DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT
Neighborhood Services Division
Bozman Government Center 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201
TEL 703.228.3830 FAX 703.228.3834 www.arlingtonva.us

MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, July 16, 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
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence

VIRTUAL MEMBERS: Dick Woodruff, Personal, Santa Fe, NM.
Gray Handley, Personal, Emerald Isle, NC.

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Carmela Hamm
Rebecca Meyer
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel

COUNTY BOARD MEMBER PRESENT: Julius D. "J.D." Spain, Sr., HALRB County Board Liaison

STAFF PRESENT: Lorin Farris, Historic Preservation Section Supervisor
Mical Durak, Historic Preservation Associate Planner
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. Lorin Farris called the roll and determined that there was a quorum.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

The Chair explained the in-person and electronic Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures. Ms. Myers described the logistics of participating virtually in the hybrid meeting via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number. Before moving on to the next order of business, Ms. Myers welcomed County Board Member Mr. Julius D. "J. D." Spain, Sr. to the meeting. She shared that Mr. Spain is the HALRB's County Board liaison and that he was there that evening to meet with the HALRB.

APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 2025 MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for any comments on the draft June 18, 2025, meeting minutes. Ms. Joan Lawrence made a motion to approve the minutes; Ms. Nan Dreher seconded the motion. Ms. Myers asked HPP staff to call the roll. Ms. Farris called the roll, and the motion passed 10-0-1 with Mr. Robert Dudka abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

CoA Discussion Agenda #1: CoA 25-05, 2831 23rd Rd. N., Maywood Local Historic District

Ms. Myers asked HPP staff to present this item. Ms. Mical Durak provided the staff report as follows:

> The property at 2831 23rd Road North is a ca. 1925 bungalow that has undergone extensive alterations over time. *[Mr. Dick Woodruff turned off his camera but remained in the meeting at 6:40 pm].* It is not listed in the National Register District for Maywood; however, the house is located within the boundaries of the Maywood Local Historic District which is why it is subject to the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and review by the HALRB. This property is considered non-contributing to the district. In January 2022, the HALRB approved CoA 21-32 which allowed for the replacement of all existing vinyl windows with aluminum-clad wood windows. The project also included the replacement of all vinyl siding with fiber cement siding, the reduction in size of two windows on the façade, the conversion of an existing window opening into a doorway, and the infill of the front doorway and replacement of the opening with a window. A new front doorway was installed on the façade's setback. *[Mr. Woodruff turned his camera back on at 6:41 pm].*
>
> The applicant is currently proposing to relocate an existing window on the rear elevation. The window would be relocated 2 feet to the left (when facing the rear elevation) to accommodate the expansion of a bathroom in the interior. The applicant would not replace the window but would use the existing.
>
> The DRC did not review this project at their July meeting since that meeting did not occur. That is why this item is on the Discussion Agenda for tonight's meeting.
>
> HPP staff recommends approval of the subject application as submitted. This non-contributing house has been heavily altered and no longer resembles the original bungalow form as originally constructed nor resembles characteristics common during Maywood's period of significance. The relocation of an existing window over 2 feet from its original location would not be visible from the public right-of-way nor would the change be largely visually discerning. The HALRB has permitted fenestration pattern changes on the house previously and on other houses in the district. Finally, staff believe this modification would comply with Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Durak then scrolled through the submitted materials for the CoA application on the screen for the HALRB and concluded her staff report. Ms. Myers then invited the applicant to speak. *[Mr. Woodruff turned off his camera briefly and then turned it back on at 6:45 pm].*The applicant, who was attending virtually, thanked staff for their presentation and explained that they were proposing this change as part of their bathroom expansion project. Ms. Myers thanked the applicant for attending and then put the matter before the board. Mr. Dudka asked staff to go back to the image of the rear elevation of the house. He noted that since there were no elevations that he wanted clarification on which window was being relocated. The applicant explained that it was the top right window (in the photo) and that it would be moving two feet to the left.

Hearing no other questions or comments, Ms. Myers made the following motion:

> I move that the HALRB approve CoA 25-05 for the request to relocate a window on the rear elevation at 2831 23rd Rd. N. in the Maywood Local Historic District.

Mr. Gerry Laporte seconded the motion. The Chair asked staff to call the roll. Ms. Farris called the roll, and the motion passed 11-0. The applicant thanked staff and the HALRB for their time.

ADOPTION OF HALRB ELECTRONIC MEETING POLICY, 2025-2026

Ms. Myers invited staff to present information about the electronic meeting policy. Ms. Durak explained that the HALRB is required annually to re-adopt their electronic meeting policy. She reminded the commissioners that they had adopted this policy last December alongside their adoption of the updates to the HALRB By-laws, but she reiterated that they are two separate documents. She noted that no changes or updates were made to the electronic meeting policy by the state during their legislative session this year and that the language of the policy matched the language of the old one. Although the HALRB's existing electronic meeting policy would be in effect until December 2025, she explained that it was now highly recommended that the policy be readopted every year right after the end of the General Assembly's legislative session which ends in the summer. Ms. Durak reminded the HALRB that she had sent the policy to the HALRB last week via email and offered to answer any questions. Ms. Lawrence offered that since no changes had been made over the past year, that the existing policy seemed to be working. Ms. Durak said that the policy complies with the requirements of the state. Mr. Gray Handley asked for further clarification about the section in the policy that notes a member's virtual participation could be disapproved if the said virtual participation violated the policy. He wanted to understand what reasons there would be to disapprove someone attending a meeting virtually. Ms. Durak said she could not think of an example at that time but offered that she could get back to Mr. Handley with more information.

Hearing no other discussion, Ms. Myers made the following motion:

> I move that the HALRB adopt the Electronic Meeting Policy as presented, effective from today, July 16, 2025, until July 31, 2026.

Mr. Omari Davis seconded the motion. The Chair asked staff to call the roll. Ms. Farris called the roll, and the motion passed 11-0. Ms. Durak stated that she would update the existing policy with the new date, send the updated version to the HALRB, and post it on the website as well.

DISCUSSION WITH COUNTY BOARD MEMBER, JULIUS D. "J.D." SPAIN, SR.

Ms. Myers moved on to the next item on the agenda which was the HALRB discussion with Mr. Spain. Ms. Myers reintroduced Mr. Spain to the HALRB and shared that he was the commission's County Board liaison. She invited him to introduce himself before the discussion with the HALRB began.

Mr. Spain shared that he was one of five County Board members, that he had been a County Board member for six months, and that he had lived in Arlington for 16 years. He shared that he and his family had moved to Arlington after having lived in Europe for seven years. He noted some additional information about his family and his professional background. He said that, as a County Board member, he serves as the liaison to seven other commissions in addition to the HALRB. He shared some of his past experience with the HALRB and items he has worked on with them and noted that he felt it was important that history was incorporated in the work of the County. He offered that he was looking forward to having a discussion with the HALRB and to answering some of the questions they had submitted ahead of the meeting. He said that Arlington was a unique community, and that each

neighborhood had its own history and that as a County Board member, it was important that he listen to everyone. He thanked the HALRB commissioners for their service to the County. He asked the commissioners to each answer the following question: why did you join the HALRB? Each commissioner provided their answer which ranged from career focuses to personal interests. Mr. Spain mentioned that his home was located in a historic Black neighborhood in Arlington. He noted that historic Arlington did not look like the Arlington of today and that all communities change, but that it was important for communities to adapt but also capture their history so that it was not lost. He pondered how Arlington could respect its past but also continue to grow and innovate.

Before the discussion shifted to the questions, Ms. Myers noted they needed to see if there were any public speakers who had signed up. Hearing and seeing none, Ms. Myers closed the public testimony period for the agenda item.

Mr. Spain moved to answer the first question posed by the HALRB which was, "What aspects of Arlington's history does Mr. Spain consider particularly important to protect or preserve for future generations?" He shared that the history of historically marginalized communities in Arlington is important to recognize and that he wanted to listen to communities that had been in the County longer than him. He also noted that each community had their own unique history which was important to recognize. To answer it generally, he said that people and spaces were important to him. He asked if the HALRB knew what the name "Arlington" derived from. Mr. Laporte answered that Arlington was named after the Arlington plantation. Mr. Spain said that it was important for the HALRB to get out into the community and talk to people to learn about their local history to make the best decisions for those communities, which he felt was particularly important with regards to the historical perspective of marginalized communities in Arlington. He said he did not want Arlington to become a "Beverly Hills 90210" and have people priced out of their neighborhoods and that it was important to retain Arlington's history.

He then began to answer the second question which was, "How do you think the new Virginia law (HB 1395/Section 15.2-2306) on historic preservation will affect development in Arlington County?" He said that the law had already affected Arlington. He said it would cause some of the County's programs to be prolonged, but it would also ensure that the County pauses to consider the situation. He compared it to a checks-and-balance. He said he appreciated that about the law and felt that the County needed to ensure they were compliant with the law. He mentioned the Melwood Site Plan project as a specific example of where this law had affected a project. He said it was important to show that the County respects these designation requests and that the County does what it should to stay within the law. He moved to answer the second part of the question which was, "How would you facilitate efficient and effective HALRB engagement in the implementation of this legislation?" He shared that the HALRB's continual engagement on Site Plan Review Committees (SPRCs) and working in unison with County staff and with community stakeholders was critical. He said that the letters the HALRB sends to the County Board were important and considered by the County Board.

He asked if the HALRB had any follow up thoughts on these two particular questions related to the new Virginia law. He reiterated his desire to have a conversation with the commission and to listen to them. He said he learned that he was the first County Board member to come to an HALRB meeting in several years and that he wanted to establish a relationship with the HALRB. He noted that it was important to continue to communicate even if parties disagreed with each other. He said that the County, to answer the question more pointedly, was following the law that was recently established and there were systems in place to follow that law. Ms. Myers noted that the questions on the screen had been pre-submitted by members of the HALRB and invited the member of the board who submitted the questions to offer their thoughts or ask follow up questions should they want to do so. Mr. Handley offered that he could not remember if he submitted the questions or not but said the HALRB wanted to help the County Board

comply with the new Virginia law, specifically with regards to the Melwood project, and that they wanted to provide the County Board with a recommendation on the building's designation. He said that the limitation they faced in doing that in a timely fashion was inadequate staff support. He said that the HPP was extraordinarily talented and hard-working, but that the queue system utilized for LHD designations presents a challenge for projects that are time sensitive. He noted that staff was not able to expedite their review of the Melwood designation report. He asked if there was any way that the HALRB and the County Board could work together to address more quickly requests that come to the HALRB for historic designation. Mr. Spain offered to answer the first part of the question about staff needs. He said that effective communication was the key to success and that when certain issues come up, that it is often because there is not good communication. He said he understood that certain projects might feel rushed, but that the County needed to stick to the process. In the future when these challenges present themselves, he encouraged the HALRB to talk to HPP staff and the County Board. He reiterated the point about him being the first County Board member attending an HALRB meeting in several years and noted it as an example of a way that there has not been good communication between the HALRB and the County Board through staff. He said the HALRB has his commitment to work with them to mitigate some of the issues that have occurred in the past. He promised that the HPP staff were working hard and had not been derelict in their duties. Mr. Handley interjected to note that he was not criticizing past performance from the HPP staff, but that he was instead noting that the HALRB had sent a letter to the County Board sharing that there was a delay on the designation determination due to a shortage of resources. Mr. Spain asked for clarification on the lack of resources. Mr. Handley clarified that it had been discussed at one point during an HALRB meeting that it would have been beneficial for the HPP staff to have a short-term consultant to help with the LHD study queue and that that information was shared with the County Board in a letter. Ms. Myers offered that the HPP staff was supposed to have four staff members but that it currently only had three. Ms. Spain asked if there was a vacancy; Ms. Farris explained that there was a vacancy, but that staff were working towards filling that position and that once the team was fully staffed, she could begin to have conversations with County leadership about resources needed. Mr. Spain acknowledged the transition of the team and said that there was room to improve communication.

Mr. Woodruff thanked Mr. Spain for joining them and acknowledged that it had been several years since a County Board member attended a commission meeting. He wanted to bring it back to the topic of LHD designation. Speaking specifically about the Melwood project, he said that since the HALRB had decided that an LHD designation report needed to be created for Melwood that that essentially meant that the County Board could not approve any work or demolition to the site until that designation had been considered. He said that it could be said that the inadequate staff resources of the HPP has not allowed this study to occur which has held up the entire Melwood project. He said, from his perspective, that he was okay with the process being held up and said that the new law was ensuring that the property could not be demolished until the designation process was completed. He said it was the HALRB's understanding from staff that they were in close contact with other County staff in the permitting office to ensure that nothing was occurring to the Melwood site currently. He cited the Febrey-Lothrop property as an example where the HALRB had recommended LHD designation for the site, but it was demolished before it could be considered by the County Board. He said he wanted to provide that additional context to Mr. Spain and offered that he would like to hear his answer to the third question which was, "Does the County Board know the current status of the Melwood Site Plan project?"

Mr. Spain said he was prepared to answer that question and had asked staff prior to the meeting to provide him with some of that information. He said that the Melwood Site Plan study had been approved by the County Board in February 2025 but noted that all building and demolition permits were on hold until 30 days after the County Board makes a decision on the proposed LHD designation for the Nelly Custis School. The County has implemented measures to ensure no permits will be issued before the County Board's consideration of that designation. He said that HPP staff planned to study the Nelly Custis property from late 2025 into early 2026. They will present the HALRB with a designation report. If the

HALRB recommends approval of the LHD, then it will move forward in the process and go forward to the County Board for their final decision. If the HALRB does not recommend approval, then the LHD designation process would end. Mr. Woodruff thanked him for his answer.

Mr. Spain moved on to the fourth question which was, "Was the Green Valley community adequately involved in decision-making related to the new residential development recently approved for S. Glebe Road?" The second part of the question was, "should the HALRB be engaged when nearby land use changes or development could have an impact on a historic asset like Lomax AME Zion Church?" Mr. Spain asked who submitted that question. Ms. Farris offered that she believed Mr. Handley submitted it. *[Mr. Woodruff turned off his camera and then turned it back on at 7:22 pm].* Mr. Spain said the process for that project began right when he joined the County Board. He said Green Valley was an area that he frequented often; he said he'd like to think he knows the community well, even if he isn't a lifelong resident to the neighborhood. He said he felt that they were adequately involved in the project on S. Glebe Road. He noted that the civic association had a representative on the SPRC for the site plan project and that there was communication with the civic association. He said that even before the project was approved on April 9, 2025, by the County Board, the Board had received a lot of feedback from the community, specifically from Lomax AME Zion Church. He explained that one of the main issues with the project was related to transportation. *[Again, Mr. Woodruff turned off his camera and then turned it back on at 7:24 pm].* He said he felt that the County had worked hard to listen to and engage with people on this project. He noted that he was a supporter of affordable housing in Arlington and that that was needed in Green Valley. He reiterated that no one was threatening to take away the historic preservation of Lomax AME Zion Church, an LHD, but that what the church wanted was a wall in between its property and the Hotel Pentagon site. He said that the HALRB also had been invited to the SPRC given the site plan's proximity to the LHD, but that the HALRB member could not attend the meetings, so HPP staff provided preservation recommendations. Ms. Farris reiterated that two HALRB members were invited to participate but that scheduling conflicts contributed to their inability to participate so HPP staff provided updates to the HALRB on the project. Mr. Spain concluded by saying several community groups and stakeholders were highly involved in the process for that project. *[Mr. Woodruff turned off his camera and then turned it back on at 7:27 pm].*

Mr. Spain then spoke to the fifth and final question on the screen which was, "How could the County Board help assure a permanent home for the Black Heritage Museum of Arlington (BHMA)?" He asked which commissioner submitted this question. Ms. Farris offered that it was Mr. Handley again. Mr. Spain noted that everyone on the HALRB could have an interest in the BHMA or any group related to history in the community. He said that yes, there are ways that the County could help not just the BHMA, but other groups aiming to preserve history in the community. He said what he would love to have in Arlington one day is a cultural arts center where groups like the BHMA could have space. He asked how many people were familiar with the Arlington Historical Society (AHS) and noted that AHS has a permanent location. He said it would require continued conversations with the BHMA and the County and other entities, but he noted that the County was operating with a tight budget. He said there are lots of office spaces in the area that could be retrofitted for this purpose and that he was committed to continuing those conversations. Mr. Woodruff offered the Nelly Custis School (Melwood) as the site for such a purpose.

Mr. Spain said he appreciated the questions and thanked the Chair and Vice Chair for their leadership. He offered to the HALRB to contemplate the future of the commission and what priorities they wanted to pursue and how they wanted to operate. He offered that the HALRB could help shape the County's legislative priorities. He asked if anyone had any final questions. Ms. Myers shared that she had a question. She offered that she would consider herself pro-housing, but that often, historic preservationists are seen as having priorities and policies that are at odds with housing goals. She said that the HALRB often does have to take a reactionary stance because they only have power to approve or deny specific things. She offered that the HALRB is not always respected on the SPRCs or other planning related

committees and that the preservation recommendations are not given high priority. Her question to Mr. Spain was how the HALRB can still be pro-housing and pro-density but also ensure that the County isn't losing its historic resources, such as churches, single-family homes, and other buildings. *[Mr. Woodruff turned off his camera and then turned it back on at 7:30 pm].* Ms. Lawrence added that she had spent time serving as the HALRB representative for a County housing study and that she advocated that preserving garden style apartments was a way to also retain affordable housing in the County. She reiterated that there is a large stock of garden style apartments in Arlington and that many of them do provide affordable housing and it pains her to see many of those places demolished. Mr. Spain thanked Ms. Lawrence for her service on the Board. He said he felt upset that members of the HALRB did not feel heard or welcome in some of these conversations or efforts in the County. He acknowledged that he was watching the development of churches in Arlington closely and that he saw this happening nationally where churches on large lots were redeveloping their properties to allow for multi-use since fewer congregants were coming in person to worship. He mentioned there are groups in Virginia who are aiming to pass legislation to make this kind of change by-right in the state. He said he thinks both can be achievable – that the County can preserve historic resources and provide more housing. He mentioned two projects in Arlington that are being adapted for housing. He said that many of the garden apartments in the County are aged and that investors weigh whether it is cheaper to demolish and build new or refurbish them. He said he felt the garden apartments should be preserved. Ms. Lawrence offered that it was environmentally smarter and better to restore an existing building rather than tear down and build a new one. He agreed that the newer materials being used for new construction were not the same quality as the historic materials. He said it is a reality that people want to build new houses which is why the County should incentivize historic preservation in Arlington. Ms. Myers offered that some of the existing incentives have the opposite effect in the County and incentivize teardowns. Mr. Nathan Burlingame brought up the housing conservation districts project from a few years ago. He said that County staff went back to look at ways to incentivize the retention of garden style apartments in Arlington but that the effort was shelved for the Expanded Housing Options (EHO) study that was completed. He said County staff should go back to this effort. He then noted that many of these buildings, with which he works closely, are falling apart and have aged and there are no financial incentives to retaining some of them. Mr. Spain agreed that something should be done for garden style apartments because they are aging and there are concerns about the loss of affordable housing at those apartments. Mr. Spain and Mr. Burlingame discussed some additional details related to the study of housing conservation districts. Ms. Farris added that the HPP has been trying to get the HALRB involved with a few other commissions and to increase their partnerships. She also noted that these studies were on planning staff's radar, but that she was unsure as to the study's current status.

Mr. Spain asked the HALRB to let him know if they had any additional questions or things they wanted him to address. He also shared that he often thinks about "equity" when he attends commission meetings and said that he appreciated the diversity of thought and demographics with the HALRB. He offered that the HALRB should acknowledge the impact their decisions will have on large groups of people in the County. He said equitable decision-making means being a voice for the people that aren't in the room, and he asked the HALRB to keep that in mind. Ms. Myers and the HALRB thanked Mr. Spain for coming to the meeting.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Ms. Myers did not have anything to mention for the Chair's Report and turned it over to HPP staff for their report.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Durak passed around the HALRB roster and asked that the commissioners in the room please check that their information was correct and up to date. She reminded them that the information was not public and was only used internally. She then reminded the HALRB that the next meeting was on August 20 and asked that commissioners let her know if they knew they were not going to make that meeting. Finally, she reminded the HALRB to continue working towards their required training for the County to retain Certified Local Government (CLG) status with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. She said she would send a reminder email in August to all commissioners with the details she needed for their training such as the date it occurred, the duration, the topic, and the provider.

Ms. Farris provided an update on the Historic Preservation Principal Planner position opening and noted that interviews of candidates would be occurring soon.

With no other business for the good of the order, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:54 pm.