



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

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

Wednesday, February 15, 2023, 6:30 PM

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Aiken, Vice Chair
Omari Davis, Chair
Alexandra Foster
Joan Lawrence
Robert Meden
Rebecca Meyer
Kaydee Myers
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff

MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIRTUALLY:
Carmela Hamm (personal/medical, Henrico County, VA)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Gerald Laporte
Mark Turnbull

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

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

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

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 2023, DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for comments or amendments on the draft minutes for the January 18, 2023, meeting. Ms. Lawrence wanted to confirm that she had asked the question about the Historic Preservation Fund monies rolling over (p. 2). Ms. Liccese-Torres recalled the question, but Ms. Bolliger agreed to check the recording to confirm it. The Chair moved to approve the minutes as amended and Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 8-0-1; Ms. Foster abstained, and Mr. Meden had not yet arrived).

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

- 1) James Anderson
3508 21st Ave N., CoA 23-02
Maywood Local Historic District
Request to replace 9 wooden windows.

The Chair asked for any concerns or questions about the consent agenda. Upon hearing none, Mr. Woodruff moved to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 9-0 (Mr. Meden had not yet arrived).

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

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

Ms. Bolliger presented the CoA amendment for the pre-1937 contributing one-story dwelling at 2317 N. Kenmore St. She explained that the applicant proposed the following modifications:

- Raise the ridgeline of the home by 4' to provide interior ceiling height to make the second story code compliant.
- Extend the existing chimney 2' above the new ridgeline to conform to the building code.
- Install a new shed dormer in the rear (east facing elevation) to provide additional head height in the second story. The dormer would have Hardie lap siding, matching asphalt shingle roofing, and two pairs of six-over-one wooden windows to match the six-over-one windows on the ground floor.
- Install a window well in the front-facing basement level to allow window egress from the basement. This window well would terminate at the ground level on a concrete pad which would double as the air conditioning footing.

Ms. Bolliger said the Design Review Committee (DRC) considered this application at its February 1, 2023, hybrid meeting. Mr. Wenchel had noted that the proposed increased ridgeline height would change the character of the 1.5-story home from the right-of-way to a more imposing front roof view from the street. Mr. Davis did not object to the application but recommended that the full commission discuss it.

Ms. Bolliger presented the staff report, noting that the HALRB had approved many requests for additions in Maywood since the establishment of the Local Historic District (LHD), many as footprint enlargements in the rear. She noted that the current proposal would allow for additional usable space without expanding the footprint of the existing home, which staff supported. She said that even though the subject property was a corner lot, which meant that the rear was more visible than on an interior lot, the proposed shed dormer would add functional space to the home in a less obtrusive manner than a bump-out addition. However, she said staff agreed with the DRC that raising the height of the ridgeline by four feet might impact the character of the dwelling and its relationship with its triplet neighbors from the right-of-way.

Ms. Bolliger cited relevant language from the *Maywood Design Guidelines* about scale and proportion and then provided a precedent example of a similar application approved by the HALRB in 2014 to raise the height of the neighboring home's roof at 2315 N. Kenmore St. by 4' (CoA 14-30). She noted that while staff recognized that this action was approved on the neighboring home in 2014, projects in Maywood are considered on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, she said staff welcomed a discussion about

whether the proposed additional 4' of height would be appropriate in this case, or if a compromise design solution could be reached with a slightly lower ridgeline that still could provide added space but with a ridgeline closer to the original.

Finally, Ms. Bolliger summarized that the proposed window well would be below grade and should not adversely affect the view of the home from the street, while providing livable space below grade. She also clarified that the proposed materials were appropriate in Maywood as per Appendix C: Cement Fiberboard Siding Materials, Appendix D: PVC Trim, and Appendix G: Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Woodruff asked if the applicants would still pursue the plans in the original CoA (22-14). Ms. Bolliger confirmed that the subject amendment would be in addition to the plans approved in the original CoA.

The applicant, Mr. Schmitt, explained that their goal was to make the upstairs space usable, and that the additional head height was being required by the Inspection Services Division to fulfill the building code requirements.

Ms. Lawrence noted that the added height made the front elevation appear very steep. Ms. Bolliger commented that Mr. Wenchel had explained in the past that two-dimensional drawings sometimes made height appear sharper than it would appear in person due to perspective.

Mr. Woodruff noted that compared to the houses across the street in both directions, the [subject] house was far lower, so relative to the homes around it, it would remain a small building with a low roofline.

The Chair asked if the additional head height could be achieved with less than 4'. The applicants' architect Ms. FitzHarris referred to the drawings and pointed out that the staircase and bathroom shower required the proposed head height.

Ms. Meyer asked if the front gable had been changed on the neighboring house at 2315 N. Kenmore St., when the roofline was raised in 2014. Ms. Bolliger confirmed it had not. Ms. Meyer said she did not have an issue with raising the roof [on the subject house]; she believed there was more value in retaining the existing character and footprint.

Mr. Wenchel noted that three one-and-one-half-story homes [on this block] had become two-story houses.

Ms. Lawrence noted that 2311 N. Kenmore St. had a shed dormer similar to the one proposed at 2317 N. Kenmore St.

Mr. Aiken agreed with Ms. Meyer and Mr. Woodruff that this was the ideal option for allowing more living space while retaining the home's original character.

Mr. Meden expressed that if the HALRB had approved the additional head height in the neighboring home, he did not see why they should not approve it for this property. Ms. Lawrence explained that as projects were considered on a case-by-case basis, this request had to be discussed on its own merits so that a precedent was not set for allowing additional roof height indiscriminately. Mr. Meden acknowledged this rationale and repeated that given the approval for the raised roof for the twin at 2315 N. Kenmore St., he believed it was appropriate to allow the same modification here.

Mr. Woodruff stated that given modern building code, it seemed inappropriate to prevent an interior stair.

The Chair thanked the board members for their discussion and proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 22-14A to raise the ridgeline of the home by 4' feet, install a new shed dormer in the rear, and install a window well in the front-facing basement level. The roof ridgeline raise is in accord with the Maywood [Design] Guidelines which aim to preserve the relative scale of houses in the neighborhood.

Mr. Wenchel seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 10-0 (Mr. Meden had arrived at 6:39 pm).

Discussion Agenda Item #2: 2910 Columbia Pike

Ms. Farris provided some background on the Arlington Hardware store, located at 2910 Columbia Pike, which has been identified for building façade preservation in the Columbia Pike Form Based Code (FBC). She gave a brief overview of the creation of the FBC and the history of renovations related to the previous tenant, P. Brennan's Irish Pub, which had been approved by the HALRB in 2009.

Ms. Farris explained that the building had been constructed in 1920 and became a hardware store run by the Eisen family in 1930. She noted some minor alterations on record after a 1996 fire but that the building had remained relatively faithful to its historic facade.

Ms. Farris presented the modifications proposed by the applicant: the demolition of the bottom of the two large storefront window openings on either side of the front door and the replacement of the fixed sashes with concertina folding doors. She explained that staff did not support the proposed changes to the façade. She expressed that the changes would be an exterior alteration that would detract from the historic character that defined the façade and went against Standards 9 and 10 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. She recognized that it was typical for commercial buildings to experience some alterations to accommodate changing uses and tenants over time, but felt this change was inappropriate for this particular façade. She concluded that staff could support a bifold window or other operational window that would fit within the existing window openings.

Mr. Wenchel commented that if the doors were open to the sidewalk, there would be spill-out into the street and that the sidewalk here was too small to permit this successfully.

Applicant Mr. Raheel Khan explained there was an 18' concrete slab below the window which was not the brick from the second story. He also said that due to his understanding of conversations with the Zoning staff, he already had purchased the proposed doors.

Mr. Woodruff asked for clarification on the HALRB's purview in this case. Ms. Farris explained that because the FBC recognized this building as requiring review as a historic façade, then the HALRB had the right to issue or not issue a CoA for this proposed work.

Ms. Lawrence expressed concern that there had been other instances of miscommunication with Zoning. Mr. Khan expressed frustration over the communications he was having and delays to his project. Ms. Farris explained that the HPP staff had met with Zoning, and they said that they do not issue such statements [suggesting applicants purchase materials] until permits have been issued.

Mr. Khan noted that the material under the window did not appear to be historic material and asked why he was being required to retain it. Ms. Farris explained that the window opening pattern, the rhythm and size, had been consistent in living memory, and this storefront character was being retained, rather than the literal historic fabric.

The Chair invited each commissioner to speak. Ms. Lawrence stated concern over the miscommunications and asked for investigation into whether the [purchased] windows could be cut down [to fit into the existing openings]. Mr. Khan replied, stating he had asked three companies and they said it was not possible. Ms. Lawrence said she believed a bifold or other window could be supported in this space if the opening was retained as-is.

Ms. Foster suggested that if the proposed doors were installed that a treatment could be applied to the bottom, such as glass frosting, which would mimic the current pattern while allowing the use of the purchased doors.

Ms. Meyer said she had not seen a neighborhood precedent for floor-to-ceiling doors in storefronts. As a compromise, she said she could imagine supporting the bifold or other operating windows in the existing window opening. However, as the doors were not required by code, she did not see a reason for deviating from what was appropriate. Mr. Aiken agreed that the proposed doors were out of character for the property and the neighborhood.

Mr. Woodruff expressed confusion as to why the applicant wanted floor-to-ceiling doors when the sidewalk could not be used for outdoor seating space, as windows would provide airflow in the same manner. Mr. Meden agreed with Mr. Woodruff and complimented Ms. Foster's design idea.

Ms. Myers said she just did some quick [online] research to see how apparent the historic [façade] designation of the [subject] building would be to anyone applying for a building permit. She noted that this historic status was not readily obvious. She recommended that the identifications be made clearer so that a simple search would return this information. Ms. Lawrence explained that the FBC had been developed in two phases and that this information would only be in the first iteration [for commercial properties] and not the second.

Mr. Wenchel stated he believed that floor-to-ceiling doors were inappropriate [in this case]. Ms. Hamm had no comments.

The Chair expressed sympathy for the applicant's situation, but confirmed the opinions expressed by the commissioners. Mr. Khan asked for clarification of whether the HALRB would approve the windows if they were in the existing opening. Ms. Lawrence clarified they would need to see the drawings before approving. The Chair agreed and stated that he believed, based on the commentary given, there was a better chance of the folding windows being approved [by the HALRB] than the proposed doors.

Ms. Foster asked the applicant whether their architect had encouraged them to purchase the doors, as the drawings were stamped by an architect. Mr. Khan replied they had been purchased based on his understanding of direction from Zoning staff. Ms. Farris pointed out that all exterior changes [on the subject property] would need to be reviewed by the HALRB; thus, if the applicant had plans for signage, that also would need to be reviewed. She said the signage could be submitted as part of the March design review cycle [if the owner desired].

Ms. Farris stated that the HPP staff would follow up with Zoning staff to clarify communication in the future. Mr. Woodruff recalled a prior meeting with Zoning about inter-departmental communication. Ms. Bolliger clarified that such a meeting had been with the Board of Zoning Appeals commission chair regarding the setback modification language in the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Myers asked for confirmation that the other [single] windows on the façade would not be affected, as they were not included on the drawings. Ms. Lawrence agreed that the entire elevation should be shown on the drawings.

The Chair proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB deny the proposed Columbia Pike Form Based Code Modification at 2910 Columbia Pike. The proposed modification does not comply with Standards #2, #9, and #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. The Chair asked for any final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 10-0.

Discussion Agenda Item #3: CoA 21-31C, 3421 21st Ave. N.

Ms. Bolliger presented the final door schedule for an ongoing rehabilitation project for the Sears home at 3421 21st Avenue N., constructed circa 1933.

Ms. Bolliger summarized the case history as follows: In January 2022, the HALRB approved CoA 21-31 for the demolition of an existing 1980s-era rear addition and construction of a two-and-one-half-story rear addition with a center patio. In June 2022, the HALRB approved CoA 21-31A to scale back the initial project to only renovating the historic house and removing the 1980s-era addition. In October 2022, the HALRB approved some window changes in the home and the garage (CoA 21-31B).

Ms. Bolliger described the proposed current amendment, which would modify the doors in CoA 21-31:

- The front door would change from a proposed ten-lite door replicating the original Sears house door to a paneled door with two rows of three clear glass lites (six total) over two vertical solid fir wooden panels.
- The side and rear doors of the house would change from a proposed ten-lite door to a 15-lite door.
- The basement door would change from a proposed ten-lite door to a paneled door with three rows of three clear glass lites (nine total) over two vertical solid fir wooden panels.
- The applicant also submitted their final garage door choice for the new detached two-car garage, to include two Villa Madre Series 8’ x 7’ double doors from the Overhead Door company, in solid cedar with three clear glass lites in the top of each door.

Ms. Bolliger stated the DRC considered this application at its February 1, 2023, hybrid meeting. The DRC had no questions or concerns and placed this item on the Consent Agenda for the February 15, 2023, hybrid HALRB public hearing. While she said the applicant submitted the garage door brochure before the deadline, they forgot to mark the preferred door style, so it was not reviewed by the DRC. Therefore, she explained the application was moved to the Discussion agenda for the February 15, 2023, hybrid HALRB public hearing.

Ms. Bolliger noted the HPP staff recommended approval of the subject application since the proposed doors would be solid wood and clear glass which is appropriate as per Chapter 5 “Exterior Renovations” of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Chapter 5 states, “There are many door types in Maywood that are made up of variations of wood panels and glass panes.” She further stated that the proposed door designs are not unlike many of the doors extant in the Maywood LHD.

The Chair asked for any comments. Mr. Wenchel said he would have preferred real double doors that opened outward but given that the garage was new construction he was willing to approve the submitted doors.

The Chair asked for additional comments. Upon hearing none, he proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-31C for final submission of door choices for the renovation.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 10-0.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF

Chair's Report

The Chair reported on a recent meeting he had with the HALRB's County Board liaison Libby Garvey. He noted her recommendation to investigate more of Arlington's pre-history, which would align with some of the recommendations in the forthcoming update to the Historic Preservation Plan. He also updated the commission on the ongoing FY24 proposed budget meetings; both he and the HPP staff are concerned that the suggested budget cuts [for the HPP] may have an impact on the implementation of the Historic Preservation Plan.

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the Board that the new Historic Preservation Fund was still open for applications and encouraged them to help spread the word and send staff any questions. She told the commissioners that staff was still waiting on a revised draft of the Historic Preservation Plan [to be shared with the public]. She said staff wanted to ensure that the HALRB had plenty of opportunities to learn about the updated plan and ask questions [throughout the upcoming periods of public engagement]. To that end, Ms. Liccese-Torres noted that there would be a special informational session on the draft Plan for the HALRB. She polled the commissioners' availability for a Wednesday, April 26, 2023, meeting date, likely at 6:30 pm.

Ms. Tawney outlined the upcoming community engagement for the updated Plan, including an open house event on May 6. She invited commissioners to join staff at the event to help answer questions, man learning stations, and support the Plan update process. Ms. Liccese-Torres added that there would be more chances to volunteer beyond the open house over the coming months.

Ms. Liccese-Torres polled the commissioners for their in-person availability for the March 15, 2023, hybrid HALRB meeting.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.