



**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND
LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, May 21, 2025, 6:30 PM**

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kaydee Myers, Chair
Alex Foster, Vice Chair
Nathan Burlingame
Omari Davis
Nan Dreher
Robert Dudka
Andrew Fackler
Gray Handley
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Rebecca Meyer
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Carmela Hamm
Dick Woodruff

STAFF PRESENT: Lorin Farris, Acting Historic Preservation Section Supervisor
John McNair, Historic Preservation Specialist

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Chair Kaydee Myers called the meeting to order and asked Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff to please call the roll. Ms. Farris called the roll and determined that there was a quorum. Mr. Turnbull arrived at 6:36 PM after roll had been called.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

The Chair explained the in-person and electronic Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures. Ms. Myers described the logistics of participating virtually in the hybrid meeting via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number. She then introduced Mr. Nathan Burlingame to the full HALRB, who was attending his first meeting as a member. Mr. Burlingame explained that he has lived in Arlington since 2003, that he and his wife had lived in the Woodlawn neighborhood since 2008, and that his son attended Glebe Elementary School. He further explained that he holds degrees in archaeology and anthropology, and that he is an estate investor through Johnson Associates, whose portfolio includes Wakefield Manor and Courthouse Manor. He then expressed his hope to provide the HALRB with the perspective of a property owner and operator of historic properties.

APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 2025 MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for any comments on the draft April 16, 2025, meeting minutes. Ms. Myers made a motion to approve the minutes; Mr. Davis seconded the motion. Ms. Myers asked HPP staff to call the roll. Ms. Farris called the roll, and the motion passed 8-0 with Mr. Burlingame, Ms. Foster, Mr. Handley, Ms. Lawrence and Ms. Meyer abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

Consent Agenda

The Chair asked if there were any questions about the one item on the consent agenda. Mr. Laporte responded that he did have a question and requested that the item be taken off the consent agenda and added to the discussion agenda. The item was then put before the full HALRB.

CoA Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 25-04, 301 N. Glebe Road, Buckingham Historic District

Mr. Laporte said that one of the drawings in the original application showed that the proposed sign was higher than the existing signs in the shopping center, adding that it was his understanding that all signs were required to be at the same height. HPP staff displayed the image for discussion. Mr. Laporte also referred to a difference in depth between the proposed sign and existing sign, but acknowledged that the staff report had said that the difference would not be noticeable, and that he did not have an issue with the proposed depth.

Ms. Farris said that she thought the image reflected the size of the sign that was currently in place. Mr. Handley responded that it was not, and that the current sign, read “Boost Mobile,” with a section painted over. A photograph of the current sign was then displayed for clarity. Mr. Laporte stated that the current sign appeared to be the correct size. Mr. Dudka asked if HPP staff knew the height of the existing sign, and Mr. Handley questioned if the perceived height discrepancy was the result of a shadow.

Ms. Farris then addressed Ms. Anne Paulus, the project applicant, who was attending virtually, to ask if she could answer the HALRB’s questions. Ms. Paulus responded that she was on the phone with the designer, who then confirmed through Ms. Paulus audio that the sign would be the same size as all the others, based on guidelines that had been provided by the landlord. Mr. Laporte asked if it would be possible for HPP staff to verify that information, and Ms. Farris agreed that they could. She also asked that the applicant update the renderings to reflect the correct dimensions. Mr. Laporte reiterated the need for accurate dimensions, as differences between the signs would be very noticeable in person.

Mr. Dudka proposed that the motion be conditional upon the sign being the same height as the others, that the renderings be revised, and that the project come back to the HALRB if HPP staff determine that the discrepancies were anything other than a graphic problem. Ms. Paulus agreed to revise the renderings and asked where to send them. Ms. Farris answered that Ms. Paulus could send the renderings directly to her and reiterated that the motion would cover that condition. She added that the project would need to come back if HPP staff found that the sign’s placement and dimensions did not adhere to the guidelines, and Ms. Paulus confirmed that the project would follow the guidelines provided by the landlord. Ms. Myers then made the following motion:

“I move that we approve COA25-04 at 301 North Road in the Buckingham Historic District contingent upon staff confirming that the sign is the same size as the other existing signage and that the graphic is updated to show the same.”

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. Prior to the vote, Mr. Handley stated that he was glad to see this project come forward, as the previous signage had been in disrepair for a long time, and that he was not sure if all the signs that are supposed to follow the guidelines were currently in compliance, which could allow a new tenant to not follow the rule. Ms. Farris then called the roll. The motion passed 13-0.

CoA Discussion Agenda Item #2: CoA 25-02, 4102 N. Glebe Road, Walker Chapel and Cemetery Historic District

Ms. Farris called on Mr. Larry Danforth, the project applicant. She then stated that she would present the staff report on Mr. Danforth's project, that he would also be allowed to address the HALRB, and that the Design Review Committee (DRC) would also provide a summary. Ms. Farris then read the following staff report into the record:

Walker Chapel and Cemetery was designated a local historic district on October 3rd, 1978. Its congregation is the third oldest in Arlington County. The original church building was demolished between 1936 and 1952. The current chapel was constructed in 1962. Most recently the HALRB approved several CoA projects for the cemetery and two CoA projects for the chapel. CoA 22-09 was for a replacement of the defunct air handler and CoA 22-7 for the removal of the defunct fire escape off the rear of the building and infilling the opening with a cellular PVE sheet.

The applicant is proposing to make exterior modifications to the chapel as part of the congregation's efforts to restore and conduct maintenance to the building this year. First, the applicant is proposing to replace any rotten portions in the chapel soffit and fascia with PVC, and the applicant plans to preserve all wood surfaces, including trim, as they are able, but is requesting to replace what they might not be able to salvage with wood, and instead have it with PVC. PVC would match the existing wood and design and dimension. The second aspect the applicant is proposing to restore the wood exit door on the north elevation along with its existing wood transom window above the doorway.

The DRC considered this application at its May meeting. The submission reviewed by the DRC originally proposed to replace any rotten portions of the chapel's trim, soffit, fascia, portico, gable and steeple with PVC trim and replacing a woodfire exit door along the north elevation with a steel door that would match the existing six panel design, and it would be painted. The commissioners asked if there had been a survey conducted at the building to determine how much of the trim would need to be replaced. Mr. Danforth stated that this would occur this summer, but that he would be surprised if it was more than 5% of the existing. Some of the DRC commissioners felt that the use of PVC everywhere was appropriate to avoid having to complete the work again in the future, whereas others felt the use of PVC was only appropriate in areas with high exposure to moisture. All commissioners expressed a preference for the use of a wood door instead of the proposed door for the side exit but understood why the proposed change was requested. The DRC felt it was important to discuss the project with full HALRB and placed it onto the discussion agenda. Since the DRC meeting, the applicant has amended the project. The applicant has agreed to use wood in the character defining areas of the chapel such as the steeple and the portico area and to use PVC only in high moisture areas where there is existing deterioration or mold, such as the chapel, soffit, and fascia, and they are planning to preserve all wood surfaces, including any trim. However, they are requesting the ability to replace what they cannot salvage with PVC rather than wood. PVC would match the existing wood, design and dimension, and the applicant is proposing to restore the wood fire exit door on the north elevation, along with its wood transom window above the doorway instead of replacing it with a steel door.

Staff recommend approval of the subject application. Since the LHD was designated in 1978 before design guidelines were individually developed, we are following the Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation, and we are using that as our guide for design review. The restoration project of the exterior steeple, portico, gable and exterior soffits would repair deteriorated wood where possible, which complies with standard number six of the Secretary of Interior standards.

The proposal includes the removal of areas where wood has deteriorated beyond repair and calls for the replacement of those sections with a modern material. Although the design and other visual qualities of the wood match the existing wood, it would be a different material. Given that the steeple, portico and gable are character-defining features of the church, staff would prefer that the deteriorated sections in need of replacement be replaced with wood to comply completely with standard number six. However, staff feel that the use of PVC in areas prone to rot or where there is high exposure to moisture, such as the areas near or underneath the gutters, is appropriate for the long-term maintenance of the property. These areas are not distinctive features of the building, and therefore, according to standard six, have less of a requirement for their complete match to the existing materials. Additionally, staff supports the amended application to restore the wood door because this would retain historic material and would be more appropriate for the historic property.

Ms. Farris then called on Mr. Danforth to speak. Mr. Danforth directed the HALRB's attention to one of the photographs of the church in the staff presentation, which showed a missing plank beneath the gutter. He then produced the plank to show the HALRB, as an example of the church's current condition. He went on to explain that the project would last approximately four to six weeks, and that he hoped to bring in the contractor to begin scraping the building and molding with a sand pressure wash to get it down to a bare state. He believed that the contractor would encounter pieces that were rotted, especially where downspouts joined with gutters in the corners where two metered pieces meet. He then referred to a recent successful restoration of another side door, which was twelve feet tall and eighty-four inches wide, as the motivation to accept the recommendation of the DRC on the second door, along with the current price of steel. He expressed his desire that both the contractor and the historic preservation planner agree on each area that needed to be restored or replaced. He also said that he suspected that because the wood was not painted on the inside of the board, that gutter spill over the previous sixty-five years may have caused rot in some areas. He was hopeful that most of the PVC replacement would be for flat boards, rather than trim, but that the church possessed considerable documentation of all the trim and molding in the building to make it easier to manufacture replacements. He concluded by saying that any PVC replacement would need to be approved by the Historic Preservation Planner.

Ms. Myers asked for clarification that the side door was now going to be repaired. Mr. Danforth responded that the door was no longer part of the project and would be restored soon. Ms. Farris clarified that she had left the door proposal in the staff presentation because it had been part of the publicly advertised proposal. Ms. Myers then asked if the DRC had anything to add. Mr. Dudka answered that he believed Ms. Farris' presentation accurately represented the DRC's opinion. He also said that the main issue had been that there were no design guidelines for this LHD, and while the Secretary of Interior standards did not typically allow PVC, the HALRB had made similar approvals in other LHDs, such as Maywood, in areas that are prone to moisture and are not easily touchable or visible. He further stated that since the door was now being repaired, that he believed that applicant's changes had adequately addressed the concerns of the DRC.

Mr. Laporte noted that the LHD designation for the site focused largely on the congregation, and that the church itself would only have been sixteen years old at the time of designation. He asked if the church was then considered a contributing structure to the LHD. Ms. Farris answered that the church still contributed to the LHD, even though it did not originally meet the fifty-year standard. Mr. Laporte stated that he liked the proposal before the HALRB and believed they could also be lenient on the application, given the building's relative age to the LHD made it different to contributing structures within other LHDs. Ms. Farris then said that the lack of design guidelines meant that they had to default to the Secretary of Interior standards to manage the property but added that design guidelines could still be created in the future.

Mr. Handley complimented the applicant for their continued partnership with the HALRB, and that he found the management and maintenance of the site to be an ideal example of how a property owner and the HALRB could work together. He added that as the building was now sixty years old, they would be glad it still reflected the way it was originally built. Mr. Danforth agreed with Mr. Handley's statement, saying that he had formerly been administratively responsible for historic preservation during the Carter administration, and that it was an honor to work with the HALRB. He also said that the church maintained the hand-drawn architectural drawings of the church.

Ms. Nan Dreher said that she believed the plan was very sensible and reiterated the need for the PVC to be a seamless match to the wood. Mr. Danforth responded that the PVC would need to be adjusted because the measurements were not the same as wood, and that they intended to prime and paint everything so it would look the same. He clarified that they would use Sherwin Williams Emerald paint with rain protection and Lexon primer on the brick, which he felt was necessary for the building's concrete bricks.

Ms. Myers made the following motion:

“I move that the HALRB approve CoA 25-02 for 4102 North Glebe Road, Walker Chapel and Cemetery Historic District, based on the revisions to the CoA suggested by the staff at DRC.”

Mr. Turnbull seconded the motion. Ms. Farris then called the roll. The motion passed 13-0.

CoA Discussion Agenda Item #3: CoA 25-03, 2332 N. Fillmore Street, Maywood Historic District

Ms. Myers asked HPP staff to present the staff report. Ms. Farris then read the following report into the record:

The colonial revival house at 2332 North Fillmore Street, Maywood Local Historic District, was constructed in 1950 and is a non-contributing house to the district. Over the past few years, the HALRB has approved several changes to the property. In December 2010, the HALRB approved CoA 10-28 for the construction of a second story addition and rear addition. The work included raising the existing side gable roof by four feet, constructing a new shed roof over the entryway, freezing the existing chimney by two feet and building a patio with a blue retaining wall. No changes were made to the existing garage as part of this project. In June 2011 the HALRB approved CoA 11-25 for the installation of a new metal handrail, a front stoop and the replacement of wooden signing in the front dormers with Hardy Plank. In September 2017 the HALRB approved COA 17-21 for the replacement of two metal basement awning windows with two light wood awning windows on the front elevation of the house. And then, in February of 2018, the HALRB approved CoA 18-02 for the installation of a metal railing on the north side of the concrete stair leading from the sidewalk to the front yard.

The applicant is proposing to replace the existing wood garage door with a steel garage door. The attached garage is below grade and located along the south elevation. The replacement door would measure eight feet in width and seven feet in height and feature a panel design with four lights across the top. The applicant is also proposing to replace the existing garage side entrance door, which is wood, with a steel door. The new door would be half-glazed, measuring 30 inches in width and 80 inches in height, and feature two panels at the bottom with nine lights at the top.

The DRC considered this application at its May meeting. There was some discussion about whether the doors could be restored rather than replaced. The applicant explained that the side door was warped and could not close properly and that the garage door was largely inoperable

due to the age of the internal mechanism. Mr. Wenchel said he did not believe that non-contributing houses should be held in the same standards as contributing buildings and felt that it was appropriate for the garage door and side door to be replaced with steel doors. Mr. Dudka offered that he felt the door should be made wood, but that someone could likely fix the existing doors. Mr. Davis mentioned that there have been other instances in Maywood where the HALRB has approved the use of modern materials for door replacements due to unfavorable conditions for wood materials, such as high moisture areas. He said he did not believe this condition was met with this situation, based on what was presented, and expressed a preference for wood doors. The commissioners believed that the full HALRB should discuss the project. As such, they placed the application on the discussion agenda for the May HALRB meeting.

Staff recommend denial of the subject application, as presented. Staff prefer that both doors be replaced with wood doors of similar designs to the existing doors. While the house has non-contributing status in the Maywood Local Historic District, the Maywood design guidelines apply the same standards to both contributing and non-contributing houses in Maywood. Maywood design guidelines do not state that wood doors are required in the district and only notes that the repair or replacement of external doors with different materials and/or a different design requires a Certificate of Appropriateness, and that there are many door types that are made up of variations of wood panels and glass panes. However, the use of wood doors is the predominant norm in Maywood and doors comprised of more modern materials have been limited to specific circumstances where the conditions of the area are not favorable for wood materials. Although Appendix G, Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness, in the Maywood design guidelines addresses detached garages and not attached garages, such as the garage in the subject application. It should be noted that garages with wood doors and wood side doors are considered appropriate and can be approved by HPP staff administratively. It is possible that the garage door and side door was original, although no concrete evidence was uncovered to definitively prove this. The house has experienced several additions and material changes; however, the attached garage is a prominent feature of the house and both doors are visible from the public right of way. HPP staff believe that additional evidence would need to be submitted to justify the use of modern materials, due to the presence of unfavorable conditions and the likelihood of the door at both locations failing due to conditions. A majority of attached garages in Maywood have wood garage and side doors, as do a majority of detached garages. One example of an attached garage with a non-wood door was found at 2206 North Nelson Street, and although this is one example that exists, it is not ignored in conformity.

Staff would prefer the use of wood for both the garage door and the side door. Proposed designs of both doors are appropriate for the district and are close matches to the existing. Specifically, the design of the garage door matches the designs noted on page G-34 of the Maywood design guidelines. However, staff do not find under the presented circumstances that the proposed material for the doors is appropriate.

Ms. Myers then called on Ms. Aruna Viswanatha, the project applicant. Ms. Viswanatha introduced herself and explained that she had gone to Home Depot to find a solution for the garage door and was informed that Home Depot did not have any wood replacements. She further said that she did not know where to find replacements that could meet the DRC and staff recommendations, and so she was requesting to replace them with the proposed material.

Mr. Dudka asked HPP staff to remind the HALRB when the house was built. Ms. Farris answered that the house was constructed in 1950. Mr. Dudka then said that he believed the staff report accurately characterized the DRC discussion. He added that he noticed that the hardware on the garage door was the same as the hardware on his parents' house, which was built in 1959. From that, he concluded that the

garage door was either original or an early replacement. He also added that he felt the side door also looked to be original. He mentioned that Mr. Wenchel had been fine with steel door replacement at the DRC meeting, but the rest of the DRC believed that the design guidelines and lack of extenuating circumstances meant that they preferred the use of wood. He referred to the previous CoA application as an example of what a painter or carpenter can do for repairs.

Mr. Wenchel said that he agreed with Mr. Dudka's statement, and that he had worked and spoken with some of the people that wrote the original guidelines, and he felt their intent differed from the Secretary of the Interior standards. He felt that the distinction between non-contributing and contributing structures held that more modern materials could be appropriate in non-contributing structures. He also said that he agreed with Mr. Dudka's comment that the existing doors could be repaired, but that the garage door mechanism would be harder to replace. He added that more discretion could be given relative to non-contributing structures, that the applicant would need to have a replacement door fabricated, and that he felt steel doors would not be an intrusion.

Mr. Dudka said that the DRC wanted the application to be reviewed by the full HALRB in event that it became a precedent. He further said that if the HALRB allowed a steel door in this case, then future applicants may expect to be able to use steel doors, which may become an issue. He added that because this was a house from 1950, it would have been a contributing structure had the LHD been formed a few years later, and that it was appropriate to hold the structure to the guidelines.

Ms. Lawrence said that the house was located near another property that the HALRB had required to have a wood garage door for an attached garage, as well as porch lattice that enclosed it, and that the HALRB required it because it was the norm in Maywood. She also said that she did not see any reason to deviate from that position for this application. She agreed that old doors brought challenges, and that they might be more easily replaced through salvage sellers. She offered that this could keep the cost down and should be the right size, given that the applicant's door dimensions appeared to be standard. She then said that if the doors were not visible from the street or if there were moisture conditions, that the applicant would have a stronger case for steel doors, and that a restored wood door could be more economical due to the cost of steel. She affirmed that Home Depot would likely not perform these services, and asked HPP staff if they had a list of recommended contractors for this type of work. Ms. Farris answered that she did not, but she may be able to provide the names of contractors who had performed similar work in Maywood. She then clarified that the HALRB wasn't saying that the applicant had to keep the existing wood doors. She acknowledged that this could cause an extra expense, and while the HALRB did not need to take cost into consideration, the reality was that it could be a factor and that HPP staff could try to help the applicant find a workable solution. She also reiterated that there had been many instances in Maywood where the HALRB had required that visible garage and side doors be replaced with wood. Ms. Lawrence responded that she understood the difficulties of straightening a warped door and that she had no objection to replacing the door with wood, but that she did object to replacing it with steel.

Mr. Handley asked if HPP staff knew how the non-wood garage door was added to the contributing structure at Nelson Street. Ms. Farris answered that she could not find a CoA for the project, but that images from Google Street View showed that it was likely been added between 2012 and 2019 as part of a new addition, which could explain how it was approved. Ms. Lawrence asked if this was the property that faced 22nd Street with a side garage, and Ms. Farris answered that the garage faced forward to Nelson Street. Ms. Lawrence then said that this house had been looked at for remodeling and asked for confirmation that the house was contributing. Ms. Farris responded that it was a contributing structure. Mr. Laporte asked if it was possible that the door was not approved, and Ms. Farris answered that this was possible. Mr. Handley said that he found this helpful, since the design for this door was like the design in the applicant's proposal. Mr. Dudka added that enough members had been on the HALRB at the

time in question that they would remember if a CoA had been approved for this project. Ms. Farris said that the HPP inspector would investigate the project.

Mr. Handley said that he felt the owner expressed that she was content to use wood. He asked if Ms. Viswanatha wished to comment. Ms. Viswanatha stated that she wanted to find a cost-effective way to make the garage door operable, and that the internal mechanism complicated the project. She acknowledged that it might be the original garage, given its current state. She added that she has children at the property, and that she could not find a wood replacement that would work. Ms. Myer responded that she had a strong preference for a wood replacement, which conformed to the Maywood standards. She added that she had done a quick web search during the meeting, and that wood options were available. She encouraged the applicant to continue looking for cost-effective alternatives and reiterated that Home Depot would likely not provide the service. Ms. Foster added that she had also performed a web search and found several carpenters that specialized in repairing wood garage doors in Arlington. Ms. Farris then said that HPP staff could try to assist in providing more information to the applicant, but that they could not make an official recommendation. She also recommended asking neighbors if they have hired anyone for similar work. Ms. Viswanatha referred to a neighbor who accidentally installed vinyl windows and needed to get a retroactive approval, saying that it showed wood was not always required for approval. Ms. Farris responded that she would need to know more about the referenced property to comment, but that different standards applied to windows than side and garage doors.

Ms. Myers made the following motion:

“I move that the HALRB deny CoA 25-03 for 2332 North Fillmore Street in the Maywood Historic District because it does not contemplate using like-kind materials, as required by the Maywood historic district guidelines.”

Ms. Meyer seconded the motion. Ms. Farris clarified that as this was a motion to deny, a vote of “yes” would be needed to vote for denial. Ms. Farris then called the roll. The motion passed 12-0, with Mr. Burlingame abstaining. Ms. Farris reiterated that approval of the motion meant that the application had been denied, and that she would contact Ms. Viswanatha the next day to provide more guidance.

SITE PLAN: INN OF ROSSLYN/1601 FAIRFAX DRIVE

Ms. Farris explained that the Inn of Rosslyn Site Plan project was before the HALRB because the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) ranked the building in the top third of the “Important” category as it was a commercial building with historical and/or architectural significance. She explained that the HRI ranked 394 historic resources throughout Arlington across six ranking categories. She clarified that 134 properties were classified as “Important,” making it the largest category, and that the County had asked for a scoring system to be used with each category. Properties within the top third were found to be very close to receiving the “Essential” designation. Because Essential and top third Important properties are characterized by a high level of architectural integrity or historical significance, building projects that include redevelopment are required to be reviewed by the HALRB.

Ms. Dreher asked for clarification that the buildings listed in the HRI were not all Local Historic Districts. Ms. Farris answered that they were not, and that the HRI was a way to manage the larger portfolio of buildings in Arlington County to determine where it is appropriate to preserve properties and try to work with property owners to get protections or rehabilitation tax credits.

Ms. Farris then explained that the Inn of Rosslyn was originally known as Motel 50. It was constructed in 1940 and is considered one of the remaining mid-century modern buildings along Arlington Boulevard, which represents the commercial architecture that helped support the growing population in Arlington

County during and after World War II. She also said that the character-defining features were its two/three story height, horizontal massing, flat roof, u-shaped building form, exterior corridors and staircases with floating walls, two-story lobby with large glass panes, the geometric pattern on the railings and a large, cantilevered sign. Notable materials include brick, steel and flagstone.

Ms. Farris then asked the applicants to present the site plan project to the HALRB. Mr. Nicholas Cumings, attorney for the applicant, Monument Realty, introduced himself and the project team present. Mr. Cumings then provided an overview of the project. He first oriented the HALRB to the site's location to show the relative massing around the location. He explained that the proposal was to demolish the existing motel and construct an eight-story residential building with up to 142 units and about 127,000 square feet of residential first floor area. He also said that there was no retail proposed for the site, and none had been recommended. He added that the parking ratio was close to 0.45, but that the effective parking ratio after compact parking spaces was closer to about 0.6, and that parking supply was limited because of bedrock beneath the site that prevented excavation. He went on to say that the proposal included several on-site affordable units as required by the area plan, and that the proposal incorporated the County's Green Building Incentive program with such considerations as energy efficiency and bird friendly glass. He also said that they were open to increasing the number of affordable units.

Mr. Cumings then addressed the historic preservation implications of the project, saying that the area plan did not identify the Inn of Rosslyn for preservation, but acknowledged that the building was located on the HRI, and that inconsistencies across planning documents was common. However, he reaffirmed that the competing interests of the area plan did not take historic preservation of the site into consideration and required that the new building be made in the art deco or colonial revival style, and for it to mirror the garden apartment aesthetic. The current design attempts to reconcile these aspects of the area plan with the HRI's mandate to incorporate the design elements of the existing structure into the project. He added that they were also working on various biophilic design elements, including additional greenery and an open space, but that these changes should not influence the design of the building to echo the historic heritage of the property.

Ms. Jasna Bijelic, project architect introduced herself to the HALRB. She explained that the project began four years ago, and that the site presented challenges with its angular shape, small size, and high bedrock, as well as an exceptional location. She then referenced the Fort Myers North area plan, which had called for eight floors on the footprint in relationship with the adjacent site. She explained that because the original building was constructed 50 to 100 years ago, it maintained an architectural presence primarily through the large sign, pronounced storefront and zigzag railing as inspirations. She added that they had attempted to incorporate the exterior stairs into the design but were unable to do so. The design of the sign was replicated, and the floor plan was designed to follow the curb. The top five floors would be located on a concrete podium, following a L-shaped building layout that created a terrace for the residents and accommodated more neighborhood green space. The bedrock made underground parking unviable. She also said that the art deco style was referenced in the Fort Myer plan, as the art deco style remains present in Arlington, but that she still wished to include elements of the hotel without creating an inconsistent design. She explained that the previous design had an exterior one-story sign near the lobby, but that it could remain near the curb because of underground utilities and that it would block the front of several residential windows. She also highlighted the creation of a historic marker to provide the story of the building, placed at the location of the hotel sign, and the emphasis of the exposed brick that is recognized as a signature element. The lobby was also moved to accommodate the geometry of the layout, the surrounding stone wall was left intact near the entrance, and the railing was replicated. A new, smaller entrance sign would also be made proportional to the existing sign, which would be visible from the public right of way, with potential for additional neighborhood history to be displayed, while the lobby would replicate the storefront. She concluded that she believed the art deco

elements would conform to the historical character of the neighborhood and create a pleasant environment.

Ms. Bijelic then asked Ms. Farris if she wanted more detail. Ms. Farris responded that she could go into more detail about the project, if she wished, and added that the design conveyed art deco into modernism architecture, and that it had geometric elements. Ms. Bijelic highlighted the metal flag poles on the building as part of the art deco design, as well as metal medallions that replicate the design language along the canopy. Mr. Cumings added that the overhang at the front of the building was to mimic the original sign. This was done to create six or seven design elements from the historic building that could be incorporated while still following the area plan for the best possible design.

Ms. Lawrence stated that she did not see the art deco influence on the existing building and asked why the art deco style was needed for the new design. Mr. Cumings answered that this was required by the area plan. Ms. Lawrence said that she thought the area plan did not call for any specific building at the location in question. Mr. Cumings answered that the area plan called for redevelopment with an art deco-style building.

Ms. Foster said that she appreciated how the design blended the many competing influences and requirements, and that she liked the reference to the floating panels, the Route 50 sign and the spacing of the windows. She also said that she appreciated the need to integrate art deco elements, but that the current design appeared more like an applique than an integrated part of the building and referred to the banding and antenna as examples that detracted from the floating panels. She asked if the design could pull from the Route 50 building, such as the banister shapes to be incorporated into the art deco style. She further stated that she believed the geometry and layers of the style were not visible in the metal band, nor was the garden apartment influence. She then asked if the garden apartment elements would be integrated later. Mr. Cumings answered that the garden influence would be more apparent by a later meeting date. Ms. Foster then asked if any new consideration had been given to preserving any of the original building materials. Ms. Bijelic responded that they had not.

Mr. Davis asked if there was a way to keep or reincorporate the existing railing. Ms. Bijelic responded that she did not believe so, but that it was currently difficult to determine as the area was still fenced off and she could not determine how deteriorated it had become; however, she said that it could be possible to keep it on the ground as an additional historic exhibit. Ms. Meyer agreed that she liked the idea of reusing material, but also felt that reusing the railing would achieve little, given the limited quantity, and that using it as a design inspiration would be more beneficial. She also reiterated that she would not encourage reuse of the railing on the building, but that it could be used as a decorative ground element. Mr. Cumings added that the railing was likely structurally unsound and had the incorrect spacing for balcony railings under the building code, but that it was not uncommon for building projects like this to recover something during development that could be given to HPP staff or incorporated into a lobby display or historic marker language. Ms. Bijelic added that the addition of bronze coloring to the building, highlighted by LED lights, would also contribute to the overall art deco design. Ms. Meyer responded that she agreed with Ms. Foster that she liked the panel projected in front of the balconies.

Ms. Myers said that she was sad that the building was going to be demolished, and while she liked the explanation of the incorporated element, she felt that an attempt could be made to save the sign in some way. She also said that certain aspects of the project, such as the peach brick, appeared to have been stopped by the white floating elevation. She added that if the peach brick came all around, it would be reminiscent of the original building. She then said that she felt the current design did not capture the current site, and that a historic marker did not do enough to recognize the historic resource. Ms. Lawrence expressed agreement with Ms. Myers' statement.

Mr. Dudka said that he believed the Fort Meyer guidelines were incoherent, as they included a variety of different buildings with different styles, and that he felt it did not seem appropriate to put all of them on the same building. He also said that Arlington was not known for the art deco style, although he acknowledged that some art deco did exist in the county. He agreed that the elements tread like an applique, and that he felt it did not add anything to the building. He also said that he thought the massing of the building was nice and more in keeping with the mid-century modern style of the motel. He referred to the exposed balconies on the end, which he felt recalled a motel where the quarters are on the outside. He also agreed with Ms. Myers he did not like the idea of losing historic elements, only to install a marker that referred to the lost historic elements. He then referred to the Bob Peck dealership, which also had a mid-century geometric design that featured diamond-shaped plates. After the dealership's demolition, the new building incorporated the diamond shapes into its motif, which created a distinct design element within Ballston that recalled the previous building. He then asked if a sign element could be placed on the corner of the building that could incorporate the windows of the units behind it. Mr. Cumings asked if Mr. Dudka was asking to incorporate the existing sign. Mr. Dudka responded that he was asking if a proportional replica could be incorporated to invoke the existing sign. Ms. Bijelic said that building corner in question would have units which could not be blocked, and Mr. Dudka responded that he felt the unit windows could be incorporated into such a design, as well as the name of the building or the number "50." He then reaffirmed his appreciation of the building's massing and that he did not agree with the art deco style. Mr. Cumings said that the style was not chosen by the designers, and Mr. Dudka said that he understood, but hoped that they would challenge the guidelines. Mr. Cumings said that he appreciated the comments and felt that they could look at ways to recreate the massing or replicate the intent of the sign.

Ms. Lawrence added that the sign's distinct post and border could also be features to replicate, and Ms. Foster replied that aspects of the sign had already been applied through the exterior hanging white panels. She asked if the number "50" could be incorporated somewhere separate, such as the terrace. Ms. Bijelic said that this had been considered in earlier designs, but that it was not included because it was not incorporated into the name of the current project. Ms. Farris acknowledged that this was a common problem with similar projects, and that they would want to find a way to invoke the building's history without creating confusion. Mr. Cumings added that if the zoning administrator allowed them to place a sign that was larger than other existing signs, it may create different problems for the project.

Mr. Handley said that he thought since the county would be losing the last mid-century modern motel in Rosslyn, the applicants should try as hard as possible to build a mid-century building to reflect the style of Motel 50 that would disappear, rather than combine several competing styles. He said that he felt that they had a good idea with the hanging panels, but that the art deco would be in stylistic opposition. He agreed that the sign had been a defining feature of the original building, and that invoking the elements of it would be appropriate. He also referred to the success of the Peck dealership project and said that he felt the current project was trying to do too much. Mr. Cumings said that he understood the point, but that the art deco design was mandated by the area plan. Ms. Lawrence said that the HALRB would support a challenge from the applicant to the area plan, and Mr. Dudka said that while the art deco requirement had been included in the area plan as a nod to historic design, the HALRB believed that there was a better way to honor the building's history. Mr. Cumings said that he believed that some good points had been made, and that they could take another look at reintroducing some of the sign elements. Ms. Foster added that there could be other ways to interpret the art deco requirement that still nod to it and break down the scale and make it feel contextual. Ms. Bijelic said that she agreed with Ms. Foster's opinion of the style.

Ms. Dreher said that she agreed with the previous points about incorporating design elements from the sign, but also asked if the original sign could be saved and incorporated somewhere inside the building's interior, such as on a lobby wall. A brief discussion took place in which the size of the sign was estimated. Ms. Bijelic said that they would first need to determine if the amenity had clearance to install

something that size on an interior wall, due to the placement of the ceiling and garage wall. Ms. Farris said that she appreciated the discussion, as it highlighted the complexities of incorporating the HRI into other plans. She also credited Ms. Foster for her involvement as the HALRB representative to the SPRC meetings.

Mr. Burlingame said that he liked the incorporation elements from the existing hotel and the use of peach brick, and that the form of the brick on the existing building was distinctive from its depth and thin mortar lines. He suggested looking into incorporating it into the design. [*Ms. Dreher briefly left the meeting at 8:29 pm and returned at 8:33 pm*].

Ms. Myers explained that new HALRB procedure would require a vote on the site plan, but that the vote would be to “Support” or “Not Support,” and that the vote did not reflect an approval or denial of the project. She also said that she would be putting forward a vote to not support the project, and that the language would not reflect all individual comments. Ms. Farris said that the new policy was intended to have the full HALRB’s vote on record in instances where the HALRB’s opinions might be written by a single member. She added that there was still time for changes to be made to the project, and that HALRB support for the project could change as the applicant made changes before future SPRC meetings. Mr. Laporte clarified that the motion would specify that the HALRB did not support the project “at this time,” as there were aspects of the project that the HALRB did like. Ms. Lawrence asked when the site plan would go to the County Board, and Mr. Cumings responded that they were planning for September. Ms. Lawrence said that she had not seen it advertised, and Mr. Cumings said that the estimated date was based on conversations with senior staff but reiterated that there would still be time to incorporate potential changes to the project. Ms. Myers then made the following motion:

“I move that the HALRB not support the Inn of Rosslyn site plan as it is currently because the project did not follow the HRI goals and policy objectives properties, such as attempting to preserve the building's historical nature.”

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. Ms. Farris clarified that as this was a motion to not support, a vote of “yes” would be needed to vote to not support. Ms. Farris then called the roll. The motion passed 13-0.

CHAIR’S REPORT

Ms. Myers stated that Ms. Foster would serve as the HALRB representative for the comprehensive plan update. She also announced that County Board Member Julius D. “JD” Spain, Sr., would be attending the June HALRB meeting, as he was the HALRB’s County Board liaison. She said that she did not yet know if he would attend the full meeting and invited members to prepare questions in advance.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Farris introduced Mr. McNair, who provided an update on two recent HPP events in connection with HALRB-approved historic marker projects.

He explained that on Saturday, May 3rd, HPP staff hosted the “Remembering Little Saigon” event at Clarendon Central Park, in conjunction with other organizations. The event included a public display of the prints of the Little Saigon historic marker in English and Vietnamese, walking tours from local historian and primary marker author Kim O’Connell, and a public forum for community members to share memories of the neighborhood. Staff recorded approximately 200 unique interactions with visitors across all stations, and the marker prints were later used by the County Board during their formal proclamation for Asian American, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

Mr. McNair then explained that on Tuesday, May 13th, HPP staff had spoken at the Recessed County Board meeting as part of the proclamation for Queen City. The County Board formally recognized the Queen City neighborhood, as well as Arlington County's failure to preserve the neighborhood. Mr. William Vollin, former Queen City resident was in attendance of the proclamation. Ms. Farris and Mr. McNair presented about the history of Queen City and the historical marker process. The talking points developed by HPP staff were also incorporated by the County Board into the language of the proclamation, many of which came from the marker or the discussions that were had at the full HALRB meeting or with the Marker Subcommittee. The proclamation was well attended, and the vote for the proclamation by the County Board passed unanimously. Mr. McNair concluded by thanking the Marker Subcommittee and the full HALRB for their work on both markers. Ms. Farris said that an unveiling event was also in-progress for the Lilli Vincenz State Highway Marker.

Ms. Farris then gave an update on the Brennan House LHD designation. She said that the RTA for the designation was approved by the County Board on May 10, and that it would go to the Planning Commission of the County Board on June 2. She asked for a HALRB member to attend the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Handley congratulated Ms. Farris for her appointment as the new Historic Preservation Section Supervisor for Arlington County.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:42pm.