



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

Wednesday, January 17, 2024, 6:30 PM

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Omari Davis, Chair
Kaydee Myers, Vice Chair
Andrew Fackler
Alex Foster
Gray Handley (arrived 6:32 pm)
Gerald Laporte
Rebecca Meyer (arrived 6:40 pm)
Andrew Wenchel
Dick Woodruff

VIRTUAL MEMBERS: None

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Carmela Hamm
Joan Lawrence
Mark Turnbull

STAFF PRESENT: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Program Manager
Lorin Farris, Principal Historic Preservation Planner
Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Associate Planner

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Chair called the meeting to order. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and determined 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. Chair Davis described the logistics of participating virtually in the hybrid meeting via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 2023 MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for any comments on the draft December 20, 2023, meeting minutes. Upon hearing none, Mr. Laporte moved to approve the December minutes and Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 8-0; Ms. Meyer had not yet arrived.

APPROVAL OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoA) CONSENT AGENDA

The Chair asked for any comments on the consent agenda. Upon hearing none, Mr. Woodruff made a motion to approve the consent agenda and Mr. Laporte seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 8-0; Ms. Meyer had not yet arrived.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

CoA Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 24-01, 2900 22nd Street N., Maywood Historic District

Ms. Tawney provided the project background:

The house at 2900 22nd Street N., located in the Maywood Local Historic District (LHD), was constructed in 2009. The house was built after the Maywood neighborhood was listed on the National Register of Historic Places, which took place in 2003. As such, the house is considered non-contributing to the historic district. The HALRB approved the construction of a single-family dwelling on this lot in November 2006 with CoA 06-33. The project came forward for additional review from the HALRB due to revisions to the house's design and changes to the landscape from 2006 to 2008; details are included in the full staff report.

The current proposal before the Board has a few different elements. The application involves the demolition of the existing rear deck and stairs and the construction of a new rear deck and screened porch. To accommodate the new rear deck and screened porch, the applicant is proposing to expand the exterior footprint of the house on the eastern side of the rear elevation by 3.3 feet by 3.3 feet. This modest expansion will have an 8-inch concrete masonry units (CMU) wing wall with a parged coat at the foundation to match the existing and Hardie lap siding to match the existing with PVC trim. The expansion of the house also necessitates the removal of four existing six-over-one wood windows in that area; these will be replaced with a double-leaf, fully glazed wood door on the rear elevation. The applicant also is proposing to install three four-over-one wood windows on the east elevation of the house.

The new rear deck would have composite deck flooring, composite railings, and a new flight of stairs with riser lights leading to a concrete landing at the ground level. In between the deck and the screened porch, the applicant is proposing to install a gas fireplace. The gas fireplace, which would open to the screened porch, but have its rear exposed on the deck side, would have a stone veneer. The screened porch would also feature composite decking and composite railings. Screens would enclose the porch and the railings would be located on the inside of the screening. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing door on this side of the house, slightly enlarging the opening, and replacing it with a wood, sliding glass door.

In addition to the construction of the rear deck and screened porch, the applicant is also proposing to make a new window opening along the east elevation and install a fixed, vinyl window. This window would be in the bathroom of the house, specifically the shower. The applicant is also requesting to replace the wood flooring on the front porch with composite decking; the existing wood railings would remain in place.

The Design Review Committee (DRC) heard this application at its January 3, 2024, meeting. The commissioners did not have any concerns or comments about the

proposed demolition and construction of the new screened porch, the new rear deck, or the small enlargement of the rear of the house. Much of the conversation focused on the proposed materials for the project, specifically the request to use composite materials and a vinyl window. Although the DRC members felt comfortable with the overall project scope, they felt that the full HALRB should discuss the appropriateness of the proposed materials.

Given that this home is of new construction and non-contributing to the LHD, staff recommend approval of the subject application. The proposed deck and screened porch will be located on the rear of the property and therefore, not visible from the public right-of-way meeting the intent of Chapter 6: New Addition/Building of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* which state, "...the new addition should not be prominently visible from the street and should be located to the rear of the house, if possible." Ideally, the construction of a new addition would have a limited impact on the existing house, but the proposed rear expansion is minimal and also situated to the rear of the house.

Although decks and screened porches are not mentioned specifically in the *Maywood Design Guidelines* as appropriate for the district, there are existing examples of both throughout the district. Staff consider screened porches and decks appropriate ways to increase the livable space of houses in Maywood. While retaining the porch railing inside of the screen of a screened porch would typically not be recommended as it obscures the banister detail, there are existing examples of screened porches with interior handrails in Maywood as well.

Regarding the materials proposed for the project, staff finds most of them to be appropriate. The proposed doors are made of wood a material that is consistent with permissible materials in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. The proposed siding and PVC trim would match existing on the house and meet the standards outlined in both Appendix C: Cement Fiberboard Siding Materials and Appendix D: PVC Trim in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. The proposed replacement windows on the east elevation meet the intent outlined in Chapter 6: New Addition/Building, specifically the section on windows, and Appendix H: In-Kind Window Replacement Guidelines of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Although these windows will not replace the windows being removed for the rear expansion, they will match the existing windows on the house in material, design, dimension, and appearance.

Regarding the proposed vinyl window for the bathroom, the *Maywood Design Guidelines* state that "vinyl or aluminum (or vinyl- or aluminum-clad) windows are inappropriate for Maywood." However, there is precedent in the LHD for the use of vinyl windows in specific cases related to high-moisture spaces like bathrooms. In two examples, a vinyl window replaced an aluminum-clad wood (CoA 18-01) and a non-historic wood window (CoA 21-11) that had deteriorated due to high moisture exposure. While the proposed vinyl window in the subject application would be a new insertion, and therefore would not have a pre-existing condition to prove a wood window would be incompatible in the space, the HALRB's approval of other instances of vinyl windows in the LHD set a precedent for the use of vinyl windows in high moisture areas such as bathrooms.

Staff encourages the HALRB to discuss the appropriateness of the use of composite materials in this project. The Guidelines state in Chapter 6: New Addition/Building

with regards to porch flooring and decking materials that, “artificial materials may be considered for decks or porch flooring” under certain circumstances. Due to the deterioration of the wood flooring on the front porch of the subject house, it would be appropriate per the *Maywood Design Guidelines* for the flooring to be replaced with composite materials as long as that material is compatible in appearance with historic materials. However, the HALRB would need to decide if the new use of composite materials on the rear of the house is appropriate.

As a point of comparison, other newly built and re-built, non-contributing houses in the Maywood LHD have incorporated a mixture of composite and wood materials. In 2004, the dwelling at 2158 N. Oakland Street used wood for their railings, handrails, and stairs; no note about the flooring materials used for this project was located. No material details were located for the new dwelling at 3320 N. 23rd Road; however, staff did find that during a deck expansion in 2006, the applicant planned to use wood handrails and composite decking which matched the existing materials of the deck. Additionally, in 2021 and again in 2023, the dwelling at 2326 N. Jackson Street used wood handrails and guardrails on the front and rear of the house but used composite materials for the porch flooring, in 2022 the house at 3205 23rd Street N. used pressure-treated wood on the stairs and handrails, and in 2017, the house at 2322 N. Fillmore Street used wood railings, wood porch flooring, and wood stairs. Since the precedent for the use of materials on newly built or re-built houses varies in the LHD, the HALRB should consider both the location and appropriateness of the proposed materials on the subject property.

After Ms. Tawney concluded the staff report, Chair Davis asked the applicant if they had anything to add to the presentation. Mr. Bob Braddock of Bowers Design Build, contractor for Resa Homan and Patrick Corbus, the homeowners, introduced himself. He did not have anything to add to the presentation but emphasized that the owners’ goal was to make the screen porch and deck as harmonious as possible with the existing architecture. He explained that the two points of contention with the proposed project (the composite materials for the decking and railing, and the vinyl window) are only being proposed for their durability. He showed the Board a physical sample of the composite decking material and noted its wood grain appearance.

Chair Davis provided the insights of the DRC. He said the DRC wanted the HALRB to discuss the application because the use of composite material could potentially create a precedent in Maywood. Mr. Handley asked how using composite materials on a non-contributing property would cause a precedent for contributing properties to the Maywood LHD. Mr. Handley did not consider what was being proposed precedent setting. Chair Davis agreed that in this context, it would not create a precedent if the HALRB clearly stated in its motion where composite decking is allowable in Maywood.

Ms. Tawney added that contributing properties in Maywood are held to a different standard and that it was important for the motion to outline why composite materials would be permissible in this particular case. She further stated that if the language in the motion is vague, it could open the door for owners of contributing properties to utilize this as logic for why they should be allowed to use composite materials for their projects.

Mr. Woodruff asked Ms. Tawney to clarify how she identified that there was already precedent for such changes. Ms. Tawney explained that the HALRB has approved the replacement of aluminum-clad wood windows or wood windows that were in poor condition because of their location in a bathroom. She noted how the subject project proposed the installation of a new vinyl window in a new opening; given this, there would be no way to prove an “inherent flaw” to the window, leaving the HALRB only to speculate

about whether a wood window would fail in this location. Mr. Woodruff next asked her to clarify the staff report concerning the composite decking material. Ms. Tawney explained that the HALRB has allowed the use of composite materials on both rebuilds and new houses in the LHD. She clarified further that some of the rebuilt or new-built houses use wood decking while others have composite decking; a majority have wood railings. Mr. Woodruff asked if that meant there was precedent. Ms. Tawney replied that it was up to the HALRB to determine if a precedent already had been set.

Mr. Laporte stated that although the property is non-contributing, the house tries to be compatible to the rest of the neighborhood; for that reason, it is not distinguishable between non-contributing and contributing buildings in the LHD. He felt projects that propose composite materials should be considered on a case-by-case basis. Since the design of the house fits into the neighborhood, he did not prefer the composite material for the decking at the front of the house, but he did not have an issue with the material on the rear of the house because it would not be visible from the street. He commented about how the composite material with the wood grain does not look as historic as without the wood grain.

Mr. Handley said the HALRB would not want to discourage a new build from fitting into the existing architecture of the neighborhood. He felt that if a homeowner built a contemporary-style house, that the owner should have to follow the same standards as contributing properties. Mr. Laporte agreed with that assessment, and that modern styles are not appropriate in Maywood. At this time, Ms. Tawney noted that the *Maywood Design Guidelines* allow composite decking on the front of houses if there is an inherent flaw (deterioration) to the wood decking. Mr. Laporte also added that in the past, the HALRB has requested replacement Hardieplank to not have a wood grain finish and that this could be applied as well for the front of the house. Ms. Foster and Ms. Myers asked Mr. Laporte if he opposed wood-grain composite because it tried to mimic the look of wood. Mr. Laporte replied that because composite material is not wood, it should not mimic the appearance of wood. However, he did acknowledge that the wood-grain texture might be safer because it does not get slippery. It was for these reasons that Mr. Laporte said he would hesitate to adopt any standards across the board and reiterated that it should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Woodruff asked if the dimensions of the composite material for the front porch would match those of the existing wood flooring. Mr. Braddock replied that the proposed Trex composite material is wider. He noted that the current wood porch flooring is a tongue and groove measuring one-by-four inches. He said the proposed composite measures one-by-six inches because that is what Trex offers; however, there is a different composite type, Timbertech, that offers a one-by-four inch. Mr. Braddock said he would be willing to use dimensions closer to what is existing if that is the preference of the HALRB.

Mr. Woodruff stated that most front porches in Maywood have wooden decks with four-inch-wide treads. Further discussion between Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Braddock continued about the existing materials on the front porch, including the wood risers and the wood flooring. Mr. Woodruff asked Ms. Liccese-Torres if the HALRB has allowed treads to be replaced with composite material because many houses have rotten treads. She said she believed he was correct about allowing treads to be replaced with a composite material but could not confirm during the meeting. However, she could not recall the HALRB requesting that such flooring not have a wood grain. She reiterated that the *Maywood Design Guidelines* called for composite siding to not have a wood grain.

Ms. Myers said she was comfortable with allowing non-contributing houses to use non-typical materials for specific reasons, such as moisture issues and durability. She stated that if the application included replacing the front porch wood railing with a composite material, or if the house was contributing, she would feel differently about the material change. Ms. Myers also noted she was comfortable with the use of a composite railing on the rear deck. Finally, she reiterated that if the property was a contributing house and the proposed materials were in areas that did not have moisture issues, she would not support a

material change. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested that the Chair provide these details and rationale in the draft motion.

Ms. Meyer asked if there should be a discussion about allowing the new opening for a vinyl window in a non-contributing house. She stated that by allowing the creation of a window opening in a high moisture area, the HALRB is necessitating the use of a vinyl window. Since the house was non-contributing, Ms. Meyer said she could be persuaded either way, but she would not support the project if it were a contributing house. Ms. Foster said it seemed appropriate to allow for an opening in a bathroom. She stated it would be unfortunate to have a property owner install a wood window in that space, knowing it would likely fail, to prove a point and have them return for a vinyl window. Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Handley agreed with Ms. Foster's statement. Mr. Handley agreed that the motion should say that the HALRB is only comfortable with the proposed changes when the building is non-contributing. Chair Davis stated that the motion could go through each point of the project to cover the specifics of what the HALRB is comfortable with approving for a non-contributing house. Chair Davis asked the applicant if they planned to paint the treads. Mr. Braddock replied the treads are a solid color and do not require painting.

Mr. Wenchel requested to see a photograph of the house. While Ms. Tawney found one to share, Mr. Handley expressed he thought it was smart to not replace the wooden railing on the front porch. Mr. Wenchel explained that one of the issues with requesting wood windows in high moisture areas is that the types of woods that are more resistant to moisture, such as cypress, are either no longer available, extremely difficult to find, or cost prohibitive.

Mr. Woodruff wanted to make sure he understood the project and that the applicants wanted to replace the decking on the front porch and on the back porch. He wanted to understand why they were not going with a four-inch decking on the front porch. Mr. Braddock replied that the exact [decking] dimension was not explored because the client did not choose it; if directed by the HALRB, they could tell their client to consider a different dimension for the front porch. Ms. Foster asked about the wood grain as an option. Other HALRB members stated that without the wood grain, the composite material would look more like plastic.

With no further discussion, Chair Davis proposed a motion as follows:

1. I move that the HALRB approve CoA 24-01 for alterations to the non-contributing house constructed in 2009, at 2900 22nd Street N., in the Maywood LHD. The project consists of the following elements:
 1. Demolition of the existing rear deck and stairs and the construction of a new rear deck, stair, and screened porch.
 2. Expansion of the exterior footprint of the existing house to accommodate the new rear deck and screened porch given that these alterations will be on the rear of the non-contributing house.
 3. Use of composite deck flooring and railings on the new rear deck and screened porch given that these materials will be on the rear of the non-contributing house.
 4. New wood doors on the rear elevation and new wood windows on the east elevation would be consistent with permissible materials in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.
 5. Creation of a new window opening to be fitted with a vinyl window on the east elevation in the bathroom given that the window's material was selected in response to its location in a high moisture space. This complies with precedence in the Local District to allow the use of non-wood windows in select circumstances, such as in bathrooms.

6. Replacement of the wood deck flooring with composite flooring on the front porch due to the failure of the current wood decking. This complies with the Materials section of Chapter 6: New Addition/Building of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Myers suggested striking the portion in item 5 concerning any previous precedence and instead focus only on the new window opening and the vinyl window because of the high moisture area. The HALRB further discussed the proposed motion language. Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the HALRB that a second for the motion was needed. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested that the Chair re-read item 5 again and afterwards, there was further discussion to either continue repeating that the property was non-contributing or only mention it at the beginning of the motion.

Mr. Laporte referenced the photograph of the house on the screen and said that the HALRB tended to make more conservative approvals for corner houses in Maywood. Mr. Woodruff corrected Mr. Laporte and said that the house technically was not a corner house. Mr. Laporte, after receiving clarification about the house's positioning, felt that the motion should still clarify that the proposed work is not visible from the street. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested this could be edited in item 2 of the motion. Mr. Woodruff urged the applicants to consider a narrower deck tread for the front porch.

Taking the discussion into consideration, the Chair edited the motion to the following:

1. I move that the HALRB approve CoA 24-01 for alterations to the non-contributing house constructed in 2009, at 2900 22nd Street N., in the Maywood LHD. The project consists of the following elements:
 1. Demolition of the existing rear deck and stairs and the construction of a new rear deck, stair, and screened porch.
 2. Expansion of the exterior footprint of the existing house to accommodate the new rear deck and screened porch given that these alterations will be on the rear of the non-contributing house and not visible from the public street.
 3. Use of composite deck flooring and railings on the new rear deck and screened porch given that these materials will be on the rear of the non-contributing house.
 4. New wood doors on the rear elevation and new wood windows on the east elevation would be consistent with permissible materials in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.
 5. Creation of a new window opening to be fitted with a vinyl window on the east elevation in the bathroom given that the window's material was selected in response to its location in a high moisture space of the non-contributing house.
 6. Replacement of the wood deck flooring and treads with composite flooring on the front porch due to the failure of the current wood decking. This complies with the Materials section of Chapter 6: New Addition/Building of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Upon hearing no further comments or questions, the Chair asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously, 9-0.

Informational Discussion Item: Barcroft Apartments, Section 1 Renovation

Ms. Farris provided the staff report for the project proposal. She explained how the project falls within the Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Area Plan Form Based Code (N-FBC) and that when projects utilize the FBC, they are required to receive a Use Permit from the County Board. She noted the Barcroft Apartments as one of three multi-family residential areas identified as a Conservation Area in the N-FBC; this requires the applicant/project team to follow specific standards for Conservation Areas as identified in [Part 7, Conservation Area Standards](#). Ms. Farris summarized the current proposal:

The Jair Lynch project team was proposing a renovation project in Section 1 of Barcroft. This is the largest section in Barcroft and consists of Buildings 1 through 16, which were constructed in 1941 and designed by Architect William Harris. These buildings are arranged along South Thomas Street, what the project team calls the “spine” of Barcroft. This section consists of the complex’s signature Colonial Revival style, with smaller buildings that have slate roofs, blind openings, cupolas, brick pilasters, and more ornate brickwork than the rest of the complex.

Ms. Farris stated that the Conservation Area Standards require applicants to meet with the HALRB a minimum of two times before the project can be considered by the County Board. Concerning other policy focuses, Ms. Farris noted that Barcroft is ranked as Essential in the County’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI); when properties have an Essential ranking and are applying for redevelopment or major exterior changes, projects likewise require review by the HALRB. Ms. Farris reminded the commissioners that the Jair Lynch project team presented the renovation proposals for Section 3 of Barcroft Apartments in June and July 2023 and Section 4 in September and October 2023; the County Board has since approved both associated Use Permits.

Ms. Farris summarized the current renovation proposal for Section 1, limited specifically to Buildings 12 through 16:

The project includes repairs to the exterior masonry, cleaning the exterior brick and concrete; removing and replacing steel-sash basement windows, existing mechanical systems, and non-original light fixtures; infilling of matching brick where mechanical systems were removed in the elevations; repairing slate roofs and replacing flat roofs; repairing and painting of existing exterior elements, including metal railings, non-original shutters, doors and frames, and corroded metal lintels; creating two new entrances on Building 16 for new accessible entries, one of which will take the place of an existing blind window; constructing an accessible ramp to these new entrances; adding outdoor amenity spaces and landscape improvements; adding new entry canopies above two accessible entrances located on Building 16 to meet Virginia Housing’s Minimum Design and Construction Requirements (MDCR); and installing vinyl or aluminum cladding on existing wood trim per Virginia Housing MDCR.

Ms. Farris mentioned that most of the proposed scope is consistent with both *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* and the Conservation Area Standards of the N-FBC, except these items: the replacement of the basement windows, covering of the exterior wood elements, and installation of canopies. She reminded the HALRB that the Jair Lynch project team is seeking out exemptions from Virginia Housing for the installation of the canopies and the covering of the exterior wood trim.

Ms. Farris gave a summary of the January 3, 2024, hybrid DRC meeting. She said the DRC members asked about the loss of trees, what the canopy material will be, and the extent of accessibility of the walkways around the buildings and the outdoor gathering spaces, specifically about which of the new gathering spaces will be closer to Building 16 where the two new accessible units are being converted. She said the DRC asked if the design team would consider installing a window next to the new doorway on the back of Building 16; the Jair Lynch project team explained they had considered this, but ultimately abandoned it because it was too much for the side elevation and would compete with the main facades of Building 16.

Ms. Farris explained that the HALRB was being asked to provide design feedback to the Jair Lynch project team for this specific portion of the Section 1 renovation project for Buildings 12-16. She stated

that the HPP staff did not have issues with most of the proposed scope, as they follow both Part 7 of the Conservation Area Standards and *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties*, specifically standards #1, #2, and #9. However, she noted the following items are not consistent with those standards: the removal and replacement of the steel-sash basement windows with vinyl basement windows, the creation of a new opening and extension to replace a blind window to create a new accessible entrance on Building 16, the covering of exterior wood trim with vinyl or aluminum cladding, and the installation of canopies above all entrances on Building 16.

Ms. Farris continued, stating that the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff considered the proposed replacement of the steel-sash basement windows with vinyl as a minor change and appreciated that the replacements would match the original window configuration and fenestration pattern. Further, she said the HPP staff supported the new Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-accessible entrance that would be installed on a secondary side elevation and therefore would not negatively affect the overall design of Section 1. Although a blind window would be removed, Ms. Farris said that staff saw this change as necessary to adapt Building 16 for its current and future residents. Finally, Ms. Farris noted that the cladding of the existing wood trim and the installation of the canopies per the Virginia Housing requirements would be minimal changes to these character-defining features; staff appreciated that the wood trim would be repaired and still exist under the cladding and felt that the canopies would not detract from the main facades.

Lastly, concerning the canopy designs for the two new accessible units, Ms. Farris said the HPP staff appreciated the simplicity of the proposed metal canopy and agreed that canopies for these specific entrances were appropriate since they would directly benefit the residents of the units. She encouraged the HALRB to consider the overall design approach for the canopies throughout the complex (for example, a traditional aesthetic as preferred by the HALRB and approved by the County Board most recently in the renovation phases of Sections 3 and 4, versus a more modern design) in case the Virginia Housing MDCR waivers are not granted. This concluded the staff report.

Representing the Jair Lynch project team, Ms. Lauren Riley of Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, introduced everyone assisting with the discussion and presentation. She mentioned that their presentation included images of garage buildings located behind Building 16 that are no longer standing because of a slope failure. Ms. Riley then described the scope of the project, which included two new entrances and ramps located on side elevations of Building 16 and new outdoor gathering spaces for residents. Mr. Tom Leibel, an architect for the project, described some of the challenges with creating ADA-accessible units in the complex. He explained how the Jair Lynch team explored every possible building and elevation to find ways to create accessible entrances in units. He said they found that most of the buildings in Barcroft cannot accomplish this for several reasons: the [steep] topography; the need for parking areas to be close to the buildings; and because the existing interior entrance vestibules cannot be reconfigured to provide access to the ADA units due to entry stairs. Mr. Leibel noted the project team believed that the proposed side elevation location for the ADA unit entrances was appropriate with the existing design and met Virginia Housing’s MDCR. Ms. Riley announced they will have an update soon about the Virginia Housing waiver request for the entrance canopies and the cladding of wood trim.

Ms. Tawney reminded the Board that the Chair of Arlington’s Housing Commission, Mr. Kellen MacBeth, submitted a public comment on January 16, 2024. Ms. Tawney read the public comment to the HALRB, which is entered here for the record:

“As chair of Arlington's Housing Commission, I would like to strongly support the inclusion of canopies at the renovated Barcroft buildings. It is essential that the safety of residents be the primary consideration for the design of any new or renovated residential building and canopies are important to keeping entranceways free of ice or water that may cause residents to slip or fall.

The Arlington Commission on Aging also strongly supports the inclusion of canopies over residential building entryways to ensure the safety of elderly residents. When the renovation project was brought before the Housing Commission, we urged the applicant to put the needs of residents first over aesthetic design considerations but were told that the canopies would not be compatible with direction from historic preservation stakeholders. I urge the HALRB to support the inclusion of canopies over entranceways at the renovated buildings for the safety of existing and new residents. Thank you for considering my comment.”

Based on the public comment, Mr. Laporte stated that he interpreted that Mr. MacBeth and the Housing Commission as being in favor of canopies over all the entrances in Barcroft (not just two) and that they were requesting something beyond what is being proposed. Ms. Riley interjected that the project team continues to recommend canopies only over the entrances to the ADA units. She continued, stating that they do not see there being issues with residents being able to access the buildings quickly and conveniently, that proposing to add canopies over all the entrances could cause issues with their pursuit of historic rehabilitation tax credits, and that it would intrude upon the ornamental door surrounds.

Ms. Foster asked for clarification about whether all the units in Building 16 would be accessible units, and if those could be accessed through the main entrances. Mr. Leibel replied that not all the units in the building would be accessible, and that some individual entries are located on the rear of the building. Ms. Foster next asked if those rear entrances would be key fobbed. Ms. Alice Hagemann of the Jair Lynch team explained that any entrance with a direct exterior entrance can also be entered through the main hallway, meaning there are two doors to those units. Ms. Riley added that the way residents enter the building will also depend on where they park. Ms. Foster stated that it seemed there was an opportunity for residents to enter the building in a covered environment, therefore achieving the goal of the Housing Commission. Ms. Myers stated that she hoped that the next time the Jair Lynch project team meets with the Housing Commission, that they explain the reasoning for not pursuing canopies over all the entrances and that the HALRB agrees the project is meeting the required safety standards. Mr. Laporte added that the concern of the HALRB is the integrity of the historic architecture and not aesthetics.

Ms. Riley stated that, as required by the FBC, the Jair Lynch project team will return to the HALRB a second time, anticipated to be in February. Chair Davis asked for more detail about the exterior community gathering spaces. Mr. Jeff Kreps of LA/ASLA, stated that the vision for those areas is more defined for outdoor uses and will include repaving and/or repairing the walkways and preserving as much of the existing materials where possible. Chair Davis asked if they could receive more information on the gathering spaces for the February meeting. Mr. Kreps stated that, if possible, they would provide information on the two outdoor amenity spaces, but Ms. Riley indicated that those details are dependent on future decisions. However, she said she felt they could provide some illustrative examples of proposed amenities, such as picnic tables and grilling areas. Mr. Kreps mentioned that the intent is to provide a stable place for residents to gather and the areas would have pervious surfaces with outdoor seating and/or flexible seating. He reiterated that these areas are envisioned as defined places where people can commune. Ms. Riley said that typically with FBC Use Permit applications, the landscape portion is an illustrative landscape plan, with the final plan developed during the permitting process. There was general discussion about the Jair Lynch project team coming back to the HALRB in February and that they would not be required to attend the February DRC meeting.

CHAIR’S REPORT

There was no Chair’s report.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Liccese-Torres announced that Ms. Tawney has been promoted to the Associate Planner on the HPP team and she will be the HALRB's new staff liaison. She said the HPP is now focused on hiring a new Historic Preservation Specialist.

Chair Davis announced that new County Board member Susan Cunningham is now the liaison for the HALRB, and that Board Member Matt de Ferranti will assist with this transition. Mr. Handley asked if the HALRB should invite Ms. Cunningham to an upcoming meeting. Ms. Liccese-Torres said she will contact the County Board Office to extend an invitation. She also asked members to confirm their attendance for the February HALRB meeting. Mr. Woodruff asked about the number of vacancies there are on the HALRB, and Ms. Liccese-Torres replied there are two vacancies. Chair Davis asked that the HALRB provide recommendations for architects and/or archaeologists to potentially serve.

Mr. Handley asked about the subcommittees of the HALRB. He stated that the HALRB Bylaws allow for four subcommittees, which includes the DRC that seems most active. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained the evolution of the subcommittees, why they were created, and how some of them went dormant. She mentioned that recently, the subcommittees for outreach and surveys/research were reactivated. Mr. Laporte mentioned other reasons why the subcommittees were created, such as for the [annual] preservation [design] awards. Ms. Tawney reviewed the HALRB Bylaws and read the description of the subcommittee for Outreach. Mr. Handley felt that with the recent approval of both the Historic and Cultural Resources Plan (HCRP) and the Plan Langston Boulevard study, that the HALRB's subcommittees could assist with the goals of the HCRP. Ms. Liccese-Torres mentioned that, lately, the HPP has had to focus more on reacting, and the HCRP was designed to assist with more proactive work. She encouraged the HALRB to contact staff if members wanted to reactivate one of the subcommittees, and to let staff know how they would be willing to help the program. Mr. Handley stated that the HALRB could assist with the goals of the HCRP and come up with a strategy for those efforts.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.