an earlier discussion with the applicant about the name of the business. She thanked the commissioners for their cooperation.

The Chair then invited Mr. Moore to speak, but Mr. Moore was not yet present.

The Chair began the commission discussion, highlighting a number of topics: the removal of the chimney, the addition of a new door in the rear to access the cooler, and the removal of the elm tree. The Chair also asked for clarifications on the [validity of the] previous [approved] work.

The Chair asked Ms. Snyder to explain why the chimney had to be removed. Ms. Snyder replied it was hard to create a custom indented cooler and that the team was trying to retain circulation space around the building and access to the dumpsters and service area in the rear. She directed the commission's attention to the letter from Ms. Al-Amin, the daughter of 'Doc' Muse, in which she stated that she supported the addition of the door in the rear and removal of the chimney. Ms. Snyder explained that the door was more

important than the removal of the chimney; she said not allowing direct access to the cooler would be a problem for the operation of the restaurant and cause potential health and safety issues. Ms. Snyder stated they would be willing to rebuild the chimney after the removal of the cooler or allow for the chimney to be retained and place the cooler further away if necessary. She explained that two inches was a typical setback for walk-in coolers.

Since the second public speaker had arrived, the Chair allowed him to speak next. Mr. Moore expressed concern about the location of the trash area and thought it would be hard for haulers to access the trash, which would be very loud for the townhouses being built adjacent to the Pharmacy building. He then asked if the dumpsters could be fenced to reduce illegal dumping and rodents.

The Chair invited other commissioners to comment. Ms. Lawrence stated the chimney should be retained. She asked if the tree CoA had expired, having been over a year since it had been approved. As there were no other plantings near the building, she believed that the tree should remain and other plantings added. Ms. Lawrence clarified that the HALRB did review signage and agreed that [any future] signage should reflect the connection to the original business to cultivate the connection to the community.

Ms. Liccese-Torres informed Mr. Moore that Code Enforcement staff was always available as a resource to resolve outstanding issues with noise or trash. She also responded to Ms. Lawrence's question about the validity of the tree removal CoA. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that the [approval of the] 2018 CoA allowed for the removal of the tree and the removal of the [false mansard] roof to return the historic facade back to its original appearance. She explained that applicants have one year after the issuance of a CoA to begin work on their project to retain the validity of their permit. If work has begun in earnest prior to the year lapsing, the CoA is considered valid for the duration of the project. The Chair asked Ms. Liccese-Torres whether the [pharmacy] sign had been saved. She replied that she believed the family had retained it. Ms. Snyder explained that the applicant would return to the HALRB at a later date for the review of new signage.

Mr. Davis asked what the effect would be if the chimney was retained. Ms. Snyder responded that they would need to remove some width from the sidewalk and the grassy area and that they had agreed to fence off the dumpsters. Mr. Laporte agreed with Mr. Woodruff on the question about the validity of the tree removal portion of the 2018 CoA. Mr. Laporte agreed it was important to the community for this building to be returned to service, but he was concerned about the removal of the chimney. He suggested an alternate solution such as cutting the bottom from the chimney to allow the cooler to be placed closer to the building but to retain the appearance of the chimney.

Ms. Bolliger stated she had conferred with the County Forester on the tree. They maintained that while it was technically healthy, it was too close to the building and would begin to damage the building as it matured. She said they also stated that the tree would become a hazard to the building once it began to deteriorate, which was likely given the planned traffic pattern around the building over the tree's roots. She continued, noting that the grassy areas that had been planned as part of the landscaping were considered adequate replacements for the stormwater management loss of the tree. The Chair voiced his concern about the continued loss of trees at the recommendation of the County Forester.

The Chair expressed his understanding that the value of the building was in its role in the community and therefore he was very receptive that the signage should be restored and the tree saved. He thought that installing a door in the rear and removing the chimney would not be destructive to the memory of what had happened in this building. He suggested making a motion and invited the commissioners to amend it as they found appropriate.

Ms. Gwin agreed that the [building's] importance appeared to be its contribution to the community and that the chimney was not a character-defining feature. She said she would prefer that the applicant pursue Mr. Davis's request for alternate options but agreed that given its commercial use, a chimney was not typical [for this kind of] structure and did not contribute to its importance. Ms. Gwin asked if the motion could be worded so that the applicant would not need to return [to the HALRB] if it was determined that the tree in fact was outside of the commission's purview. Ms. Liccese-Torres expressed concern that the HALRB had already acted on the tree [in 2018] and the tree removal had not been recently advertised; therefore, it could not be acted upon in a motion this evening. The Chair said that the applicant could return to staff for an Administrative CoA for the tree based on the Forester's recommendation. Mr. Wenchel bemoaned the removal of the roof and signage and expressed concern about the lack of elevation [drawings for the proposed alterations to] the building. He supported the reincarnation of the business but requested additional review by the HALRB.

The Chair asked the commissioners if they felt that the HALRB should move forward with considering the application or if they should defer it and ask the applicant to return. Ms. Snyder voiced the opinion that it was the applicant's priority for the application to move forward; to do so, then she said they would be willing to retain the chimney and place the walk-in cooler past the chimney and construct a walkway connecting the building and cooler. Mr. Davis stated that given the applicant's priority, he would support the project moving forward if the chimney was retained. Ms. Gwin asked Ms. Snyder for clarification on the material that would be used as infill. Ms. Snyder replied they would use a parged block to match the building and that the cooler would need to move back approximately 12 inches from the rear wall.

In collaboration with Ms. Gwin, the Chair made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-30 to allow the following alterations to the Green Valley Pharmacy Historic District building located at 2415 Shirlington Road: to install an opening in the east façade to access a new exterior walk-in cooler and to make appropriate landscaping changes to improve ADA accessibility as proposed in the subject application on the condition that the existing chimney be retained in its entirety and the walk-in cooler be located immediately adjacent and the new infill panel will be stucco clad to match the existing façade.

Ms. Hamm seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 10-0 (both Mr. Turnbull and Ms. Meyer had left the meeting and were not present for the vote).

Discussion Agenda Item #4: CoA 21-32 at 2831 23rd Rd. N.

Ms. Bolliger recounted that the property at 2831 23rd Road North originally was a circa-1925 Bungalow that had undergone extensive alterations over time. She provided the following site history:

Although not listed in the *Maywood National Register Nomination*, the house is located within the Maywood LHD. The 1936 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map recorded a one-story wood frame house. In 1955, the owner enclosed the front porch, and in 1959, added a front bay window (as per the Arlington County historic building permits). After 1959, the owners added another mass onto the front, covering the porch and original front doorway. The siding was patched over time and is currently a mixture of painted brick and vinyl siding. While it can be assumed that the original 1925 windows were solid wood, all visible windows have either been replaced with vinyl one-over-one windows or were installed in the new addition as vinyl. Since the original front door had been enclosed, the current front door into the addition over the original porch could be assumed to be non-original.

Based on the evidence, the materials visible from the right-of-way (including the siding, windows, and doorway) are not original either to the dwelling or the period of significance of the LHD, and neither was the massing or setback, modified for the post-1959 façade addition. This level of alteration was likely the reason the property was considered non-contributing to the LHD. However, the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not differentiate between contributing and non-contributing houses so all homes within the LHD are subject to the design guidelines.

Ms. Bolliger then described the application details and DRC feedback:

The applicant is renovating the interior of the house and is requesting to replace all the existing vinyl windows with two-over-two Lincoln aluminum-clad wood windows. Two windows on the first story of the front façade addition would be reduced in height (the sill would be raised and the header would remain the same) to allow for an interior kitchen counter. One window in the rear would be converted into a doorway with eight-lite Lincoln double-leaf sliding doors with full size windows on either side. On the front façade non-original addition, the existing front doorway and sidelite would be infilled and replaced with a window, while a new front entrance would be installed in the facade setback. The new front doorway would consist of glazed panel double-leaf doors with four-lite glazing over two shaker panels. All vinyl siding would be replaced with fiber cement Hardie siding.

The DRC considered this application at its January 5, 2022, virtual meeting. The members agreed that non-original windows in altered, non-contributing dwellings in the LHD should not necessarily be considered by the same standards as original windows in non-contributing or contributing homes and suggested that this was a broader conversation for the full commission. The DRC members did not otherwise have concerns about the proposed changes to the door and window openings.

At the DRC meeting, staff noted that because an existing window opening was being used for the proposed new front doorway, the new entrance would not be centered to the existing stairway, which was not typical for a traditional front entrance. Mr. Davis noted that the proposed doorway would be centered with the window above it and implied that movement of the existing railing and staircase to center the doorway might therefore be preferred. The owners replied that they had the same concern and had future plans to center the stairway when it needed replacement. The DRC placed this item on the Discussion Agenda for the January 19, 2022, virtual HALRB public hearing.

Ms. Bolliger stated staff recommended approval of the subject application as submitted and gave this additional explanation:

This non-contributing house has been severely altered and no longer resembles the Bungalow form as originally constructed nor does it retain characteristics common during Maywood's period of significance. The original front façade has been entirely obscured and the visible materials are not original to the building.

While clad windows are outlined as not appropriate in the LHD per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*, the dwelling features visible vinyl windows. Requesting that the applicants switch from vinyl to solid wood windows in a non-historic addition to a non-contributing house where the windows may originally have been vinyl appeared

to be conjectural and goes against Standard 3 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties*. Replacing the windows with solid wood likewise could violate *The Secretary of the Interior's* Standard 6 as there is no evidence of the window materials in the addition. Staff made the caveat that given the very few altered non-contributing houses in Maywood with vinyl windows, the precedent set should be minimal. To mimic original aluminum windows, wood-clad aluminum windows were allowed in the non-contributing renovation project at 2206 North Nelson Street (CoA 21-08.) On July 15, 1992, the HALRB also approved aluminum-clad wood windows on the non-contributing dwelling at 3215 22nd Street North.

The proposed fiberboard cement siding is appropriate according to Appendix C of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and has been approved and used in the Maywood LHD.

Moving the main entrance door from the side of the addition to the main facade would be a return to a more historically appropriate location because most historic entrances were on front facades. The applicants had informed staff and the DRC that they planned to center the front railing and staircase, at a later date, to rectify the concern about the new front doorway not being centered on the approach stairway. However, staff advocated that this alignment be completed at the same time as the entrance opening is changed to remain in keeping with the character of the LHD.

Applicant Mr. Inch thanked staff and explained that the majority of the renovation was interior and that the change in window size was to accommodate the counters for the new kitchen at the front of the house. Mr. Davis said the DRC found the requests appropriate. Ms. Lawrence stated she believed the renovation would be a huge improvement on what had been a group rental home with diverse materials and sizes of windows. She asked if the DRC had a comment on the material of the front steps. Mr. Wenchel expressed concern that moving the kitchen [to the front of the house] would require the change of the window size in the front which was divergent from typical homes in the neighborhood.

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

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-32 to allow the exterior changes proposed in the subject application for the non-contributing house located at 2831 23rd Road North. HALRB notes that the house has been substantially altered in past years and no longer resembles the Bungalow form as it was originally constructed, nor does it resemble other building characteristics common during Maywood's period of historical significance.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 10-0.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF

Chair's Report

The Chair informed the board that Libby Garvey had been appointed the new County Board liaison to the HALRB and that he recently had a constructive conversation with her about preservation in the County.

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Liccese-Torres updated the commission on the progress toward developing the new subcommittees. She also summarized the community engagement plan for the Historic Preservation Master Plan update and invited members to contribute to the outreach effort at the planned open houses and farmers market events later in the year. Ms. Liccese-Torres said receipt of the first full draft of the plan was imminent and after internal review would hopefully be shared with the public in the spring. She praised Ms. Tawney for her work developing a summary of responses from the previous feedback opportunities which soon would be posted on the Master Plan project webpage.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:37 PM.