



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

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD

Wednesday, April 16, 2025, 6:30 PM

This was a hybrid public meeting held both in person and through electronic communication means.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nan Dreher
Robert Dudka
Andrew Fackler
Gerald Laporte
Kaydee Myers, Chair
Mark Turnbull
Richard Woodruff

VIRTUAL MEMBERS: Omari Davis, Personal, Charlotte, NC.

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Alex Foster, Vice Chair
Carmela Hamm
Gray Handley
Joan Lawrence
Rebecca Meyer
Andrew Wenchel

STAFF PRESENT: Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Associate Planner

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Chair called the meeting to order and asked Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff to please call the roll. Ms. Mical Tawney called the roll and determined that there was a quorum.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

The Chair explained the in-person and electronic Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures. Ms. Myers described the logistics of participating virtually in the hybrid meeting via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number.

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 2025 MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for any comments on the March 19, 2025, draft meeting minutes. Hearing none, Ms. Myers made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Dick Woodruff seconded the motion. Ms. Tawney called the roll, and the motion passed 7 – 0; Ms. Nan Dreher abstained.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

Consent Agenda

There were two items on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Myers asked if the commissioners had any questions about the items. After hearing none, Mr. Mark Turnbull made a motion to approve the items on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. The Chair asked staff to call the roll. Ms. Tawney called the roll, and the motion passed 8 – 0. Speaking to attendees present for the Consent Agenda, Ms. Tawney shared that those items had been approved and thanked them for joining.

BARCROFT APARTMENTS SECTION 1, SECTIONS 3 AND 4, AND SECTIONS 6 AND 7 RENOVATION PROPOSALS

Ms. Tawney explained that the Barcroft Apartments project team was presenting three separate use permits and that the HALRB had already seen all three of them at previous meetings, but the Neighborhood Form Based Code (N-FBC) required that each use permit be presented to the HALRB twice. Ms. Tawney said they were going to split the presentation into two and that she would first share staff's presentation before turning it over to the Barcroft Apartments project team. Ms. Tawney shared the following for the first two use permits being presented:

On February 19, 2025, the Jair Lynch project team attended the hybrid HALRB public hearing to present their proposed rehabilitation project for Buildings 1-11 in Section 1 (referenced as RBU2) and Building 41 in Section 6 and Buildings 44-46 in Section 7 (referenced as RCU2) at the Barcroft Apartments, which is a large garden apartment community located along the Columbia Pike corridor. The Neighborhood Form Based Code (or N-FBC for short) requires that the project team attend two HALRB meetings, and tonight is the second HALRB public hearing that they are attending.

Again, the proposal is very similar to previous rehabilitation projects that the HALRB has reviewed. During the February HALRB public hearing, the discussion focused on their proposal to soften the visual impact of the accessibility ramps, the uses of the existing garage buildings, the retention of the existing copper-cladded canopies, the locations of the new canopies, the retention and repair of the existing slate roofs, and that the project team continued to expect waivers from Virginia Housing. There was discussion about the HALRB wanting to see the NRHP nomination for Barcroft at an appropriate time with the hopes that the HALRB could support the report and nomination. Lastly, there was some discussion about potential designs in the areas slated for demolition in Barcroft. The project team indicated they did not have anything concrete to share with the HALRB concerning the designs for those areas.

The project team was not requested to attend the March 4 or April 2 DRC meetings and could return to the full commission later to answer any questions about the proposal.

The HPP staff supports most of the work identified in Sections 1, 6, and 7. The scope follows the guidance of both Part 7 of the Conservation Area Standards in the N-FBC, and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

There are elements in the scope for Section 1 that require a Conservation Area standard modification. For Buildings 1, 3, and 7, those include modifying existing or creating new entrances for five accessible units and adding new windows to meet building code. The HPP staff does not see these alterations as affecting the overall design integrity of Section 1 and supports these changes because they are occurring on the rear and/or side elevations of the buildings and the design of the proposed accessible entrances have the appearance of secondary entrances.

Staff does have questions about the window replacement occurring in Section 1. The general scope on page 4 states that the basement-level steel-sash windows will be replaced with aluminum

windows matching the original. However, throughout the plans, the notes identify some vinyl replacements or there is no material change identified. Staff request that the project team provides clarity about the work being proposed for the windows.

Concerning Sections 6 and 7 only, there are elements in the scope that also require a Conservation Area standard modification. This includes adding new window openings and accessible entrances for the three new accessible units in Building 44 on the rear elevation. The design of the proposed accessible entrances has the appearance of secondary entrances and the accompanying new windows to these units are a requirement per the building code. The HPP staff does not see these alterations as affecting the overall design integrity within the complex and supports these changes. This concludes the staff report for Sections 1, 6, and 7.

Ms. Tawney invited Ms. Lauren Riley to share the project team's presentation with the HALRB. Ms. Riley re-introduced the members of her team attending the meeting that night and outlined what they would present that evening. She reminded the HALRB where Sections 1, 6, and 7 are located within the Barcroft garden apartment community. Ms. Alice Hagemann then shared the scope of work being proposed for these sections of Barcroft reiterating that the HALRB would be familiar with the scope as it was similar to what had been presented to them previously. Ms. Hagemann reminded the HALRB that some buildings in Barcroft have a large amount of unused basement space which provides a perfect opportunity for the creation of additional units or for the expansion of existing units to create family-size units. This requires the enlargement of existing windows that are smaller than code requires for egress. She noted this sometimes also requires the creation of a window well for egress as well and shared an example on one of the elevations and reiterated that the new wells would match the existing window wells found on site. She also noted that there were some instances where they would also need to add a railing around the window well to comply with code. They were proposing to install a metal pipe railing and utilize metal cable in between the pipe railings to reduce the opening size. There is precedent for the use of metal pipe railings in Barcroft as they are currently utilized around some existing window wells in the community; however, they are not code compliant because a 4-in. sphere could pass through the openings between the railings. The insertion of the proposed cable in between the metal pipe railings would not be largely visible from far away since the cable visually "disappeared" with distance. She noted that this condition would be used for window wells that were deep enough to require the installation of the railing and shared a few additional elevation drawings to demonstrate where the window wells would be located and what they would look like in situ. Ms. Hagemann then invited Mr. Martin Olivier to speak to the window scope for this section. Mr. Olivier said that HPP staff had correctly identified the contradictory notes in their drawings but shared that he had updated all the notes for the elevations so that they were now correct. He reiterated that all new windows would be aluminum and that the steel basement windows they are replacing will be replaced with aluminum windows and painted black to match the existing windows. He also shared that the width of the windows they are expanding to permit egress will match the width of the existing windows and that the muntin pattern would remain the same. That concluded the project team's presentation, and they opened it up for discussion with the HALRB.

Ms. Myers asked if the presentation addressed all of staff's questions. Ms. Tawney noted that it did and thanked the project team for addressing the discrepancies in the drawings. Ms. Tawney asked if the project team was going to add the cable wiring onto the existing metal pipe railings in these sections of Barcroft as well. Ms. Hagemann clarified that they would only be inserting the cable wiring where they are creating new window wells that require the railing and that they would not be modifying the conditions of the existing metal railings. Mr. Robert Dudka asked if the new pipe railing would match the existing with the exception of the cable in between. Mr. Olivier said it would essentially be the same and that they would match it to the existing as best they could within the parameters of code requirements. Ms. Myers asked if there was a reason it had to be railing instead of a flat grate system. Mr. Olivier said that the new window openings had to be available to use for emergency egress from bedrooms and

offered that if a grate were there instead of a railing, the grate would need to be operable so that people could escape. They also wanted to ensure that air and light was getting to the unit and felt that a grate might prevent that from occurring. He said that there was not a great product in grate form on the market that could accomplish all those goals. Ms. Riley said there were two priorities for the railing system: one was to prevent people from falling into the window wells and the other was the egress component of allowing people to escape the unit. Mr. Omari Davis reminded everyone that there had been some discussion at previous meetings about the installation of a gate system or other way for people to get out of the window well itself and asked if the project team had any updates on that topic. Mr. Olivier confirmed that they would install a ladder system to assist people in getting to the top of the well. He said he did not think they would have gates in the railing systems and noted that the use of an egress window assumes that someone could also climb over the railing. The railing also allows firefighters and other first responders to get into the building.

Hearing no other questions or comments, Ms. Myers asked staff to share their report for the next section. Ms. Tawney shared the following:

On March 19, 2025, the Jair Lynch project team attended the hybrid HALRB public hearing to present their proposed rehabilitation project for Buildings 27-29 in Section 3, and Buildings 30-31 in Section 4 at Barcroft Apartments. They are identifying this project as RA2. The N-FBC requires that the project team attend two HALRB meetings, and tonight is the second meeting.

The proposal is very similar to previous rehabilitation projects that the HALRB has been comfortable with supporting. During the March HALRB public hearing, much of the discussion focused on the project team's proposal to install interior storm windows to existing wood windows to meet building code requirements. If they are not permitted to do this, the project team is proposing to replace the wood windows with aluminum-clad windows. However, the project team did not think they would get a resolution on the windows by tonight's meeting.

The project team was not requested to attend the April 2 DRC meeting, and instead return to the full commission tonight.

The HPP staff supports most of the work identified in Sections 3 and 4. The scope follows the guidance of both Part 7 of the Conservation Area Standards in the N-FBC, and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, specifically standards #1, #2, and #9.

The potential replacement of wood windows with aluminum-clad windows where necessary for egress would require a Conservation Area standard modification. The HPP staff acknowledges that the original window configuration and fenestration pattern is important to retain, which the applicant is proposing, and that if necessary, replacing the wood windows with aluminum-clad windows for egress would only occur if the mechanics of the interior storm windows at the existing wood windows is not possible. If that is the case, the project team would come back to the HALRB later to present more details about these changes to the wood windows.

However, staff does have questions about the proposal to replace the wood fixed windows on the main entry doors of Buildings 27-31. This was included in the project team's March submittal plans, but it was not an item of discussion, nor was it pointed out in the staff report. The scope of page 12 of the submittal plans states the project will include the "repair and paint[ing] of building entry doors and frames" but does not mention the replacement of the fixed lites in the doors. Staff suggests that the HALRB discuss with the project team the proposed replacement of the fixed wood windows in the doorway, specifically discussing the material of those replacement windows. This concludes the staff report for Sections 3 and 4.

Before turning it over to Ms. Riley, Ms. Tawney shared that, in her reviewing of the materials for the meeting, she did think that there was some confusion between the different notes in the drawings related to the treatment of the doors and asked if that project team could speak to that during their presentation to clarify. Ms. Riley said they could address that and reminded the HALRB where these sections were located in Barcroft. She then turned it over to Ms. Hagemann to address staff's question. Ms. Hagemann confirmed that there might have been some confusion between the note on the repairs to the doors and the replacement of the lantern lights next to the doors in the drawings. She confirmed that the doors would be repaired, not replaced and that there would be no replacement of the lites in the doors. Given that the question was asked at a previous meeting, she also shared that there were 93 wood windows in Building 28 and 30 wood windows in Building 29 and that the remainder of the windows were vinyl. She reiterated that the vinyl windows would remain as would the wood windows with the addition of the interior storm window. The steel basement windows, as elsewhere in their project, would be replaced with aluminum windows.

Ms. Tawney thanked the project team for addressing staff's questions. Ms. Myers reminded the HALRB that they would be making motions for all items on the agenda moving forward, even for projects where they do not have the authority to approve or deny it, but where they could indicate support or opposition. She made the following motion:

I move to support the Barcroft use permits for Sections 1, 3 and 4, and 6 and 7.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Ms. Myers asked staff to call the roll. Ms. Tawney called the roll, and the motion passed 8 – 0. Ms. Tawney and Ms. Myers thanked the Barcroft team for attending the meeting and for their hard work.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Ms. Myers reminded the HALRB to let herself or HPP staff know if they were interested in serving as the HALRB's Housing Commission Liaison. Both Ms. Myers and Ms. Tawney reiterated that there could be some great connections made through this liaison relationship.

Next, Ms. Myers shared that Ms. Alex Foster attended the Inn of Rosslyn Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) meeting recently. Since she was unable to attend the HALRB meeting that evening, she shared her summary of the SPRC meeting before the HALRB meeting and asked that either HPP staff or the Chair share it with the full board. Ms. Myers read the summary as follows:

For 1601 Fairfax Drive, the project is within the boundaries of the Fort Myer Heights Sector Plan and County Staff explained that this project is within the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), categorized under the top third of the "Important" classification. The existing building has good architectural integrity and strong presence along the highway. The SPRC meeting focused largely on site-design, set-backs, overhangs, and design. One primary concern expressed by the Planning Commission was the lack of tree canopy and green coverage on the site.

A primary design challenges of the project includes tying into and expressing the architectural elements, materials, and colors of the adjacent Colonial Revival and Art Deco style garden apartments of the neighborhood, while still meeting the sidewalk along Fairfax Drive and expressing elements of the mid-century, Motel 50.

The proposed development does not currently include any tangible preservation of the existing building. Staff has suggested exploring options to preserve the existing lobby, bricks, and even incorporating signage that directly references the 50 on the hotel façade. The developer explained

that these suggestions are not financially viable, but have incorporated design inspiration from the hotel, including: abstracting the floating panels on the Motel 50 to still be visible from the highway, including zig-zag railings, and incorporating a color palette similar to the existing structure.

We explained that the current design does not adequately address the county's goals for historic preservation and would like to see more in the vein of tangible preservation. We expressed our concern that by demolishing this building, we are losing an HRI resource and would like to understand what they are proposing to make up for the deficit. Future discussions could include signage/placards and a study, architectural salvage, or even design references that more concretely incorporate elements of the existing design.

There was some discussion about where the Inn of Rosslyn was located since some HALRB members were unfamiliar with it. Ms. Myers shared that Ms. Foster was planning to attend future SPRC meetings. Mr. Woodruff asked what was being proposed to be built. Ms. Tawney said she thought the proposal was for a residential building. She said Ms. Lorin Farris was working closely with Ms. Foster on the project and that she believed there was at least one more SPRC meeting. She also shared that the project will be presented to the HALRB at a future meeting and offered that they could share their thoughts on the proposal at that time. There was some general discussion about the building and its architectural elements as well as other motels being demolished in the County.

Ms. Myers then invited Mr. Gerry Laporte to share a summary of the Arlington Historical Society's unveiling event for the stumbling stones project in Lyon Village. Mr. Laporte said it was hosted on a Sunday afternoon and that about 100 people attended. He explained that this was the third installation of stumbling stones in the County and that the design was different from what had been installed at the Ball-Sellers House (a project that had received a CoA and was reviewed by the HALRB). He said these bronze stumbling stones are embedded into the sidewalk. He shared that AHS was seeking donations for the stumbling stones project to embed more stones throughout the County. He noted that the County has been supportive of the project and that Arlington Public Schools was also involved in the manufacturing of the stones. Ms. Myers and Ms. Tawney thanked Mr. Laporte for attending the event. Ms. Tawney said she believed AHS's goal was to continue having more events as they installed more stumbling stones.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Tawney said she would provide an update on the Hotel Pentagon Site Plan project. Before sharing the update, there was some general discussion about the location of the site. She then shared the following update:

On Wednesday, April 9, the County Board approved the Hotel Pentagon Site Plan project. The project is located in the Green Valley neighborhood at 2480 South Glebe Road, which is bordered by the Lomax AME Zion Church (Lomax), which is an LHD. The developer is proposing to demolish two existing hotels and surface parking area and construct up to 531 residential units, with 494 units in a multifamily building and 37 townhouses and townhouse-style units. The project also included three new streets, public open space, and 549 parking spaces. HPP staff remained in contact with Planning staff concerning the project to ensure that Lomax was being heard and did not have any major concerns throughout the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC for short) process. There were attempts to have HALRB representatives participate at the SPRC meetings, but scheduling conflicts prevented this from occurring. HPP staff became aware that the Lomax congregation had concerns with the project via a letter dated March 18, 2025, that was sent to the Planning Commission and the County Board. Their concerns were also made more public during the County Board public hearing on April 5 and 9, and through various news

articles. On April 9, the County Board approved the project, with 4 votes to approve and 1 vote to abstain (it was Mr. JD Spain abstained). If the HALRB has questions about the approved project, staff recommends listening to the extensive public comments provided by the community or reviewing the Board Report and subsequent attachments. The HPP will monitor the new project during its construction and will continue to have a watchful eye during inspections of Lomax to ensure that nothing is impacting the LHD and its site.

She concluded by offering to share the link to the County Board report with anyone who was interested. Mr. Woodruff asked what it meant when a County Board member abstains from a vote. Ms. Tawney said it meant the same as it did for when a HALRB member abstained from voting. Mr. Woodruff said the HALRB abstains from voting on the minutes if they were not present for that meeting. Ms. Tawney and other HALRB members reminded Mr. Woodruff that HALRB members could also abstain to vote from other motions, not just ones related to the minutes. Mr. Dudka offered that members could abstain if they did not feel strongly enough against the motion to vote “no,” but they did not want to vote “yes” either. Mr. Turnbull also pointed out that members could abstain from voting if they had a conflict of interest in the project. Mr. Woodruff remarked that there was no abstaining in Congress and general comments were made about how voting occurs in Congress.

After more conversation about the general use of abstention when voting, Ms. Tawney moved the conversation to the final update in the staff report which was about the “Remembering Little Saigon” event being held on May 3, 2025. Ms. Tawney explained that the event was a collaboration between the HPP and Kim O’Connell, the Charlie Clark Center for Local History, Arlington County Public Libraries, and the Arlington Art Truck. She provided details about what time the event was occurring, what the event included, and encouraged the HALRB members to attend if they were available.

With no other business for the good of the order, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:22 pm.