



**MINUTES OF THE
HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, August 16, 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
Gray Handley
Joan Lawrence
Kaydee Myers
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel

MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIRTUALLY: Rebecca Meyer

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Alexandra Foster
Carmela Hamm
Gerry Laporte
Richard Woodruff

STAFF PRESENT: Lorin Farris, Historic Preservation Planner
Serena Bolliger, Historic Preservation Planner
Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Specialist

[The video conference system in room 216 was not working so the meeting was moved to room 220 and began at 6:40 pm]

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Chair called the meeting to order. Ms. Farris called the roll and determined that there was a quorum.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

The Chair explained the in-person and electronic Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures. 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 MAY 2023 MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for questions on the May 2023 draft meeting minutes. Upon hearing none, he asked for a motion on the minutes. Mr. Aiken moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Myers seconded the motion. Ms. Farris called the roll and the motion passed 4-0-3, with Mr. Handley, Ms. Lawrence, Ms. Myers and Ms. Meyer abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1) Bartley and Alexia Collart
3205 23rd St. N., CoA 21-02A
Maywood Historic District
Request to change side entrance on new construction home approved in CoA 21-02A to design approved in CoA 21-02.

The Chair asked for questions on the consent agenda. Upon hearing none, Mr. Turnbull moved to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Handley seconded the motion. Ms. Farris called the roll and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

DISCUSSION AGENDA

Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 23-20, 5620 3rd St. N.

Ms. Bolliger invited Ms. Jessica Kaplan, a representative of the Arlington Historical Society (AHS), to present their public art project. Ms. Bolliger explained that the applicant had been working on a research effort to recognize people enslaved in Arlington and collect information about their lives.

To commemorate these lives, Ms. Kaplan explained that AHS had developed a public art concept which would mark the sites with some type of physical object where people in Arlington had been enslaved. She said this proposed interpretive site element would honor the enslaved people who lived and worked at the Ball-Sellers House in the nineteenth century and is part of the AHS project “Memorializing the Enslaved in Arlington, 1669-1865.” The concept was inspired by a recognition project created in Germany to memorialize Holocaust victims.

As three people had been identified as having been enslaved at the Ball-Sellers House Local Historic District (LHD), owned by AHS, Ms. Kaplan was requesting to install three 4” x 4” brass plaques mounted on stone or concrete blocks set in gravel in the corner between the sidewalk and brick pathway along the west elevation of the Ball-Sellers House. Each of the 4” x 4” wide blocks would protrude 6” from the gravel at their highest point and slope toward the sidewalk with a lowest height of 4”. The brass plaque would be installed on the sloped surface. The proposed text is as follows:

- Enslaved Here, Nancy, born ca. 1775, died ca.1831-1840
- Enslaved Here, Name Unknown, Male, Born ca. 1806 -1820
- Enslaved Here, Name Unknown, Male, Born 1844

Ms. Kaplan said each plaque would have the Sankofa symbol, of Ghanian origin, representing “embracing past lessons for a brighter future.” She noted the brass square plaques would be manufactured in collaboration with Arlington high school students.

Ms. Bolliger stated that staff recommended approval of this application as submitted. She said this would be an interesting public art interpretation of a historically under told part of the property’s history. Furthermore, she noted that the markers would be installed in a way that added to the narrative of the

property without affecting the historic house. As the applicant proposed to install the markers in the privately-owned grass adjacent to the existing walkway and the right-of-way, and not on the home, she said staff found the proposal met the intent of Standard #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.

As the area had already been disturbed for utility excavation and pavement installation, Ms. Bolliger said staff was not concerned that the installation would damage archaeological resources on the site, which complied with Standard #8 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*. Ms. Bolliger explained that these were only three elements of the larger art project and may not reflect what would be installed elsewhere because of the different requirements for public and private sites.

Mr. Handley asked if more information had been discovered about the people being recognized to enrich the story. Ms. Kaplan replied that very little information was available. Ms. Lawrence stated her support of the project. Mr. Aiken asked if there was any concern about the raised stones close to the right-of-way. Ms. Kaplan responded that the idea of “stumbling stones” required them to stand out from the landscape. Ms. Bolliger explained that the site was not ADA accessible, so there was less concern about the stones interfering with traffic. Ms. Kaplan also noted that the Ball family did not have a record of hiring or owning enslaved people, so the markers had been placed away from the oldest portion of the Ball-Sellers House which the Ball family constructed.

The Chair thanked the commissioners for their deliberation and proposed this motion based on the discussion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 23-20, Ball-Sellers House Local Historic District, request to install three brass plaques as part of the AHS’ “Memorializing the Enslaved in Arlington, 1669-1865” project. The plaques will be mounted on blocks set in gravel in the corner between the public sidewalk and the brick walkway.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing no other comments, the Chair asked for the roll to be called. Ms. Farris called the roll and the motion passed unanimously.

[Cancelled] Discussion Agenda Item #2: CoA 23-17, 3605 21st Ave. N.

Ms. Bolliger explained that based on previous HALRB and Design Review Committee (DRC) feedback, the applicants had sought in-kind replacements for the siding and were repairing the existing front door; therefore, a CoA would not be needed for their work.

HALRB By-Laws: Update

Ms. Bolliger explained that in 2022 the Virginia Legislation had required architectural review boards to have an in-person quorum after the COVID-19 emergency order allowing all-virtual meetings had been lifted. As the HALRB had not established a quorum definition in its By-laws, she said staff had been using “Robert’s Rules of Order” (a guideline for parliamentary procedure) to determine quorum. To establish the quorum language and expand the official sub-committees listed in the By-laws, Ms. Bolliger said the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff had developed a draft By-laws update which had been presented and discussed by the HALRB at its July 19, 2023, hybrid public hearing. She said the draft could be considered by the HALRB for a vote.

Ms. Meyer stated her support for a minimum of five in-person commissioners. Mr. Aiken and Mr. Davis agreed. Ms. Bolliger stated that staff hoped that this change would make the HALRB more accessible to people who would not traditionally be able to attend due to non-traditional work hours, disability,

caretaking, cost issues, etc. Mr. Handley suggested including an additional virtual quorum to ensure that a representative portion of the commission was voting. Ms. Myers appreciated the suggestion but recommended fulfilling the Virginia quorum reporting requirement and not adding a layer of complexity to the HALRB’s quorum. Ms. Bolliger explained that commissioners had a minimum attendance requirement which should encourage virtual attendance.

The Chair thanked the board members for their deliberation and proposed this motion based on the discussion:

I move to approve the updated HALRB By-laws including the provision that quorum consists of the minimum of five members present and all other revised language as submitted.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing no other comments, the Chair asked for the roll to be called. Ms. Farris called the roll and it passed 7-0-1 with Mr. Turnbull abstaining.

Marker Review: Mount Olive Baptist Church

Ms. Bolliger invited Ms. Dangerfield, the representative of Mount Olive Baptist Church, to comment on the proposed marker. Ms. Dangerfield said she had worked with staff to finalize the language and hoped the commission was happy with the result. Ms. Lawrence noted that a comma needed to be removed after “edifice” in the last paragraph but otherwise she supported the language. Mr. Handley stated this version was a great improvement and would be a wonderful commemoration.

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

I move that the HALRB approve the Mount Olive Baptist Church marker as submitted.

Mr. Turnbull seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Farris called the roll. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Handley thanked Ms. Dangerfield for her patience with the process. Ms. Dangerfield thanked the commission and the staff.

Marker Review: Arlington Junction Park

Ms. Bolliger noted that the HALRB had received two written comments about the marker draft and that there was also a speaker signed up to comment.

Two public comments had also been submitted prior to the meeting. The public comments are included here for the record:

Public Comment #1

I am writing to comment on the proposed historical marker for Arlington Junction Park. I am glad to see that the history of the Alexandria Canal and the electric trolley will be highlighted with this new marker.

First, the Alexandria Aqueduct (also known as the Potomac Aqueduct and later the Aqueduct Bridge) is displayed prominently in the photograph at the top of the marker but is not called out by name anywhere on the marker or in the image caption. I suggest giving the name of the aqueduct somewhere in the marker text.

Second, there is a description of the products shipped via the Alexandria Canal, but no acknowledgment of the labor systems that underpinned the agrarian economy of the area prior to the Civil War. European colonizers established an economy based on tobacco plantations that relied on the labor of enslaved and indentured people in the 17th century. Indentured servitude dwindled in the late 17th century, and by the early 18th century large-scale agricultural labor in the Chesapeake region was predominately performed by enslaved Black people. Plantations and many farms continued to exploit enslaved Black workers when the economy shifted from tobacco cultivation to grain cultivation in the region in the mid-18th century. This exploitation continued into the 19th century during the period when the Alexandria Canal was opened. More of this history is detailed in Wood and Rabinowitz's "Coming to Manassas: Peace, War, and the Making of a Virginia Community" <https://irma.nps.gov/DataStore/Reference/Profile/2264713>

It is misleading to discuss the products that were traded as part of this economy based on enslaved labor without discussing slavery. I suggest including a description of slavery and how the labor of enslaved people supported the region's economy when the Alexandria Canal opened for business in 1843.

Thank you for your consideration.

Angelina Jones

Public Comment #2

HALRB members:

The [final Arlington Junction Park historic marker \(revised August 15, 2023\)](#), which the HALRB will review at its August 16 meeting, has the following errors:

- The second sentence in the third paragraph states:

“The new trolley line allowed the Mount Vernon Railway Company to offer continuous service between Washington, D.C. and Mount Vernon.”

The railway company’s name is incorrect. The company’s name was actually the "Washington, Alexandria and Mount Vernon Electric Railway. (Reference: [Snowden, William H. \(1902\). Some Old Historic Landmarks of Virginia and Maryland, \(title page\).](#))

I therefore suggest that the HALRB recommend that the above sentence be changed to:

The new trolley line allowed the Washington, Alexandria and Mount Vernon Electric Railway to offer continuous service between Washington, D.C. and Mount Vernon.

- The third sentence in the third paragraph states:

Once trolleys made it to Arlington Junction Station, the line’s route split and passengers could continue west to Fairfax City and Falls Church or take a diverging line that served Arlington National Cemetery, Rosslyn, and the Green Valley neighborhood.

Passengers could continue west from Arlington Junction to Fairfax City and Falls Church on a line that the sign’s 1907 map of Alexandria County designates as “W. A. & F.C. RY.” (Washington, Arlington & Falls Church Railway). Alternatively, passengers could take a

diverging line designated on the map as “W. A. & MT V. RY.” (Washington, Alexandria & Mt Vernon Railway) that traveled north to Arlington National Cemetery and Rosslyn.

However, passengers could not travel between Arlington Junction and the Green Valley neighborhood on either of those two lines. A different W. A. & F.C. RY. line connected Rosslyn, Fort Myer, and the Green Valley neighborhood (which was known at the time as “Nauck”). That line was outside of the area that the 1907 map in the proposed sign shows. Passengers traveling between Arlington Junction and Clarendon, Falls Church or Fairfax City crossed that line south of Fort Myer. (Reference: [Expanded 1907 map of Alexandria County, showing W. A. & F.C. RY. line connecting Rosslyn, Fort Myer and Nauck and crossing W.A. & F.C. RY line connecting Arlington Junction and Clarendon](#))

I therefore suggest that the HALRB recommend that the above sentence be changed to:

Once trolleys made it to Arlington Junction Station, the line’s route split and passengers could continue west to Clarendon, Falls Church and Fairfax City or take a diverging line that traveled north to Arlington National Cemetery and Rosslyn.

Board members:

The final version of the Department of Park and Recreation's (DPR's) proposed historic marker (dated August 15, 2023) has a number of errors. I have described two of these in an earlier message that I sent to you.

In addition, the first paragraph in the marker states: "*The park you are in today reflects the evolution of how people move and use public space in Arlington County. Before it was a park, The Alexandria Canal and an electric trolley station called “Arlington Junction Station” marked a change in how people used public land in Arlington from travel on our waterways to rail lines, before shifting again to roads and now, a public park.*"

However, both the Alexandria Canal and Arlington Junction were on private property when operational. The canal and railroad companies owned the right-of-ways. Neither was on public space or public land. Further, there is no evidence that shows that Arlington Junction Station was within the area that Arlington Junction Park now occupies.

Only a part of the northwestern portion of the triangular set of tracks that comprised Arlington Junction is now within Arlington Junction Park. Arlington Junction Station was near the east corner of the Junction, outside of the area that is now within the park.

To confirm this, see the following:

[Arlington County's GIS spyglass](#) superimposes selected portions of the 1900 "Map of Alexandria County, Virginia for the Virginia Title Company" on a recent satellite image of Arlington County. Search for "South Eads Street and 11th Street South" to place the spyglass over Arlington Junction Park. The spyglass will then superimpose the Junction's triangular set of tracks over the satellite image of the Park. Move the spyglass to the right to see the labeled location of Arlington Junction Station, which was near the east corner of the Junction and is now one block east of the park.

[A circa 1915 U.S. Geological Survey topographic map](#) does not show any buildings near the northwestern portion of the Junction, part of which the Park now occupies. The only building that

is adjacent to the Junction's triangle is on the south side of the tracks at the Junction's east corner (east of the Park's area). That building appears to be the Arlington Junction station.

I therefore suggest that the HALRB recommend that the DPR change the first paragraph of the marker to correctly describe the features and functions of the transportation facilities that the park's area actually contained.

Thank you,

Bernie Berne

Mr. Max Ewart, staff from the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), was not yet present so Ms. Bolliger invited Dr. Berne to speak. Dr. Berne shared his written comment (see above) to the commission. Mr. Ewart joined the meeting, so Ms. Bolliger invited him to respond to the comments and provide some context. He stated that DPR would be happy to update the name of the railway to the more formal nomenclature.

Mr. Ewart explained that the comments about images and captioning were well received and would be resolved. He also noted that Ms. Jones's comment about the inclusion of the role of enslaved labor in the construction was important and would be addressed. He said he was grateful to this public forum for reminding DPR staff about the historic context and public interest.

Dr. Berne noted that the comment he had submitted to Mr. Ewart had been based on the first draft of the marker and not the updated draft on the screen.

Ms. Farris noted that given the number of comments, she suggested Mr. Ewart update the draft and return for future comment.

Mr. Aiken stated that much of the text was hard to read and did not appear as accessible and he recommended changing the color or text. Mr. Ewart replied that the colors had been chosen based on the DPR Master Plan, and some of the text was part of the map images utilized. Ms. Lawrence clarified that the captions were hard to read and recommended improving their legibility. Mr. Aiken congratulated the staff on their research. Ms. Lawrence pointed out that the pink map marker legend was confusing and recommended making it clearer. Mr. Aiken asked if there was any concern about the colors fading. Mr. Ewart explained that there were, and they were analyzing the site and the marker for longevity.

Mr. Handley also supported DPR coming back with an updated draft. Mr. Aiken asked if Fairfax City was incorporated and whether the station name was correct. Mr. Ewart agreed to confirm the station names and lines. Ms. Farris asked about more information on the station image. Mr. Ewart agreed to consider the additional information if it could be included without diverting the marker from the goal content. Mr. Aiken recommended finding an inset map which included more context about the rail line and the stops along the line. The commissioners agreed that the marker was well received and had included a lot of hard work.

LHD Design Guideline Update: Colonial Village Windows

Ms. Bolliger explained that in 2015 the HALRB had approved design guidelines for Colonial Village which allowed staff to approve windows within certain parameters via Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness (ACoA). In the past year, she said the main producer of the windows which complied with the 2015 parameters had discontinued production of the approved windows, and the tenants and managers of Colonial Village had struggled to find any windows that complied with the 2015 design guidelines. Thus, she said they approached staff to update the guidelines to allow currently manufactured

windows to be approved via ACoA. Ms. Bolliger reminded the HALRB members that they saw the proposed windows in person at the May 17, 2023, meeting and made a preliminary recommendation based on the windows presented in the meeting. After the May meeting, Ms. Bolliger adapted the existing guidelines with the new recommendations and shared them with the Colonial Village board; the board returned some edits which Ms. Bolliger incorporated.

Ms. Bolliger invited Colonial Village site manager Chuck Vaughan to comment. He explained that Colonial Village staff and tenants had reviewed and approved the language and explained that Colonial Village II Board President Mr. Geoff Lawson also was in attendance. Mr. Lawson explained that there had been many technological improvements since the 2015 guidelines had been approved and that tenants were interested in getting energy efficient windows for their homes. Mr. Lawson noted there was already a lot of variation because the original wooden windows had been initially replaced with aluminum during the condominium conversion in the 1980s, and then ad hoc by owners until the 2015 design guidelines had been passed. He said he thought these guidelines were the appropriate strategy to allow some small variation between the windows.

Ms. Bolliger asked for comments on the updated proposed guidelines. She explained that her only hesitation was including language about the half-screen as the HALRB generally did not review window screens or storm windows but understood that this was for visual cohesion since the Colonial Village Board used these guidelines as their own approval checklist.

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

I move that the HALRB approve the amended Colonial Village Window Design Guidelines as written.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Farris called the roll. The motion passed unanimously.

Site Plan Presentation: Wakefield Manor

Ms. Farris invited the Walsh Colucci team to present on the Wakefield Manor site plan. Ms. Lauren Riley introduced the project, and Ms. Farris explained how staff had given recommendations to aid in the design of the new construction adjacent to the easement site at Wakefield Manor. Mr. Handley asked for some background, and Ms. Farris explained that the Wakefield Manor garden apartment complex was adjacent to a single-family site and a surface parking lot which the applicant was proposing to convert to apartments. Architects Henry Mahns and Aileen Horn presented the design of the twelve-story apartment block proposed in the site plan.

Ms. Lawrence noted that having been involved in the original site plan design, she thought this design was an improvement. She expressed she would have preferred something other than a tall building on this site and had heard concerns for neighbors about the impact of the high-rise on the historic site and its residents. Ms. Lawrence noted appreciation for the Mesrobian architectural elements included in the design. Mr. Handley asked about the comments from the public. Ms. Riley replied that the main community concerns were parking, construction impacts, and site improvements; she noted site plan conditions had been included to manage these concerns.

Ms. Lawrence regretted the loss of the tree and asked if the area near the historic site would be used for additional planting. Ms. Riley noted that additional sites were being sought for trees on the green roof and at ground level plus off-site planting in the County-owned cul-de-sac.

Mr. Davis asked if there was any public activation on the ground floor such as a community space. Ms. Riley explained that there was a large lobby as a public entrance to the building. Mr. Handley asked why the designers had selected rectangular balconies across the building rather than the rounded balconies above the entrance. Mr. Mahns explained that they had been selected for size as the rounded edge reduced the footprint. As this was just an update on the project, no motion was necessary from the HALRB.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Farris reminded the HALRB that staff would be at the County Fair this weekend and that the Historic and Cultural Resources Plan draft update was on track to be shared with the HARLB in September. Mr. Aiken asked if there would be another special meeting for the draft release. Ms. Tawney replied it would be folded into the September meeting agenda as the goal was to provide a shorter overview of the changes, rather than re-introducing the entire plan.

Ms. Farris then noted that the Plan Langston Boulevard (PLB) staff had asked to present at the September HALRB meeting. She proposed that the presentation focus primarily on the cultural resources section of the document to limit the discussion. Mr. Aiken and Ms. Lawrence agreed that a focused presentation about the impact on cultural resources would be most helpful. Ms. Lawrence expressed that based on her attendance at the PLB meetings, she felt there was not enough emphasis being placed on identified historic resources.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:37 pm.