



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

**Wednesday, September 20, 2023, 6:30 PM**

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Omari Davis, Chair  
Alex Foster  
Rebecca Meyer  
Kaydee Myers  
Andrew Wenchel

**MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIRTUALLY:**  
John Aiken, Vice Chair (Personal, Arlington, VA)

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Robert Dudka  
Carmela Hamm  
Gray Handley  
Gerald Laporte  
Joan Lawrence  
Mark Turnbull  
Dick Woodruff

**STAFF PRESENT:** Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Program Manager  
Lorin Farris, 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 JUNE 2023 AND JULY 2023 MEETING MINUTES**

The Chair asked for any comments on the June 2023 minutes. Upon hearing none, Ms. Myers moved to approve the June minutes and Mr. Davis seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the vote passed 3-0-3; Mr. Aiken, Ms. Foster, and Ms. Meyer abstained. The Chair asked for any comments on the July 2023 minutes and upon hearing none, Ms. Meyer moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Davis seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 5-0-1, with Ms. Foster abstaining.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEM: BARCROFT GARDEN APARTMENTS SECTION 4 RENOVATION**

Ms. Farris introduced the informational item for the Barcroft Apartments (Barcroft) Section 4 renovation project and provided a staff summary: The HALRB needed to review the project and provide input on the proposed renovation, similar to what the HALRB reviewed in May and June 2023 with the Barcroft Section 3 renovation project. Barcroft is identified in the Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Area Plan, also known as the Form Based Code (N-FBC). Barcroft is one of three multi-family residential areas identified as a Conservation Area in the N-FBC. In the case of Barcroft, the applicant is required to follow specific standards for Conservation Areas as identified in Part 7, Conservation Area Standards. The Standards also require applicants to meet with the HALRB a minimum of two times before the project can be considered by the County Board. The applicant would return to the HALRB again in October to further discuss the project.

Ms. Farris described the proposed project scope for renovating Section 4, which included the following:

- Repairing exterior masonry (including brick and cast stone);
- Repointing of deteriorated mortar where necessary, matching the existing size, shape, color, and texture;
- Gentle cleaning and washing of all existing brick and concrete facades;
- Removal and replacement of steel-sash basement windows with vinyl windows that match the original configuration;
- Removal and replacement of existing mechanical systems, including existing through-wall mechanical system openings, and patching of exterior walls to match surrounding brick;
- Removal and replacement of non-original light fixtures with new compatible fixtures;
- Replacement of gutters and downspouts in-kind;
- Replacement of asphalt roofs with new asphalt shingles;
- Repairing and painting existing metal railings;
- Repairing and painting existing non-original shutters;
- Repairing and painting corroded metal lintels;
- Addition of ADA-compliant ramps and entrances with fiber-glass doors at rear elevation of Building 33;
- Addition of new entry canopies above entrances to meet Virginia Housing requirements;
- Addition of vinyl or aluminum cladding on existing wood trim per Virginia Housing requirements;
- Addition of new penetrations on rear elevations for bathroom exhaust, dryer, and HVAC vents; and
- Construction of a new trash enclosure north of Building 33.

Ms. Farris provided a summary of the discussion at the September 6, 2023, Design Review Committee (DRC) hybrid meeting. Mr. Wenchel suggested adjusting the design of the proposed rear handrail for the ADA ramp with a more horizontally focused railing to soften its appearance.

Ms. Farris provided her recommendations to the HALRB for the renovation project. She stated that the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff did not have issue with the scope, which included the following: repairs to the masonry; repointing the deteriorated mortar; the cleaning approach towards the brick and concrete facades; patching the exterior wall to match surrounding brick where mechanical systems would be removed; replacing non-original light fixtures with new compatible fixtures; in-kind replacement of gutters, downspouts, and asphalt roof shingles; repairing and painting existing metal railings, non-historic shutters, and metal lintels; adding ADA-compliant ramps and entrances with fiber-glass doors at the rear of Building 33; and constructing a new trash enclosure. Ms. Farris explained that these specific items followed the guidance of both Part 7 of the Conservation Area Standards in the N-

FBC, and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties*, specifically standards #1, #2, and #9.

Ms. Farris acknowledged that the scope also included items that were not consistent with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* and the Conservation Area Standards of the N-FBC, including:

1. The removal and replacement of the steel-sash basement windows with vinyl basement windows matching the original configuration;
2. New penetrations for vents on the rear elevations;
3. Use of vinyl or aluminum cladding on existing wood trim as per the Virginia Housing requirements; and
4. The installation of canopies above all entrances to meet Virginia Housing requirements.

Ms. Farris explained that the HPP staff considered the proposed replacement of the steel-sash basement windows with vinyl as a minor change to the historic material of the existing buildings. She said all the original windows in Section 4 have already been replaced except the basement story windows; although the steel-sash basement windows are original, they are not considered character-defining features to Barcroft. Concerning the new penetrations for vents on the rear elevations, she said the HPP staff saw this as necessary for the historic buildings to adapt to the needs of its current and future residents without negatively affecting character-defining features; these penetrations would be minimal and only would be visible on the rear elevations.

Ms. Farris stated the HPP staff agreed that the cladding of existing wood trim materials and the installation of entrance canopies, as per the Virginia Housing requirements, likewise are minimal changes to these character-defining features. She said the applicant will be required to repair any deteriorated wood prior to cladding it with vinyl or aluminum; although this cladding will be a visible barrier, the wood material will still exist, and the cladding treatment can be reversible. As for the canopies, she stated the proposed designs will not overshadow the decorative door surrounds on the facades and are compatible to the overall design of Barcroft. Additionally, she noted that the installation of the canopies will only occur on the rear elevation of Building 33 and will be mounted in the mortar joints so as not to cause damage to the historic brick material. She said the cladding of existing wood materials and installation of entry canopies mostly followed standards #6 and #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Farris stated that the HPP staff was encouraged by the applicant's ongoing conversations with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources on the likelihood that the applicant's request for waivers of these Virginia Housing requirements would be approved even if this approval cannot currently be guaranteed. Ms. Farris clarified that staff would continue to work with the applicant about getting waivers for these items, but that the project needed to be presented to the HALRB as if the waivers were not likely since that is how the project will be presented to the County Board. Regarding the tree removal and replacement plan, she said the HPP staff recommended that the project team communicate with the County's Urban Forestry staff to discuss and refine the tree removal and replacement plan.

Next, Ms. Farris invited the applicants to present their project. Ms. Lauren Riley of Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, & Walsh, legal counsel for the applicant, provided an overview; she outlined the timeline of the project and when they plan to go before the County Board. Ms. Riley also mentioned that the project considered the feedback from the September DRC meeting and provided multiple options for the railing for the ADA-compliant ramps proposed at the rear of Building 33. Mr. Mehrdad Froozan with Bonstra Haresign Architects presented the four "type A" units proposed in Building 33, which would be ADA-compliant. He said they designed new openings on the rear elevation of Building 33, one new ramp, and a sloped walkway for access to these four units. He suggested two different options for the railing along the

ramp where it was required (the sloped walkway did not require a railing): one with an infilled mesh panel and another with a horizontal design that contained a light cable.

Mr. Froozan provided perspectives of the existing doors at Building 33 and said they are proposing to use the same design and fenestration pattern but would use fiberglass doors with dual-pane insulated glass instead of wood doors. He noted that the design of the exterior lights would be like what is there currently. He said the vinyl window replacements at the basement stories would retain the existing fenestration pattern. He then proceeded to explain the minimum design and construction requirements for the Virginia Housing credit, such as the cladding of wood trim and the entrance canopies. He stated they were proposing that the canopies would need to be at least 12 inches on each side of the entrance door and have a 30-inch overhang from the front door. He shared two options, including a modern design with a tie back to the exterior brick wall and a more traditional approach that was preferred by the HALRB in the Section 3 renovation proposal. Mr. Froozan explained that Building 32 would receive six canopies, Building 33 would receive two canopies, and Building 34 would need one canopy. Lastly, Ms. Riley provided their application summary for the items submitted for the N-FBC use permit application.

Chair Davis asked if Mr. Wenchel wanted to ask any questions about the proposed options for the railings. Mr. Wenchel explained how in his experience working on ADA projects that many individuals using ramps did not want to bring attention to themselves and their disability. Thus, he thought the lighter cable was the right approach in design for the railings. Ms. Myers asked if they needed a full guardrail or just a handrail for the sloped walkway. Landscape architect Jeff Kreps of the Barcroft project team replied, stating that anytime they get above the 30-inch change in elevation from the top of a ramp surface to the adjacent grid, the ramp will need to have a guardrail plus the handrail; therefore, the top part of the ramp would need the guardrail. Ms. Meyer preferred the horizontal steel slats for the guardrail. Ms. Foster preferred the horizontality of the slats because it was more modern and stated she had concern about the maintenance of the horizontal cables. She discussed the canopies and appreciated the modern design as opposed to the traditional approach. She made suggestions about the canopy placement in relation to the entry.

Ms. Meyer preferred the modern canopy and its location to the entrance, and she preferred the cable guardrail to differentiate the modern elements from the historic elements. Mr. Froozan explained that the canopy placement was strategic to not hide the architectural design of the doors. Ms. Meyer further asked about the plan for the front entrances and the existing doors. The applicant replied, stating they only would be repairing and repainting the existing wood doors and that the hardware would probably need to be replaced in-kind. Ms. Farris asked for clarification on which canopy was approved in the Section 3 renovation application; Ms. Riley confirmed that option 2, the more traditional canopy design, was previously approved.

Ms. Farris recognized that the HALRB members present seemed to be gravitating towards the modern canopy design, and she asked if they were comfortable with having two different canopy designs at Barcroft. Ms. Foster thought it would be possible to have two different canopy designs at the complex as long as each section kept to one specific canopy. Further discussion occurred about the location of the entrances and the access to the interior units. The applicant explained that the new rear entrances would provide access to a specific unit and not into a building corridor. Ms. Meyer stated she felt more comfortable with one canopy type, that mixing and matching could be disjointed, but that it could be compatible in one area of Barcroft. She thought it would look odd to have a different canopy design on the front versus the back of the buildings. Mr. Davis agreed that mixing the canopy designs on a building was not compatible, but it could be considered for a specific section.

Ms. Farris asked the applicant if they had received enough guidance concerning the canopies and the guardrail designs so as to prepare for the October HALRB meeting. Ms. Riley asked for further

clarification of the canopy design. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested that the project team receive feedback from the HALRB in October on the two horizontal guardrail designs and the canopy style preference. There was further discussion among the HALRB members about proposing the different areas where different canopies could be appropriate throughout Barcroft. Chair Davis asked if the applicant planned to use salvaged brick in the areas where the elevations need brick infill and this was confirmed.

### **DPR MARKER REVIEW: ARLINGTON JUNCTION PARK**

Mr. Max Ewart, staff from the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), presented an updated draft of the Arlington Junction Park marker that the HALRB previously reviewed in August 2023. Mr. Ewart explained that the previous comments from the HALRB and the community had been considered. He noted that DPR colleagues had recommended reducing the word count to increase engagement with the marker. Mr. Ewart noted he had received some textual comments from Ms. Bolliger and then highlighted some graphic changes that the staff planned to make, including removing the extraneous station names from the central map graphic. He also stated that DPR had received several comments about the interest in this site and its history, so Mr. Ewart presented the idea of including a QR code for more information. He invited comments from the HALRB.

Ms. Tawney noted that a public comment had been submitted, which has been written into the record below. The commenter, Dr. Bernie Berne, also signed up to speak. Ms. Tawney invited him to address the Board. Dr. Berne repeated his written comment but had some connectivity issues, so Ms. Tawney read his comment into the record. Dr. Berne followed up with a message during the meeting and an email comment after the meeting, which has been copied below.

### **Public Comment #1**

HALRB members:

The HALRB will review at this evening's meeting an updated version of the Department of Park and Recreation's [Arlington Junction & Alexandria Canal marker](#) in Arlington Junction Park (submitted September 18, 2023). The proposed marker has the following errors:

- Map of the route of the Washington, Alexandria & Mt. Vernon Electric Railway.
  - The map has two typographical errors. The station marked "Jason City" should be "Jackson City". The station marked "New Alaxandria" should be "New Alexandria".
  - The Railway did not travel as far north as Mt. Pleasant (where the map identifies a station next to a red dot). Beginning in 1905, the trolley line's Washington terminal was located at 1202 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, near the present locations of the Federal Triangle Metro station and the Old Post Building (which now holds the Waldorf Astoria Washington DC hotel.)

A building in the Federal Triangle is now located at 1202 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW. [Click here](#) to see a red pointer at the terminal's former location on a 2023 satellite image. The new terminal replaced the railway's original terminal, which was located at the present location of Freedom Plaza, about a block northwest of the new terminal.

The attachment to this message contains a corrected map of the route of the Washington, Alexandria and Mount Vernon Electric Railway. The map shows the location of the railway's

Washington Terminal, the corrected names of the misspelled Jackson City and New Alexandria stations, and the deletion of the railway's Mt. Pleasant station (which did not exist). The DPR should use this map when correcting the above errors.

- The first sentence in the second paragraph of the DPR's updated marker for Arlington Junction Park states: "*The Alexandria Canal had been completed in 1843, **largely through the forced labor of black slaves**, ....*". However, I have not been able to find any documentation that supports that statement.

The City of Alexandria's government has developed an "[African American Heritage Trail](#)". A marker at Stop 9 of the Trail, which is located at the Alexandria Canal's Tide Lock, states more cautiously in the first sentence in its second paragraph: "*The aqueduct and canal were constructed from 1832 to 1843, **probably** with the labor of enslaved African Americans.*"

A [National Park Service publication entitled "The Workers Who Built the C&O Canal"](#) states: "*Early on, enslaved blacks were used in some places, but that practice had largely been abandoned by the time construction reached the Blue Ridge, near present-day Hagerstown, Maryland.*" [Construction on that canal had reached Hancock, Maryland \(west of Hagerstown\) by 1839.](#)

[The Alexandria Canal was constructed during the same time period \(between 1833 and 1843\).](#) It therefore appears likely that few, if any, slaves participated in the Alexandria Canal's construction.

**The DPR should therefore remove from the marker its reference to forced labor and black slaves.** The reference lacks documentation and may well be incorrect.

Reference:

Location of the railway's Washington Terminal: [Merriken, John E. \(1987\). Old Dominion Trolley Too: a history of the Mount Vernon Line. Dallas, Texas: L.O. King, Jr., page 17.](#)

Thank you.

Bernie Berne

### **Message During Meeting**

Please read the written comment that I submitted before the meeting. It is important to add the trolley line's Washington Terminal to the map, even if other stations are removed. It is also important to remove the reference to slavery in the text about the Alexandria Canal. No known document describes this. It appears to be unlikely that slaves were used in the construction of the Alexandria Canal because of the time period during which it was constructed.

### **Email Follow Up to Public Comment #1 and Speaker #1**

Serena:

My computer disconnected from the internet while I was speaking during the September 20 HALRB meeting on the Alexandria Canal / Arlington Junction marker. By the time that the connection was restored, the HALRB had ended its discussion on the marker.

When I subsequently watched the meeting recording, I noted that the HALRB had received an oral summary of my written comments. However, the summary lacked some of the most important points that I had intended to present to the HALRB when I spoke.

The HALRB approved the marker with the understanding that the Historic Preservation Program and the Department of Parks and Recreation Program may make additional changes. It is therefore important that your office and the DPR make the following changes. My written comments described some of these, but the HALRB did not hear them.

- Remove the phrase in the second paragraph that states that the Alexandria Canal was constructed "***largely through the forced labor of black slaves***". No documentation supports any such statement.

Instead, well-documented conditions existing during the construction of the C&O Canal suggest that slaves (or "enslaved people") were no longer being used when building canals in the D.C. area during the entire time that the Alexandria Canal was under construction. My written comments provide details about this comparison. **Historic markers must not contain undocumented statements, especially when contemporary documents suggest that they are wrong.**

- Remove from the map the name of the Mt. Pleasant station and the dot adjacent to the name. The trolley line did not travel as far north as Mt. Pleasant. The line had no station with that name.
- Before I spoke, Mr. Ewart stated that most or all the names of the trolley line's stations except Arlington Junction would likely be removed from the map. However, it would then be difficult or impossible to identify the route of the trolley line that used the Junction.

**The map highlights with dark lines the routes of a number of different railroad lines that traveled through D.C. and Virginia.** The entire route of the trolley line will need to be colored or marked in some other manner to avoid confusing visitors.

- **Add the name and location of the trolley line's Washington Terminal**, even if the names of other stations are removed. The Washington Terminal was the line's most important and most-used station. It marked the northern end of the trolley line. The map that I provided with my written comments shows the location of the terminal.

Thank you.

Bernie Berne

## **Public Comment #2**

Angelina Ribeiro Jones sent HPP and DPR staff a primary source from 1833 describing the author E.S. Abdy meeting the Alexandria Canal contractor in 1833 and transcribed the contractor's detailed account of his use of enslaved labor on the Canal project. *Journal of a residence and tour in the United States of North America, from April 1833, to October, 1834, by E.S. Abdy, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge.* p.180-181 Accessed from the Hathi Trust

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.32044010530681&seq=192>

Ms. Farris invited the Board to discuss. Ms. Meyer stated support for the QR code on the marker post. Mr. Davis and Ms. Foster agreed. Mr. Ewart expressed an interest in geocaching in the parks and the commissioners expressed support. Mr. Aiken asked whether staff had considered entirely removing the names from the trolley graphic in the center of the draft marker. Mr. Ewart replied they had considered that and noted that since the map itself had station names on it the overlay text could be removed. Mr. Aiken asked whether the text could be unified across the marker as it was scattered across the surface. Mr. Ewart said there was some potential for rearrangement. Mr. Aiken complimented the improvements from the previous draft and expressed support for the QR code.

Ms. Meyer asked whether the Arlington Junction station call-out could be moved closer to the site, as the distance and arrow were separating the text from the graphic. Ms. Foster noted a similar concern with the titling of the site on the bottom map and suggested using the same icon on both maps. Ms. Myers agreed that it would be simpler. Mr. Ewart explained that one site was the station, and one site was the rough location of the park; everyone agreed the same icon could be used.

Ms. Foster recommended changing the language from “slaves” to “enslaved people.” Mr. Ewart asked for confirmation about whether the commissioners wanted the other station titles removed entirely. Ms. Foster recommended making the titles less bold and putting the Arlington Junction station back onto the photograph rather than called out separately. She also recommended keeping the station markers as they were hard to see on the photo. Ms. Myers said that if the station names were acceptably visible on the map, she did not think it was necessary to also have them in overlay text. Mr. Aiken and Mr. Davis agreed that retaining the stop icons but removing the names was a good idea. Ms. Myers requested that staff add dates to each of the maps. Mr. Aiken asked for confirmation that the Alexandria Canal text was an existing part of the map. Mr. Ewart offered to provide the final version to the HALRB once it was finalized for the commission to see.

The Chair asked for any final comments and upon hearing none, made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB conditionally approve the DPR Historic Marker for Arlington Junction as submitted including any outstanding text or design edits per coordination with DPR and HPP staff.

Ms. Foster seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 6-0.

#### **SITE PLAN MARKER REVIEW: COURTHOUSE LANDMARK HISTORIC MARKERS**

Ms. Farris invited Ms. Kim Daileader of EHT Tracerics, a preservation consultant for the Courthouse Landmark [now called the Commodore] site plan project to give a brief overview of the approved site plan, which included retaining the facades of the First Federal Savings and Loan Bank building and the Investment Building. Ms. Farris explained that the site plan conditions included historic interpretation and the Courthouse Sector Plan Addendum gave some direction about documentation and interpretation for the site including the so-called “Lawyer’s Row,” which had been demolished.

Ms. Daileader presented proposed text for the three markers, one for each building and one for “Lawyer’s Row.” She mentioned some of the images they planned to include on the signage. Ms. Liccese-Torres recalled an image of the Courthouse in the HPP’s archives that she offered to share with the consultant. Ms. Farris asked how the signs would be displayed and therefore whether information needed to be repeated on individual markers. Ms. Daileader replied that the Lawyer’s Row and the Investment Building markers would be situated together and the First Federal Savings and Loan Bank marker would be on the N. Uhle St. side closer to the bank site. Ms. Myers stated that locating them close to the original



sites was important. Ms. Farris proposed as an alternative style option a transparent acrylic sign outlining the demolished buildings. Ms. Daileader noted this style might be possible for the First Federal Savings and Loan Bank building if it were installed across the street in the mini-park. Ms. Foster expressed concern about how the acrylic material might age and weather. Ms. Liccese-Torres noted she had seen this style of interpretive panel done on glass. Ms. Daileader offered to study this style option. She thanked the commissioners and invited them to send her any additional comments.

**PLANNING STUDY PRESENTATION: PLAN LANGSTON BOULEVARD**

Ms. Natasha Alfonso-Ahmed, of the Planning Division and the Project Manager for the Plan Langston Boulevard (PLB) study, presented a summary of the policies and recommendations being made for an update to the County’s General Land Use Plan. She explained that Planning staff released their draft PLB plan in June 2023 and will release the Request to Advertise (RTA) draft in late September for discussion at the Planning Commission meeting and the County Board public hearing in October. Ms. Alfonso-Ahmed provided the following PLB overview:

Started in 2019, this comprehensive, high-level vision for the corridor will guide both public and private investment in the long term. The plan’s recommendations are focused on the core study area for neighborhoods two, three, and five located on or near Langston Boulevard. Other neighborhoods located in the core study area, East Falls Church and Cherrydale, have their own adopted plans and policies that will continue to apply. The plan’s policies and recommendations are centered around resiliency and an equitable approach to land uses by meeting the needs of the corridor’s residents. This can be accomplished through leveraging proximity to transit and existing activity centers to reduce travel times, carbon emissions, and increasing housing supply. The plan uses the County’s equity lens to understand whether and where there are racial inequities that exist or are being exacerbated. The plan includes recommendations to mitigate this or minimize the burdens for current and future residents.

In total, there are twelve historic resources in the planning area that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the Virginia Landmarks Register. The Leeway Overlee and Old Dominion neighborhoods are potentially NRHP-eligible historic districts in the planning area. There are also seven Local Historic Districts (LHDs) in the planning area. The firm AECOM conducted a cultural resources survey to identify historic resources along the corridor that increase public understanding and appreciation for its architectural and cultural history.

The plan recommends a new land use framework to achieve a green main street for Langston Boulevard by linking neighborhoods to businesses, activity nodes, housing, and public spaces. The plan proposes four new mixed-use activity hubs that will concentrate development in these areas, which could expand opportunities for increasing housing supply and affordability. The policies on building form are aimed at achieving context sensitive building design by focusing the tallest building heights at activity hubs near key intersections that are within walking distance of transit or metro. The plan’s goals are to incentivize positive change to encourage special exception development that helps achieve many of the County’s aspirations.

Currently, Langston Boulevard is car-centric with narrow sidewalks, minimal tree coverage, wide lanes, and has numerous driveways that create conflicts between all modes of travel. The policy for transportation focuses on creating complete streets that accommodate all modes of travel, reducing driveways, minimizing conflict points,

expanding the street, increasing pedestrian and bicycle networks, enhancing transit service, and promoting different parking strategies. Currently, there are 24 existing public spaces in the planning area with varying types of amenities that lack connectivity. The policies in the plan align with the Public Spaces Master Plan, which focuses on expanding the network of public spaces. Through privately owned public spaces, the plan can achieve an additional 28 public spaces in the core area, some of which are proposed near historic and cultural resources whose stories could be highlighted through public art, signage, and other interpretive methods.

Concerning stormwater management, about 70 percent of the core area is pervious and located along the top of 13 watersheds that cause flooding to downstream neighborhoods. The plan recommends detention and overland relief for specific locations to detain water, provide a safe path for that water to flow, and minimize the impact to the downstream communities. The core area tree canopy has a coverage of 21 percent where the county average is 40 percent. The plan recommends increasing the tree canopy through private development and at public facilities and schools. The plan's goals will require a greater reliance on public funds and fewer strategic public/private projects to achieve the desired improvements to meet many of the Countywide priorities. The study proactively plans for this change in coordination with other County policies and plans to better control the outcome and meet the goals of the County and its community's aspirations.

Next, Ms. Farris described the project's cultural resources approach:

During the planning process, County staff and the community established goals for the historic and cultural resources in the core study area, such as maintaining a unique sense of place and increasing awareness of the corridor's rich history. This was broken down into eight goals. The first goal focuses on finding balance between Countywide goals and those developed for Langston Boulevard. Goals 2, 6, and 8 focus on educating the public about the historic and cultural resources in the core study area. Goals 3 and 4 focus on encouraging and/or achieving full preservation, partial preservation, and/or interpretation of significant historic and cultural resources to retain visible reminders of Arlington's cultural and architectural heritage as the corridor experiences changes. This could be done via specific implementation strategies including Transfer of Development Rights, commercial renovation or improvement assistance, bonus density, and historic easements that protect the exterior. And then lastly, Goal 5 focuses on achieving Committed Affordable [Housing] Units (CAFs) with full preservation and/or partial preservation of existing multifamily housing identified in the plan as historic and cultural resources.

Throughout the planning process, the HPP staff, Planning staff, and the County's consultant identified and surveyed approximately 120 historic and cultural resources in the corridor. From this body of information, the County made a determination that 42 properties were significant and should receive preservation strategies in the plan. This required the HPP staff to establish a methodology and criteria to determine which of the 42 properties should get full building preservation, partial building preservation, on-site interpretation, nearby interpretation, and/or a combination of those treatments. However, that number was reduced further because ten properties were removed from consideration because they are located outside the core study area. An additional nine were removed because they are located in East Falls Church and Cherrydale which

have separate planning guidance. With the narrowing of the study area, the HPP staff determined a total of 23 preservation treatment recommendations.

The preservation treatment criteria considered the following:

- If a property was a LHD;
- If a property held a protective exterior easement;
- If a property was listed in the NRHP or determined eligible for the NRHP (based on the HPP’s research for Garden Apartments and Complexes);
- A property’s ranking in the County’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI);
- If a property represented a unique architectural style, building type, or time period of architecture;
- If a property had a majority of the seven aspects of integrity as defined by the National Park Service; and
- If a property conveyed a sense of place or was an informal landmark related to legacy businesses and/or African American history.

In Area 2, the plan recommends Mr. Moore’s Barber Shop to be fully preserved, and the Garden City Shopping Center, Calloway United Methodist Church, and the Judge Thomas Monroe Law Office for partial preservation. The remaining properties included either a form of site interpretation, nearby interpretation, or were not in the core study area.

In Area 3, the plan recommends the Vale Apartments to be fully preserved, and the Lee Heights Shops, Dominion Terrace condos, and the Wood-Lee Arms Apartments for partial preservation. The rest of the properties in this area, such as Lebanese Taverna (a legacy business) or the sites of Civil Rights sit-ins in the 1960s, are recommended for site or nearby interpretation.

Lastly, in Area 5 the plan recommends full preservation of the McClaine Court Apartments and the Lyon Village Apartments, as well as partial preservation for the Park Georgetown Apartments. The other properties in this area are recommended for site interpretation, such as the Lyon Village Shopping Center and Civil War sites Fort Bennett and Fort Strong.

Planning staff and the County’s Communications team has been working closely with the public about these recommendations for the historic and cultural resources. The public wanted to better understand what these preservation strategies mean. A few property owners have requested to be removed from the preservation recommendations, such as the Calloway United Methodist Church (recommended for partial preservation and site interpretation), the Lee Heights Shops (recommended for partial preservation), and the Lyon Village Apartments (recommended for full preservation).

County staff has responded to these concerns stating that although these are preservation strategies, many factors will need to be considered if a property is being proposed for redevelopment. Ms. Farris concluded by stating that preservation in Arlington County does not exist in a bubble and that the County has a responsibility to balance many of its goals when it involves redevelopment projects. She stated that the HPP staff will continue to work with the property owners that are being recommended for a specific preservation treatment, and that it is the goal of the HPP, especially with

recommendations identified in the draft updated Historic and Cultural Resources Plan (HCRP), to explore new tools that could support these preservation recommendations.

There was one public speaker for this item:

Mr. Zach Williams, land use attorney with Venable:

He commended the efforts of County staff on the PLB effort and moving forward with its adoption. He represented the property owners of the Lee Heights Shopping Center who disagree with the preservation recommendations for their property. Mr. Williams explained that the owners do not consider their property as architecturally significant and that they have the support of the Waverly Hills Civic Association, whose neighborhood is adjacent to the property, in this viewpoint. They were seeking more flexibility for future redevelopment scenarios and were requesting that the plan remain nimble and able to adapt to the future market conditions. The property owners and the surrounding community recognize that the Lee Heights Shopping Center should remain as a central commercial activity node for the corridor, but they felt there were other tools proposed in the plan that could better accomplish this and that historic preservation was not the right approach.

Ms. Farris then highlighted a 2022 letter from Mr. Woodruff on behalf of the HALRB, to Planning staff about his concerns with the PLB study. In summary, Mr. Woodruff had concerns about the plan's impact on the Garden City Shopping Center and the Lee Heights Shopping Center, and about the proposed heights of 12-15 story redevelopment that could be allowed at the Lyon Village Shopping Center, ultimately affecting Maywood's Thrifton Park. Ms. Alfonso responded to Mr. Woodruff's letter stating that shadow studies were conducted and that the impacts to these historic resources would be minimal. Mr. Woodruff had suggested to the HALRB via email in advance of the September HALRB meeting that they consider requesting language within the plan to acknowledge the historic context of these two shopping centers and their vital significance to the corridor.

Ms. Myer asked how strong the preservation treatment recommendations were and if they were like the preservation treatments in the [Columbia Pike] Form Based Code. Ms. Farris explained that the preservation treatments set the stage for when a future redevelopment project is proposed, and depending on other County goals for a particular project, it will be determined if the preservation treatment recommendation is appropriate or if it needs to be adjusted. When it comes down to process, Ms. Farris reiterated that the HALRB will be part of the site plan review process.

Ms. Foster asked if the significance of the historic commercial properties in the corridor was only in their value towards commerce for the community or their architectural value. Ms. Farris replied that it depended on the property's history and noted how the plan is trying to allow flexibility to consider all of this. Ms. Farris used the Garden City Shopping Center as an example since the preservation recommendation is partial preservation -- if a redevelopment project is proposed for this property, it is more likely that the HPP staff will try and work towards façade preservation. However, while exploring these options, she said finding ways to retain the local businesses to keep their legacy at that project site also should be considered. Ms. Farris also stated that it is during the site plan review process when the historic context of those historic properties would be highlighted, but she also mentioned that the first phase of PLB did include the history of these properties. Ms. Foster appreciated the plan's flexibility but also recognized that developers and the County Board could interpret the preservation recommendations as ironclad. She thought it would be helpful to articulate what is valued in each historic property, such as the story or the architecture. Ms. Farris clarified that the properties with preservation recommendations are all significant and that it would be determined during the site plan review process, in collaboration with the community, what level of preservation priority is most appropriate.

Mr. Davis asked how the plan would work with other County preservation policies. Ms. Farris replied that they are meant to work together. She believed that the approach the HPP staff developed for PLB is how it could be done in future efforts to allow for more predictability across County plans. Mr. Davis appreciated the logic to the criteria and the methodology. Ms. Farris mentioned that it would be appropriate for the HALRB to provide a letter to the County Board concerning the PLB study. Ms. Myer thought that the recommendations were well thought out, encouraged the HPP to stick to those recommendations, and continue to inform the property owners that the County values their contribution to Arlington's history. Ms. Farris stated she would keep the HALRB informed if any changes are being reconsidered for the preservation recommendations.

### **UPDATED HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES PLAN: RECOMMENDED DRAFT**

Ms. Liccese-Torres presented the HALRB with a brief overview of the HPP's planning process to date, highlighted the main changes made to the Plan since the initial draft was released in April, and asked for the HALRB's formal support of the Recommended Draft HCRP. She reminded the Board that back in April 2023, the HPP staff and their consultant Jackie Barton [of Birch Wood Planning] presented the initial draft of the HCRP (formerly known as the Historic Preservation Master Plan [HPMP]) to the HALRB. Since then, she said staff completed a robust public engagement period and analyzed both public and internal feedback on that draft. She said revisions to the draft Plan have been made and an updated version called the "Recommended Draft" was released in mid-August 2023.

She reminded the HALRB that the original plan, which is an element of the County's Comprehensive Plan, was approved by the County Board in December 2006. The planning process underway marks the first update to that original plan. She thanked the HPP team for their help, as the undertaking has been a big lift for the staff, but also a very important project that will provide exciting new direction for the program for the next ten years.

Ms. Liccese-Torres continued with her overview of the Plan:

The planning process for this update has been ongoing since Spring 2020 and major milestones completed each year were explained, including a range of public engagement efforts and a considerable amount of time last year to address initial input from interdepartmental staff and County leadership. The HPP released an initial draft of the Plan for public review and comment in mid-April 2023 while staff concurrently led a public engagement period to seek feedback on the draft. From April to June, the HPP hosted a community open house and a series of 15 pop-up events Countywide, had an online feedback form, did a social media campaign, developed a digital story map highlighting the main goals proposed in the draft, and distributed yard signs around the County. The HPP produced a new cultural heritage video about Mr. Moore's Barber Shop, an African-American owned legacy business located on Langston Boulevard, and re-released the 2021 video on Freddie's Beach Bar and Restaurant, a LGBTQ+ and straight-friendly bar in Crystal City.

After tonight's public hearing with the HALRB, the HPP will remain on track to bring the RTA forward to both the Planning Commission and County Board in October, followed by consideration for adoption of the updated Plan in November. A separate Implementation Framework document is also in progress detailing the ongoing, short-, mid-, and long-term priorities for carrying out the HCRP, as well as identifying resource needs and potential partnerships with other County agencies and collaborators. Full implementation of the HCRP will require both a phased approach

and additional County resources. The Implementation Framework will be finalized with County leadership leading up to and following Plan adoption.

These are the five focus areas in the draft Plan:

- Building an inclusive understanding and support for history, people, and places through Community Engagement;
- Encouraging financial and other benefits of preservation through Incentives;
- Integrating historic preservation with other County policies/priorities and addressing the importance of cultural landscapes through expanding our Partnerships;
- Improving regulation processes, creating new tools, preserving new types of resources, and establishing an Archaeology Program; and
- Expanding and improving both the HRI and other preservation-based technology and information systems.

The forward-thinking goals and action items in the Plan will allow the HPP to advocate for more meaningful preservation through increasing partnerships and offering more flexibility and incentives into its standard preservation tool kit. The HPP is proud that the Plan provides recommendations to preserve and interpret an inclusive collection of histories and resources for future generations, and developed Equity Aspirations for each goal in the Plan to describe how these achievements could advance inclusion, diversity, equity, and/or accessibility.

Between April and June 2023, the HPP requested community input on the initial draft of the Plan and spent the Spring and Summer analyzing that feedback and making minor revisions to the draft accordingly. These changes are reflected in the Recommended Draft that was released in mid-August, such as adding locations of historic resources and neighborhood reference points, which was a suggestion from the Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission. Staff also strengthened the connection between the historic built environment and the natural environment by adding several references to the County’s Biophilic initiatives.

Several clarifications were made throughout the Plan including:

- Providing additional context to certain sections of the Statement of Historical and Cultural Significance;
- Recognizing County transportation projects as a partnership opportunity;
- Explaining the size of proposed Neighborhood Heritage Districts in the Regulation goal;
- Updating select section titles in the Plan to be more specific;
- Clarifying the use of the term “character” throughout the Plan; and
- Adding a disclaimer statement in the full HRI table towards the back of the Plan that states the table contains the raw, current data as originally approved by the County Board in 2011.

One suggestion was made to add more maps and historic content into the Plan that the HPP opted not to do because it would have resulted in too much detailed information in a document that is intended to be visionary and aspirational. The icon used in the Historic Preservation segment of the Comprehensive Plan’s color wheel was updated

as well to better reflect the broader breadth of the Program’s work, such as architecture, historic interpretation, and archaeology.

The plan proposes to increase internal partnerships, update the HRI, and improve the local designation process, all of which were related to the comments made by the HALRB during its April work session.

Ms. Liccese-Torres closed by reminding the HALRB to review the Recommended Draft and consider filling out an online comment form, which closes on October 1, and to share the Draft with their colleagues, neighbors, and others interested in history and preservation. She requested that HALRB representatives attend the Planning Commission and County Board meetings this Fall. Lastly, she requested that the HALRB make a formal motion in support of the recommended draft as well as submitting an official letter that could then be submitted as part of the HPP’s County Board report package that both the Planning Commission and the County Board will review.

Ms. Myers stated she supported the recommended incentives in the Plan, including financial and zoning incentives. She was encouraged about the mention of pursuing demolition review at the state level because that would be a big next step for preservation in the County. Mr. Aiken aligned himself with everyone’s comments about the Plan and the level of effort completed by the HPP staff. Mr. Davis asked for more detail concerning the updates related to biophilia; Ms. Liccese-Torres replied these references were added in the Plan’s introduction and there are highlights throughout the document referencing the connection between the County’s built environment and green spaces and how they complement one another.

Mr. Davis asked about the remaining process schedule, and Ms. Liccese-Torres talked about the upcoming meeting schedules for both the Planning Commission and the County Board in October and November. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that staff would let the HALRB know when those dates were confirmed to allow commissioners to attend. The Chair asked for any final comments. Upon hearing none, he made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB recommend approval of the updated Historic and Cultural Resources Plan: Recommended Draft as submitted.

Ms. Meyer seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 6-0.

## **REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF**

### **Chair’s Report**

The Chair reminded the commissioners to consider attending the upcoming public meetings for the HCRP to express support, and to reach out to neighbors and community members to encourage them to review the plan and comment or express support.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:08 pm.