



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, April 19, 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  
Gerald Laporte  
Joan Lawrence  
Robert Meden  
Rebecca Meyer  
Mark Turnbull  
Andrew Wenchel

**MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIRTUALLY:**  
Richard Woodruff (personal/medical, New Mexico)

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Robert Dudka  
Carmela Hamm  
Kaydee Myers

**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 FEBRUARY 2023 MEETING MINUTES**

The Chair asked for questions on the February 2023 draft meeting minutes. Hearing none, he moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Meyer seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 7-0-1, with Mr. Turnbull abstaining (Ms. Lawrence and Mr. Meden had not yet arrived).

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

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- 1) Leslie Aun  
2501 N. Underwood St., CoA 22-20A  
George Crossman House Historic District  
Retroactive request to install a flat-topped gate instead of an arched gate.

The Chair asked for any concerns or questions about the consent agenda. Mr. Laporte asked for clarification of which gate image had been approved in the initial application and which had been installed. Upon hearing the clarification from staff, he moved to approve the consent agenda. The Chair seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 9-0-1, with Mr. Meden abstaining since he had just arrived at 6:41 pm; Ms. Lawrence had arrived at 6:39 pm).

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

**DISCUSSION AGENDA**

**Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 23-06, 2910 Columbia Pike**

Ms. Farris presented an application for a new blade sign and a new façade channel sign for the proposed restaurant at 2910 Columbia Pike. Formerly known as the Arlington Hardware Building, she said the building was identified in the Columbia Pike Commercial Form Based Code (FBC) as a “Historic Facade” and constructed circa 1920. Ms. Farris reminded the commission that the applicant had consulted with the HALRB in February and March 2023 and received approval for the installation of foldable windows into the existing window openings located on the first level of the historic facade (CoA 23-03).

In the subject application CoA 23-06, Ms. Farris explained that the applicant proposed to install new signage on the historic facade. She summarized the proposal as follows:

A new horizontal sign, measuring 150” x 60”, would be installed above the main entrance featuring the building’s address, 2910, with cursive lettering below to read “Food Redefined.” The applicant would use the existing blade sign hardware with new plexiglass panels for the 22” x 120” blade sign reading “2910” and “Food Redefined.” The signs would both contain internally illuminated LED channel letters, a white acrylic face with black trim, and black aluminum returns. The font of the letters and numbers were meant to be complementary to the building’s simple design. The applicant indicated that any punctures that could be exposed when removing the existing signage would be repaired, and that the existing power supply connections and remaining punctures for the installation of the two signs would be used. The applicant also indicated they would communicate with the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff on properly cleaning the facade if it were necessary once the existing signage was removed.

Ms. Farris explained that the Design Review Committee (DRC) considered a different signage design at its April 5, 2023, hybrid DRC meeting. The DRC noted that the font for the two signs was out of character for the architectural style of the building and suggested a different approach with the signage design. Mr. Wenchel noted that the proposed text was not easily legible. Mr. Dudka indicated that attempts should be made to elongate the horizontal sign located above the main entrance and to evoke the style of the two known previous signs. Ms. Meyer asked which parts of the existing sign hardware would

be reused and what the brick behind the sign looked like given that the proposed sign would be smaller than the existing. The applicant explained that he was unsure what was behind the current sign but planned to reuse the hardware as much as possible and only drill into the mortar for any changes. Ms. Farris outlined the recommended maintenance and cleaning procedures for historic brick. The applicant was receptive to this suggestion and submitted an updated package to be reviewed by the full HALRB in April.

Based on this updated submission, Ms. Farris explained that the HPP staff recommended approval of the subject application. She said the proposed materials and overall design of the new signs are consistent with other signage along the Commercial FBC corridor. Additionally, she stated the proposed signage conformed with Standard #10 specified in *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, as it was an alteration which could easily be reversed without an adverse effect to the historic property.

The Chair invited the applicant to speak, but Mr. Khan was not immediately present. Ms. Bolliger shared his previous submission to the DRC on the screen to demonstrate the changes implemented since the DRC meeting. She pointed out the addition of a horizontal line to mimic the streamline style of the Arlington Hardware and P. Brennan signs, and a change in the font to be more legible from a distance. Ms. Bolliger explained that the applicant had also increased the size of the sign in response to Ms. Meyer's concern that the difference between the exposed brick and the heretofore hidden brick behind the existing sign would be apparent.

Ms. Meyer stated that she would prefer to see the sign longer rather than taller, removing the line from above the text, and adding "food redefined" to the title line rather than below. Mr. Laporte agreed with Ms. Meyer and noted that the numbers on the blade sign did not appear to be spaced evenly. Ms. Lawrence recommended having two paired horizontal lines to mimic the P. Brennan and Arlington Hardware signs rather than the separated lines. Mr. Aiken agreed. Mr. Woodruff stated that he thought the proposed signage was inappropriate for the building. Ms. Foster applauded the applicants for the improvement in the design but recommended going further with it.

Ms. Meyer asked whether the blade sign hardware would be moved because the written dimensions did not appear to match the location in the photograph. She expressed concern that the taller channel sign would hit the blade sign.

Mr. Khan joined the call and explained that his restaurant name was just the address number which made it difficult to make the sign longer. The Chair reiterated the concern with the signs running into each other and recommended that the applicant check the dimensions and consider making the channel sign less tall and longer. Mr. Khan explained that he added the horizontal lines to the channel sign in response to the commission's requests to mimic the horizontality of the P. Brennan and Arlington Hardware sign. He noted that it was almost 14' long and that it was challenging to elongate the sign given the name. Ms. Farris noted that the signage was not a character-defining feature of the building and that it was typical for signage to change on commercial properties with the advent of new businesses. She continued, stating that Mr. Khan had shown that he would protect and preserve the historic facade, which was the spirit of the facade preservation in the FBC. Mr. Woodruff suggested removing "food redefined" from the bottom of the sign to give it a more horizontal look. Ms. Lawrence recommended adding a second horizontal yellow line to the bottom of the sign. Mr. Woodruff suggested approving the sign conditionally, pending a final review by the DRC at its next meeting in May where they could review the proposed changes and potentially provide final approval.

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

I move that the HALRB grant conditional approval of the blade sign and facade sign proposed for 2910 Columbia Pike pending DRC review and recommendations.

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

**Discussion Agenda Item #2: CoA 23-05, 2408 Columbia Pike**

Ms. Farris presented an application for a new box sign at 2408 Columbia Pike, a building often known as the “Rappahannock Coffee” building, identified in the Columbia Pike Commercial FBC as a “Historic Facade.” Constructed in 1951, she said the building has been the subject of many conversations over the past decade concerning redevelopment opportunities, as the property currently includes a vacant block corner and two separate commercial buildings sharing a rear parking lot. She noted that the HALRB has considered two FBC projects at this site in the last nine years but neither have come to fruition.

She summarized the proposal as follows:

The new tenant in the 2408 space of the two-store facade wants to install a new sign. The main sign would read “Thicker Cloudz” with smaller signs on the side that would read “vape” and “smoke.” The 16’ x 33” horizontal sign would be installed above the building’s canopy directly on the building and consist of internally lighted channel letters with a raceway. There would be 5”-deep aluminum channels with black returns. The sign’s letters would be made of red and white acrylic covered by vinyl, each letter with two drains, and Samsung L.E.D. lights. All hardware would be galvanized, and any penetrations would be sealed.

Ms. Farris explained that the DRC had considered this application at its April 5, 2023, hybrid meeting and the DRC had suggested moving the signage higher for better visibility and to prevent the sign from touching the canopy. The applicant asked for guidance on the sign placement in relation to the painted green brick located near the roof coping. The HPP staff and the DRC suggested aligning the proposed sign to the neighboring Rappahannock Coffee sign, as that would leave one painted strip of green brick visible. The DRC suggested softening the black background proposed for the signage at the sides of the main sign to a more muted color, and the applicant agreed to this approach.

Ms. Farris stated that the HPP staff recommended approval of the subject application. She said the proposed materials and overall design of the proposed sign were consistent with other signage along the FBC corridor. Additionally, she noted that the proposed signage conformed with Standard #10 specified in *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, as it is an alteration which could easily be reversed without an adverse effect to the historic property.

Ms. Bolliger invited the applicant to speak. Mr. Kataria explained that the height of the top of the sign matched the top of the adjacent Rappahannock sign, and that he had softened the black of the “vape” and “smoke” portions of the sign, and that the red in the image was brighter than intended. Ms. Bolliger asked him to clarify the existing electrical element on the building frontage. He stated that he thought it was an electrical box rather than a light.

Mr. Laporte recommended muting the colors to match the muted colors of the historic façade and adjacent sign. Mr. Turnbull and Ms. Lawrence agreed that the sign coloring was too bright, and a more subdued color would make the signage more appropriate for the facade. Ms. Lawrence suggested a blue color to match the paint on the building. Mr. Kataria asked if staff could find an image of the previous sign, as it was similar to his application. He also expressed that he had understood that color was not

regulated by the commission. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that color was not reviewed for residential projects in Local Historic Districts (LHDs) but as this was a commercial site within the FBC, the color of the proposed sign fell within the design portion of the HALRB’s review. Ms. Farris recommended a more subdued shade of the proposed red, such as a burgundy, to retain the brand coloring in a way that was more suited to the coloring of the building. Ms. Farris then recommended that the applicant also receive conditional approval at this meeting, to return for final approval at the next DRC meeting in May.

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

I move that the HALRB grant conditional approval for the facade sign for 2408 Columbia Pike pending review and recommendation of the DRC.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed 9-1-0, with Mr. Turnbull opposing.

**Discussion Agenda Item #3: 400 N. Manchester St.**

Ms. Farris presented a preliminary CoA application for the Reevesland LHD. She explained that the dwelling had been constructed c.1900 in the Bluemont neighborhood. She said the property became a LHD in 2004 and a County-held preservation easement protecting the exterior was recorded in 2018. She explained that Reevesland was designated for its architectural history and its association with the rural and agricultural history of Arlington, as it was the last operating dairy farm in the County.

Ms. Farris outlined the history of the County’s ownership of the building and the process that had led to this project review. Ms. Farris presented the joint applicants, representatives from L’Arche and Habitat for Humanity (Habitat) and presented the proposal. She explained that the proposed design concept included: 1) restoring the exterior of the farmhouse, 2) modernizing and renovating the home’s interior, 3) constructing two new historically compatible additions, and 4) modifying some aspects of the grounds and landscaping. She described the proposed additions as a new two-story addition at the south elevation (rear), and a new one-story addition at the southwest elevation (side). She noted these alterations would increase the house’s bedroom count to seven bedrooms and provide ADA-compliant access and gathering spaces.

Ms. Farris next provided a detailed summary of the proposal:

The applicant proposes to remove the existing wood double-hung windows and replace them with prefinished aluminum-clad wood, one-over-one double-hung windows with insulated low-e glazing, including argon gas fill. Habitat indicated their preference for the replacement of the existing windows because of cost, time, and long-term maintenance. The existing vinyl/aluminum siding and trim would be removed from the house, and the condition of the underlying wood siding and trim will be inspected (if extant) to determine what could be restored or require replacement. The current restoration plan for the wood siding and trim was to patch, repair, and/or replace to match as required, as well as paint the exterior. If the condition of the existing siding and/or trim was badly deteriorated, the applicant would install new wood clapboard siding to match the existing profiles.

The applicant proposes to replace the existing asphalt shingle and metal roofing with new dimensional asphalt shingles and install new gutters and downspouts. On the house’s north roof ridge (northwest), the applicant proposes a new shed-roof dormer with two small, fixed aluminum-clad wood windows; this dormer is necessary to accommodate

interior clearances for a reconfigured main stairway. In the 1904 section of the house (northeast), the applicant proposes to remove the existing brick chimneys down to the roofline and rebuild them with a flagstone cap.

The applicant proposes to remove the existing historic wooden main entrance door, to be salvaged for reuse within the interior. They would install a new 36"-wide, 4-panel solid wood exterior door with lites, then paint the door and install accessible hardware with a deadbolt.

The applicant plans to install an ADA-compliant ramp near the existing front porch to provide access to the parking area and walkways. The HALRB was being asked to consider three different configurations for this ramp at the northwest corner: 1) a U-shaped ramp; 2) an L-shaped ramp; and 3) a straight ramp that would run along the farmhouse's west (side) elevation. Per code compliance, the existing front porch would need to have new railings added (design details forthcoming) and repairs made as needed.

A new two-story, gable-roof rear addition is being proposed adjacent to the 1878 section (south) of the farmhouse. Although the gable roof of the proposed addition would be flush with the original farmhouse's roofline, the applicant has indicated that materials, color, and/or an additional seam on the dimensional asphalt shingles would help differentiate the new section from the old construction. The roof configuration would accommodate needed interior clearance and an elevator that would be necessary for the second story of the house to be ADA-compliant. Although the applicant had met with the HPP staff to consider other options to allow for the elevator, the current proposal was determined to be the most efficient option. The gable roof's west side would be elongated, to recall the roof configuration of the 1911 section of the house. The addition's east elevation (side) would contain two, one-over-one double-hung windows at the first and second stories that would be arranged closer to the south elevation. The addition's south elevation (rear) would contain one, one-over-one double-hung window at the first and second story that would be arranged closer to the east elevation. At the southwest corner of the addition, an inset rear porch would be constructed to recall the existing 1911 rear porch in this section.

A new one-story, cross-gabled roof addition would be sited at the 1911 section of the farmhouse (west elevation). This new wing, with an east-west orientation, would provide multiple bedrooms and bathrooms. This addition would be two-bays wide by two-bays long, and the gable end would feature a closed return to correlate to the farmhouse's west gable end. The addition's roof cladding is proposed as dimensional asphalt shingles, with prefinished aluminum gutters and downspouts. Its exterior would be clad in prefinished fiber cement lap-siding with fiber cement or PVC trim. The proposed windows would be prefinished aluminum-clad wood, one-over-one, double-hung windows. The addition's north elevation (front) would contain two windows, with two shed-roof dormers with smaller one-over-one, double-hung windows. These dormers would reflect the new shed-roof dormer proposed on the 1911 section of the farmhouse. The addition's south elevation (rear) would contain three double-hung windows, with one window arranged closer to the rear porch. There likewise would be two shed-roof dormers with smaller one-over-one, double-hung windows on the south roof ridge. The addition's west elevation (side) would contain a central entry flanked by windows. Above the entrance there would be two, side-by-side windows in the closed-gable peak. The entrance door, which would contain a 36"-wide, 4-panel solid wood exterior door with lites, would be accessed by a new walkway.

Ms. Farris continued, stating that an existing tree (dimensions and species unknown) located southwest of the proposed two-story addition would need to be removed because the location of the addition would encroach upon the tree's critical root zone. She said the applicant would be meeting with the County's Urban Forester to determine the best approaches to mitigate the loss of this tree, and noted that another tree located northwest of the parking area would remain.

Ms. Farris mentioned that per the Chesapeake Bay Ordinance, the applicant is proposing a storm water management bio-facility to be located northeast of the farmhouse (more details forthcoming). The paved area west of the farmhouse would be expanded to provide adequate parking and clearance for Metro Access vans that would provide transportation for future residents of the home.

Ms. Farris stated that the DRC had considered the preliminary design proposal at its March 1 and April 5, 2023, hybrid meetings. During the March DRC meeting, the project team, which consisted of Habitat, L'Arche, and project architects Scott Matties and Krutika Shah of Wiencek-Associates, provided an overview of the project. They explained how the County acquired the property in 2004, the architectural evolution of the farmhouse, and three design options for the proposed additions. The DRC members expressed support for one specific design option, as it was more sensitive to the historic farmhouse. The DRC requested that the project team refine their design details for this particular option, then return to the DRC. In general, the DRC made the following design recommendations:

- Consider lowering the two-story addition's roofline to show a definite line where the historic farmhouse's roofline ends;
- Consider ways to break-up the roof massing on the one-story addition;
- Refine the spacing of the fenestration on the one-story; and
- Provide multiple options for the location of the ADA-compliant ramp needed for access to the front porch and main entrance to avoid obstruction of the commanding views of the property from the front porch.

During the subsequent April DRC meeting, the project team presented modifications to the DRC's preferred option for the additions. Although the architect was unable to lower the two-story addition's roofline because of needed interior clearance and the elevator, the team reiterated that materials and/or color would be used to help differentiate between the old and new construction. The DRC members acknowledged the programmatic needs in this area of the house and were comfortable with this design approach. The DRC also discussed the following aspects of the design:

- They provided their preference for the front porch ramp location to be along the west elevation as the most appropriate visually;
- They agreed the proposed shed dormers helped reduce the massing of the one-story addition's roof; and
- They agreed the spacing of the fenestration on the one-story addition section was appropriate.

At the April DRC meeting, the applicant indicated that the location of the front porch ramp along the west elevation would require people to travel the longest distance as well as the removal of the side steps to the front porch. The HPP staff asked for confirmation that the historic wood main entry door on the front elevation would be replaced for ADA compliance. Since this original feature of the farmhouse is proposed to be removed, the HPP staff requested that it be reused as an interior door or at a secondary entrance and that the replacement door have a similar design to the historic door. The applicant agreed to this approach.

Ms. Farris explained that at this time, the HALRB was being asked to review the proposed massing and overall design concepts for the restoration of the exterior of the historic farmhouse, the construction of the two new additions, and various grounds and landscaping modifications. She clarified that the applicant was seeking preliminary HALRB approval of a CoA to satisfy one of the main conditions of the Letter Of Intent signed with Arlington County in February 2020. She said that upon receipt of a preliminary COA, the applicant could proceed with the preparation of construction drawings to be submitted for County permitting. She stated the overall proposal would return to the HALRB later this Spring for a final CoA, which would include additional details on materials and specifications, stormwater requirements, and a landscape plan.

Ms. Farris stated that the HPP staff recommended approval of the subject application as submitted. She thanked the applicants for their receptiveness to design feedback over the past several months. She said the HPP staff felt that the proposed exterior restoration plan was both appropriate and sensitive to the character-defining features of the historic farmhouse, thereby complying with Standard #2 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. She further summarized the appropriateness of the proposal:

The removal of the existing vinyl/aluminum siding and trim and restoration of existing wood siding and trim followed Standards #5 and #6. The removal of the existing asphalt shingles and/or existing metal roofing and replacement with new dimensional asphalt shingles complied with Standard #6, as did the removal/reconstruction of the brick chimneys.

Following Standard #9, the proposed railings and new ramp on the front porch would not detract from the overall design, function, or aesthetics of this historic design feature, and would allow the historic farmhouse to become ADA-compliant which is an essential requirement for the new residents.

The construction of a new shed-roof dormer on the farmhouse's north roof ridge follows Standard #9 and would be compatible in design to an existing dormer located on the 1911 section of the house. The proposed one- and two-story additions should not detract from the scale or massing of the historic farmhouse, as their designs are compatible with the existing vernacular architecture and can be distinguished from what is historic and new construction, thereby meeting Standard #9.

Ms. Farris remarked that the proposed ground surfaces and landscaping changes, including the proposed walkway and stormwater management bio-facility, should not cause a negative effect to the environmental setting of the LHD. She said the potential tree removal could be mitigated with further consultation with the County's Urban Forester. Finally, she stated that the proposal did not conflict with the intent/guidance in the recorded County-held exterior preservation easement. Ms. Farris explained that when the final CoA was approved, the HPP staff would seek additional approvals from the County Manager per the easement process for these major modifications.

Next, the applicant team presented updated drawings of the project, reiterating Ms. Farris's review of each element.

There was one public speaker for this item and the Chair invited him to speak. Neighbor and Civic Association President Mr. Tighe voiced his support of the project on behalf of the neighborhood. He explained the many years of work that he and the community had put into championing this project and the preservation of the home.



The L'Arche team then expressed their excitement about bringing more housing opportunities in Arlington for adults with developmental disabilities.

Mr. Laporte voiced his support for L'Arche as an organization, and said he thought that aluminum clad windows could be appropriate here for the increased ease of maintenance. Ms. Lawrence stated support for the overall project and design. Mr. Turnbull agreed with both Ms. Lawrence and Mr. Laporte and asked staff what would happen to the adjacent historic milk shed through this process. Ms. Liccese-Torres replied that it was not part of the project site, it would remain in County ownership, and that structural analyses were ongoing. The applicant clarified that the milk shed was currently fenced off for safety.

Mr. Woodruff commended the applicants for the design and worthwhile cause. He recommended retaining HALRB consistency and requiring wooden windows here, given that wooden windows were required at other LHDs with historic wooden windows. Mr. Wenchel agreed that good quality wooden windows could last indefinitely when well maintained. The applicant explained that they wanted the property to be usable and affordable long term and had done research on the materials and believed clad windows were the most suitable for this application. Ms. Foster noted that clad windows would be heavier than wooden windows, and if the applicant wanted operability, then wood windows should be considered. She also reiterated Mr. Woodruff's point about retaining consistency. Mr. Meden agreed with Mr. Laporte that he thought clad windows could be appropriate. Ms. Meyer noted the discrepancy between requiring homeowners to retain wooden windows while allowing commercial renovations such as this one to install clad windows. She continued that she would not be opposed to clad windows in the new construction and wood in the historic portion of the house. Ms. Lawrence stated that the 1909 windows [in her home] were still in working use and she felt that wooden windows could be required in this setting.

The Chair asked the applicant to explain the variations to be considered for the ramp to the front porch. The applicant stated they had considered various options at the DRC meeting and their preference is for the L-shaped format [option 2] for access and usability. Ms. Lawrence stated that option 2, and not deleting the existing stairs, would be best. Mr. Wenchel and Mr. Turnbull agreed.

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

I move that the HALRB approve a conditional CoA for Reevesland LHD at 400 N. Manchester pursuant to their return for a full CoA approval when their plans are further established provided that the issue of aluminum clad windows will be left open to the Board in the future.

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.

**Proposed Local Historic District Preliminary Consideration: 2002 N. Stafford St.**

Ms. Bolliger presented a single-parcel residential LHD application for the property at 2002 North Stafford Street. She explained that the circa 1920 single-family Craftsman-styled bungalow had a lot of architectural integrity and contributed to the Cherrydale National Register Historic District. She said that the Cherrydale District, located close to one of the main 1900 County thoroughfares, was designated for its association with community development and architecture at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, including the development of residential suburban neighborhoods and its Craftsman, Colonial Revival, and Tudor Revival homes. Ms. Bolliger explained that a brief analysis of the historic information available for the home indicated that it had been built by a first-generation Irish immigrant carpenter for his family, and only owned by three families in its history. She described it as representative of a typical, popular residential style in Arlington in the 1920s with only minor architectural updates.

Ms. Bolliger concluded by stating that the LHD application had received a letter of support from a neighbor stating that they had no objection to the application. Ms. Bolliger noted that the property owners were in attendance, and she introduced Mr. and Mrs. McIntyre to speak. Ms. McIntyre expressed their appreciation of the home and their loving stewardship of its character. She stated that she hoped neighbors would join their pursuit of preserving the character of their neighborhood. Mr. McIntyre noted that their neighbors have all lived there upwards of three decades and he thought that was indicative of the anchoring nature of the historic area. Ms. Bolliger shared some images of the property on the screen and Mr. McIntyre pointed out some issues with the aluminum siding on the rear addition, which was covering cedar shake. Ms. Bolliger noted that staff was working on including more cultural history in LHD designations and research thus far had unearthed interesting information about the original homeowner and what that reflected about the roots of the Cherrydale community.

The Chair invited the commissioners to discuss. Ms. Lawrence applauded the owners for applying to preserve their home. Mr. Woodruff likewise commended the McIntyres and expressed his support for preservation from the perspective of an LHD resident. He agreed that he saw many demolitions around the County and had seen almost none in his own neighborhood of Maywood since its [LHD] designation. As a long-time resident of the Maywood LHD, Mr. Woodruff offered to speak in support of LHDs to any of the McIntyres' interested neighbors.

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

I move that the HALRB add the parcel at 2002 N. Stafford St. to the Historic Preservation Program staff's queue to research for consideration as a Local Historic District.

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

### **Marker Review: Evelyn Reid Syphax Marker**

Ms. Bolliger presented an updated draft of a proposed historic marker for Evelyn Reid Syphax. She thanked Mr. Laporte and Ms. Hamm for working with her on the edited copy. Mr. Laporte noted some final outstanding edits, including the incorrect siting of Hoffman-Boston and that using "emancipated African Americans" before the Emancipation Proclamation was issued was confusing. Ms. Bolliger agreed to work with Mr. Laporte to make the final edits.

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

I move that the HALRB approve the Evelyn Reid Syphax marker including any outstanding minor text or design edits.

Ms. Meyer 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 deferred his time to Mr. Laporte to report on the Wakefield Manor site plan project. Ms. Farris thanked Mr. Laporte for his summary and explained that while the HALRB did not have an official review of the project, the Board could continue to give feedback by being involved in the public Site Plan Review Committee process.

**Staff and Other Reports**

Ms. Liccese-Torres announced that the draft of the Historic and Cultural Resources Plan had been released and posted to the website earlier today. She invited the commissioners to review the document and share it widely with fellow Arlingtonians, along with the accompanying feedback opportunities. Ms. Bolliger informed the commissioners that paper copies had been printed and would be distributed to those present at the meeting and then mailed to those not in attendance. Ms. Liccese-Torres invited everyone to review the document before the HALRB's special informational meeting on the following Wednesday, April 26, also at 6:30 pm, and to come prepared to hear a presentation from the consultant leading the project and discuss any questions.

Ms. Tawney outlined the upcoming community engagement for the updated Plan, including an open house event on May 6 from 12-3 pm at Arlington Central Library. She invited commissioners to join the HPP staff at the event to help answer questions, man learning stations, and support the Plan update process.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:05 pm.