

# APPROVED MINUTES

August 13, 2015

## THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

---

### Fairfax County Government Center Conference Rooms 2 & 3, 6:30 PM

#### Members Present:

Jason Sutphin, Chairman  
Robert W. Mobley, Vice Chairman  
Michele Aubry  
John Boland  
John A. Burns, FAIA  
Elise Murray  
John Manganello, P.E.  
Christopher Daniel\*  
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA\*

#### Members Excused:

Richard Bierce, AIA  
Susan Notkins, AIA, Treasurer

#### Staff Present:

Linda Blank,  
*Fairfax Department of  
Planning & Zoning*  
Leanna O'Donnell,  
*Fairfax Department of  
Planning and Zoning*  
Laura Arseneau,  
*Substitute Recording  
Secretary*

*\*Arrived after the meeting officially began*

Mr. Sutphin opened the August 13, 2015 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:33 p.m. in Room 2/3 of the Government Center; Mr. Burns read the opening statement of purpose.

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

**Motion: Mrs. Murray made the motion to approve the agenda, with a modification of the order of events of the Board and Staff items. Mr. Burns seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on a vote of 7-0.**

#### INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS:

- Sandi Wagner, Administrative Assistant in the Planning Division. Observing the meeting to assist with ARB duties at the Planning Division.
- Leanna O'Donnell, Branch Chief in the Planning Division. Mrs. O'Donnell is observing this meeting in preparation for of the September ARB meeting when Mrs. Blank will be absent.
- Boy Scout observing a public meeting for communications merit badge.

**CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS:** None proposed.

#### ITEMS FOR ACTION:

1. **Proposed lighting** at 13890 Lowe Street, tax map #34-2 ((1)) 17E, located in the Sully Historic Overlay District (HOD). At its July 9, 2015 meeting the ARB approved with conditions **ARB-15-SUL-01** for the construction of a one-story, 14,900 square foot, 26.9'

high building with signage to house offices, a showroom and a warehouse to store plumbing supplies and fixtures. The conditions of approval were that a Photometric Study and all proposed lighting be presented to the ARB for review and approval. Mr. Christopher K. McKneely, AIA, Flanagan Architects PC, represents the application. (Item-**ARB-15-SUL-01**)

- Presentation by Chris McKneely:
  - Mr. McKneely stated that the application was approved at the July 2015 ARB meeting with conditions. Mr. McKneely returned today with specifications on the lighting design that were requested by the ARB. He noted that the ARB members had been given a photometric study. The lighting design includes 8 wall mounted LED lights that would face down (2 on the southern façade, 4 on the western façade and 2 on the northern façade). In addition, there would be one pole light in the parking lot for security and safety. No lighting was proposed on the eastern façade of the building.
- Discussion: None

**MOTION: Mr. Mobley made a motion to approve ARB Item ARB-15-SUL-01 for the lighting and photometric study associated with 13890 Lowe Street, Tax Map tax map #34-2 ((1)) 17E, that was submitted and presented to the ARB at the August 13, 2015 meeting.**

**The motion was seconded by Ms. Aubrey and the motion carried on a vote of 8-0. Mr. Plumpe was absent for the vote.**

**2. The proposed development of park facilities** to be located adjacent to Lorton and Furnace Roads, tax map #107-3, in the Lorton Correctional Complex National Register-eligible Historic District. The 2001 Lorton Correctional Complex Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) stipulates that the ARB review *undertakings* within the area eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and that the area within the Eligible District is subject to review as stipulated in Section 7-200 of the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. The Laurel Hill Park Master Plan was approved by the Park Authority Board in July 2004. The plan identified Section G as the Central Green; an area for picnic grounds with pavilions, a play area and trails providing connectivity to the Laurel Hill Greenway. A circular entrance drive with 220 head-in parking spaces would be adjacent to a parallel 6' wide asphalt trail, and surround four picnic shelters, a restroom facility, and play area. An 8' wide asphalt trail is proposed to the east of this area allowing controlled access into a meadow conservation area. At the November 14, 2013 and March 12, 2015 ARB meetings, the proposal was discussed in workshop sessions. Ms. Kelly Davis, Park Authority senior planner, represents the application. (Item-**ARB-15-LOR-01**)

- Presentation by Ms. Kelly Davis
  - Ms. Davis noted that the project had been reviewed at two previous ARB meetings as a workshop item. The proposal includes a central green/picnic area, 3 picnic shelters, a loop road, an asphalt trail, a playground and a general location for the future restrooms and a future pavilion. Ms. Davis noted that a letter had been received from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources requesting a map showing the relationship of the proposed construction to recorded resources

as it appears that an unevaluated site may be impacted. She stated that a Phase 1 archeological study would be completed. Since the last ARB meeting, the parking development proposed close to the Barrett house, a historic site, has been removed.

- Irma Clifton, President of the Lorton Heritage Society stated that the group voted and they do not oppose the design plan
- Discussion:
  - Mr. Mobley noted that the proposed stone trail has been replaced with an asphalt trail. He asked that if equestrian uses were proposed with the site and the response was no.
  - Mr. Mobley inquired on the design of the toilet facilities.
    - Ms. Davis responded that there was no design as no architect was hired. The current plans only showed the future locations. Once a design was selected for the toilet facility it would be brought in front of the ARB for review.
  - Mr. Burns asked if there would be any toilet facilities before the permanent facilities were installed.
    - Ms. Davis responded that porta-johns would be used temporarily.
  - Ms. Aubry asked if the proposed meadow would be a natural preservation area.
    - Ms. Davis responded that the trail loop and the inside of the loop includes 4 acres of meadow preservation area.
  - Ms. Murray noted that she was glad that the new design would not impact the Barrett House.

**MOTION- Ms. Murray made a motion to approve ARB item ARB-15-LOR-01 for the approval of Section G of the Laurel Hill Park Master Plan located adjacent to Lorton and Furnace Roads, tax map #107-3, as presented at today's meeting with no conditions.**

**Upon review of the materials and adherence to the items cited above, the proposal is found to meet requirements of Zoning Ordinance 7-200 HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS.**

Mr. Burns seconded the motion for discussion.

- Ms. Aubry wanted to include a condition that a Phase I archeological survey be conducted prior to proceeding with the project.
- Mr. Burns wanted to include conditions to ensure that the design for the future restrooms and the pavilion and any development plans of the meadows would be reviewed by the ARB.

**The motion was revised to include the conditions that:**

- 1) the design of the proposed future rest room facilities and pavilion are subject to future ARB review and approval;**
- 2) a Phase I archaeological survey will be conducted prior to proceeding with the project; and**
- 3) the two open space areas enclosed by 8' wide asphalt trails located east of the picnic and parking area will be retained as Meadow Conservation Areas and if there are any development plans of the meadows, they be reviewed by the ARB.**

**The revised motion carried on a vote of 9-0.**

**3. The proposed construction of a new single family residence** at the subdivided parcel of the Langley Ordinary, 6349 Georgetown Pike, tax map # 22-3 ((1)) 63B, in the Langley Fork Historic Overlay District (HOD). The ARB approved the construction of a single family residence for this property at its May 9, 2013 meeting; ARB-13-LFK-01; this approval has expired. The current proposal is to construct a two-story, wood sided single-family dwelling, with side gable roof and side gabled dormers at the north (front) elevation. The dwelling footprint would measure 62' X 119' with heights ranging from an average of 31' 5" to 39' at midpoint of the gable. It would be connected to a 3-car garage by a 1-story, shed roof enclosed gallery. Vehicular access would be a semi-circular driveway from an outlet road off Georgetown Pike. At its November 10, 2011 meeting, the ARB recommended approval of the application to subdivide the property into two buildable lots. Messers Doug DeLuca & Matt Bronczek, property owners, represent the application. **(Item ARB-15-LFK-01)**

- Presentation by Mr. Matt Bronczek, Mr. Don DeLuca  
The applicants noted that this application was previously approved in May 2013 but has expired. The plan is of a 2 acre residential property in Langley. The applicants brought in architectural plans. The only change from the previously approved 2013 plans was a shed roof on the rear addition which was redesigned as an A frame roof. There were no changes in the footprint of the dwelling, the windows, the siding or roof materials that were previously approved.
- Discussion
  - Ms. Blank noted that the approved plans from 2013 and the conceptual drawings from July 2015 were distributed to the ARB members. Additionally she noted that the grading plan has already been approved.
  - Ms. Blank stated that a breezeway was previously approved from the garage to the house, but that it is not delineated clearly on grading plan as a breezeway. Ms. Blank will clarify with Department of Public Works and Environmental Services –Site Plan Review to ensure that this structure remains a breezeway.
  - The applicants mentioned that since the 2013 approval the architect has changed.
  - Mr. Mobley asked to see the first approved rear elevation versus the current rear elevation. He inquired if this was the only change.
    - The applicants responded in the affirmative and that the room would be a family room.
  - Mr. Mobley asked if there was any change in the window type or design.
    - The applicants responded that the windows have been shortened but kept in the same location.
  - Mr. Mobley asked if the grading or the heights of the house had been altered since the previous ARB approval.
    - The applicants responded that there have been no alterations to the grading, but the retaining walls have been removed. The house height has been increased by 1 foot.
  - Chairman Sutphin inquired if the house shape had changed.
    - The applicants responded the footprint had not.

- Ms. Murray asked if the drawings submitted were within requirements for approval.
- Chairman Sutphin- asked the other ARB members if they believe drawings meet the submission for approval.
- Ms. Murray asked if the applicants were seeking a conceptual approval.
  - The applicant responded no; they are seeking final approval so as to apply for building permits.
- Mr. Burns stated that some items needed to be explained that are not visible in the drawings and he did not feel the drawings adequately explained what is desired to be changed. In addition, the grading issue discussed by Ms. Blank is still outstanding.
- Mr. Burns stated that if the building is substantially unchanged, we do not have an adequate explanation in the drawings of what has changed so that it can go into the record.
  - The applicants responded that the footprint has not changed and the front elevation has not changed. The only change is the roofline in the back of the house.
- Mr. Burns requested that the applicant submit a verbal description with the submission of what has changed since the previous approval.
- Ms. Blank stated that it was not clear what architectural details and plans previously approved in 2013 still applied to the current application.
  - The applicants responded that all the details previously submitted with the 2013 application were the same.
- Ms. Blank asked which elevations were applicable now.
  - The applicants responded that the current application is the last 4 sheets of the July 31, 2015 package. The first pages of the application are copies of what was previously approved in 2013.
  - Mr. Burns asked if pages 2, 3, 7 and 8 illustrated the changes.
    - The applicants responded yes.
- Chairman Sutphin asked if the first sheet submitted with the package illustrated the location of the materials on the buildings.
  - The applicants responded that the materials were previously approved and there were no changes from the 2013 submission.
- Mr. Daniel clarified that the ARB is approving drawings from the July 2015 submission along with the previously approved materials and detail sheets approved in 2013.
- Applicant responded affirmatively.

**MOTION- Mr. Daniel made a motion to approve ARB item ARB-15-LFK-01 for the approval of the revised architectural drawings and site plans, located at 6349 Georgetown Pike, tax map # 22-3 ((1)) 63B, as presented at today's meeting with no conditions.**

**Upon review of the materials and adherence to the items cited above, the proposal is found to meet requirements of Zoning Ordinance 7-200 HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS.**

**The motion was seconded by Mr. Burns and carried on a vote of 9-0.**

## ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

4. **After-the-fact review of an addition** at 10010 Colvin Run Road, tax map # 18-2 ((1)) 23, in the Colvin Run Mill Historic Overlay District (HOD). The addition was constructed to the “Money House”; identified as one of the HOD’s contributing properties. A 160 square foot gable roof with dormer second story addition was constructed above an existing c. 1925 one-story flat roof addition at the southwest side of the dwelling sometime after May 2007. The addition did not have benefit of permitting or ARB review. The overhang of the ca. 1925 flat roof one-story addition was retained, and covered with a pent roof. This pent roof surrounds the base of the 2007 addition. The roof ridge of the 2007 addition is 22" lower than that of the original late 19<sup>th</sup> century structure. The completed addition was discussed as part of the workshop for a proposed addition at the March, April and May 2015 meetings. Mr. David Olin, property owner, represents the application. (Item-**ARB-15-CRM-03**)
- Presentation by Mr. David Olin property owner (dormer discussion only)
    - Mr. Olin presented that he was before the ARB to apply for an addition built in the Colvin Run Historic Overlay District without prior ARB review. The discussion at this meeting was a focus on the dormer. The addition was previously approved at the July 9, 2015 meeting with 3 conditions. The applicant has paid for a building permit and has returned for the discussion of the scale and mass of the dormer.
    - Mr. Olin provided structural drawings of how the dormer was constructed and discussed three options of reconstructing the window and dormer.
  - Discussion-
    - Mr. Burns asked about the interior height of each of the window design options. He also questioned if the pentagonal window design option would interfere with the ceiling height.
      - Mr. Olin responded that the design would be an open dormer and that the ceiling height would not interfere.
    - Mr. Mobley noted that the window design has improved, but one of the designs (a pentagon window) imported from another house does not fit with the dormer and could potentially be visually awkward. He further noted the slope of the window did not match the slope of the dormer and would like to see a design where the slope of the window and the dormer matched.
      - Mr. Olin responded that he would be able to fix the angle of the window to match the dormer as it was a custom window.
    - Ms. Murray asked to see Mr. Mobley’s drawing conception.
    - Mr. Mobley was in favor of continuing the existing roof design and cutting off the bottom of the dormer.
    - Mr. Daniel stated the Board would be glad to continue to work with the applicant on refining the design of the windows and the dormer as he moved through the submission process.
      - Mr. Olin responded that at the next ARB meeting he would return with the detail for the dormer and a new elevation.

**5. Proposed new addition(s)** at 10010 Colvin Run Road, tax map # 18-2 ((1)) 23, in the Colvin Run Mill Historic Overlay District. Mr. David Olin, property owner, and Mr. Tom Bullock, Bull's Eye Restoration, represent the proposal.

Presentation by Mr. David Olin property owner (first floor addition)

- Mr. Olin discussed the limitations for construction of an addition on the first floor considering ARB concerns, floodplain and topography behind the house. There is an existing retaining wall and evidence of a possible ice house. The current proposal is an addition to the rear of the dwelling and an open porch on the L-shaped addition. The porch would be set back 8 inches which is accessed by converting the two windows and replacing with a glass door. Mr. Olin noted that the original roofline would be kept, the area viewable from the street would not be altered, a limited number of windows would be added and they would have to dig into the hill in the rear yard to construct the addition. Mr. Olin stated two conditions from last time including:
  - Mr. Daniel recommended designing the addition so that it can be differentiated from the original structure.
  - Ms. Notkins suggested a breezeway, but the design of it is limited by the lot size.
- Discussion-
- Mr. Mobley asked if there would be any paneling on the covered deck and if it was going to be a screened porch.
  - Mr. Olin responded that the screen porch would be designed with some sort of solid border on the bottom half to limit the amount of exhaust and also provide privacy.
- Mr. Mobley asked the applicant if he would consider the porch to be enclosed with glass.
  - Mr. Olin responded that he would prefer that option, with glass from the ceiling to the floor.
- Mr. Plumpe inquired if the design would be a glass porch if it would be air conditioned and be livable space
  - Mr. Olin responded yes.
- Mr. Mobley stated if the applicant was trying to minimize the visual impact of the porch he would prefer it to be glass.
- Mr. Mobley asked if in the design of the second floor addition if the applicant was trying to cantilever the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.
  - Mr. Olin responded that the foundation of the second floor would be dug into the hill.
  - Mr. Mobley asked for a photograph to be brought in to demonstrate the existing grade of the hill.
- Mr. Olin stated that moving forward he will design a glass porch, remove the panels from the bottom of the porch and re-use two of the windows to be removed and then installed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.
- Mr. Daniel asked the height of the addition to the rear of the dwelling.
  - Mr. Olin responded that the addition would be 2 to 3 feet higher than the existing peak of the house.

- Mr. Burns asked if the windows on the second floor matched the windows on the first floor. Mr. Burns suggested that the grid pattern of the new dormer window be compatible with the spacing and size of the grids of the window on the other floors of that façade.
- Mr. Burns stated that the goal of the ARB is to minimize the visual impact of the porch on that side of the house visible to the street.
- Mr. Burns asked about the fenestration on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the addition.
  - Mr. Olin responded that the proposed fenestration will ensure the addition would not be able to be seen from the Colvin Run Mill.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the framing of the glass windows would be dark or light.
- Mr. Burns recommended that the window framing be white to match the window trim on the existing house.
- Mr. Manganello asked the applicant for the reasoning behind not putting more windows in the additions.
  - Mr. Olin responded that there was a concern about the number of windows with prior presentations
- Mr. Plumpe suggested making the window frames as small as possible to minimize trim to be seen.
- Mr. Daniel stated that the new addition needs to speak to the original house. The renderings are going to be critical when it is returned for vote for approval.
- Mr. Plumpe asked the applicant to bring in colors and samples of the material for the proposed addition.

**PRESENTATION:** Denice Dressel, Resident Curator Program (RCP) Manager, will provide an overview of the program. The Board of Supervisors has requested the appointment of up to 2 ARB members to serve on a to-be-created Community Technical Advisory Committee (CTAC) for launching the program. Ms. Dressel will review the function of the CTAC.

**PRESENTATION:** Denice Dressel, Resident Curator Program (RCP) Manager, will provide an overview of the program. The Board of Supervisors has requested the appointment of up to 2 ARB members to serve on a to-be-created Community Technical Advisory Committee (CTAC) for launching the program. Ms. Dressel will review the function of the CTAC.

- Presentation by Ms. Denice Dressel, Resident Curator Program (RCP) Manager
  - Ms. Dressel introduced herself stating that she works for the Fairfax County Park Authority and was hired to develop a RCP. The reason for the presentation to the ARB was she was looking for an additional member to serve on the Technical Advisory Committee (CTAC); Mr. Daniel had already volunteered. She noted that Fairfax County was the first locality to adopt the RCP. Properties have been identified for potential curatorship and the BOS has requested that two members of the ARB serve on the CTAC.
- Discussion
  - Mr. Plumpe asked about the frequency of the committee meetings.
    - Ms. Dressel responded that the committee is scheduled to meet on the 4<sup>th</sup> Monday of every month for the next year.
  - Ms. Murray noted that the legislation for the RCP was started for a property that is not eligible for inclusion in the program.

- Mr. Plumpe asked if there was adequate funding for the project.
  - Ms. Dressel responded yes, for this phase.
- Mr. Plumpe asked about the duties of the appointed members.
  - Ms. Dressel responded that the committee will develop the program to set up a plan for a curatorship and to create the program procedures. She noted that the first property or properties will essentially be a pilot. After the pilot, assessment of the program will be conducted.
- Mr. Daniel noted that the plan for the committee is to develop criteria to do the work and review.
- Mr. Plumpe recommended that the committee develop a list of contractors to provide for the people living in the historic properties.
  - Ms. Dressel responded that the committee could potentially provide the Virginia Department of Historic Resources list of contractors and portfolios to potential curators.
  - Ms. Blank noted that any work has to comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
- Ms. Dressel noted that it is anticipated that part of the review process will include having the curators' provide information on their selected contractors and approval of drawings.
- Ms. Blank noted that it has not been determined that the program is only for residential uses. Commercial and not-profit uses may also be considered.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the concept for the RCP is for leases for the use of the house.
  - Ms. Dressel responded that there was no committee yet to make that decision. She noted that the leases would be fair market value and potentially with costs associated such as taxes.
  - Ms. Blank stated that there are two county attorneys on the committee who are familiar with lease agreements.
  - Ms. Dressel added that the cultural resources manager and procurement staff for the park authority, along with county risk management staff are on the committee.
- Mr. Burns asked if work is to be done to the Sec. of Interior Standards if there will be an opportunity to apply for preservation tax credits.
- Ms. Dressel indicated that she understood this may be a possibility.
- Mr. Burns asked if the properties had to be on or eligible for the Inventory to be able to be on list. He further asked who was doing the survey to determine if a property is eligible.
  - Ms. Dressel responded that to be considered historic as required by the county ordinance that a property did have to be in or eligible for the Inventory to be able to be on list.
  - Ms. Blank responded that the project is starting with 20 properties for consideration and a survey may be completed in the future to determine other available properties. At this time, she noted that a survey had been completed with the initial study that was done to identify historic properties that are publicly owned and which have no current viable use or are currently underutilized as determined by the county.

- Ms. Aubry asked that since all of the 20 potential properties are not in a historic overlay district if the ARB would be involved in review.
  - Ms. Dressel responded that it is undetermined if the ARB would review these cases. The committee will make recommendation on this.
- Mr. Daniel advocated that there be an ARB review on every project.
- Mr. Burns asked if there was any review of proposals for properties.
  - Ms. Dressel responded that a subset of the project review team would be the reviewer.
- Mr. Mobley asked if two ARB members who decided to be on the committee be able to review the applications when they come in front of the ARB.
  - Mr. Daniel responded that there could be a conflict of interest in the future.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if the historic scope to be reviewed would be beyond the building itself, and would include the grounds and driveway.
- Ms. Blank stated that many of the properties are in a park, so a portion of the property would have to be called out as a part of the proposed curatorship area. This would be done individually for each property.
- Mr. Burns asked what the phrase in the prospectus to “provide limited public access” means.
  - Ms. Dressel responded that a specific plan would be developed for each site to provide public access. Examples would include a website or historic house tours.
- Mr. Burns asked how much public access these sites currently had.
  - Ms. Dressel responded that some are located in parks but are not technically open to the public.
- Mr. Burns volunteered to be on the committee. (Mr. Daniel had previously volunteered to join the committee).

**BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:**

- **Review and action on approval of minutes:**
  - Changes were discussed and adopted

**MOTION: Mr. Burns made a motion to approve the July 2015 minutes as amended and to pay the secretary for the July 2015 minutes. This motion was seconded by Mr. Plumpe and carried on a vote of 9-0.**

- **Treasurer’s Report: No report.**
- **News/other business: None.**
- **Discussion/Update Reports**
  - Mr. Plumpe discussed the most recent review of the county Exceptional Design Awards. He noted that 2 honor awards, 4 merit awards, and 2 honorable mention awards were presented. The awards ceremony will be at the October 6, 2015 Board of Supervisors Meeting.
- **Administrative**

- Leanna O'Donnell, Planning Div. Branch Chief will be staffing the Sept. 10 ARB meeting
- Laurie Turkawski, currently in the Planning Division will be leaving the county and has obtained a new job with the Delaware State Historic Preservation Office.
- Eva Campbell is a historic preservation intern in the Planning Division.

**Old Business-**

- Follow up to July 9 meeting discussion: Proposed demolition of the 1974 American Press Institute Conference Center in Reston, designed by architect Marcel Breuer with architect Hamilton P. Smith, and associate Hasram Zdinoeddin. Proposed redevelopment for housing. (Mr. Burns) (Staff to provide requested update.)
  - Discussion
    - Ms. Blank noted that county staff has provided general information about the project including that the existing office building would be demolished and 37 single family attached dwellings would be constructed.
    - Ms. Blank had been told that a demolition permit has already been obtained. The building has not been identified as a heritage resource and no heritage resource survey has been done in the Reston area.
    - Ms. Blank noted that the developer has been made aware of the historic/architectural significance of the building.
    - Mr. Burns provided some photographic history and aerial views of the office building.
    - Mr. Burns noted that the DC Metro system is expanding through Reston and the county is welcoming rezoning requests with Transit-Oriented Development.
    - Mr. Burns noted that the building was designed by an internationally recognized architect.
    - Mr. Burns stated that in a related case in McLean, The Commons of McLean property, that the ARB recommended mitigative documentation.
    - Mr. Burns noted that a historic survey needed to be completed in the Reston area to identify historic properties and to be proactive so that the county and developers can make informed decisions.
    - Mr. Plumpe suggested that the ARB should do review for more than just the HOD and perhaps do a historic review around the new metro stations.
    - Mr. Burns recommended that the ARB write to the Board of Supervisors to urge them to assess if any properties are historic within the areas of the new Metro development.
    - Mr. Daniel recommended a two part letter, with the first part addressing the issues on this particular site and the second identifying the larger concern over the need for survey and the identification of historic properties.
    - Ms. Murray said that staff and a task force studied these areas

more than once and asked if they did not look at the individual properties.

- Mr. Burns asked how a master plan can be done without a historic survey.
- Ms. O'Donnell noted that staff was trying to prioritize what surveys needed to be done.
- Mr. Daniel suggested that areas with high development potential should be considered priority.
- Mr. Burns suggested that the ARB may have some leverage with the proffers in rezoning applications.
- Ms. Blank suggested that the ARB write a letter to DPZ to show the interest in the proffer language for the historic survey and preservation. The purpose of the ARB is to advise the BOS on historic properties throughout the county. This letter would serve as a written document to make county staff aware of historic issues.
- Chairman Sutphin noted that the ARB cannot do a historic survey, but that the county staff has to complete it.
- Ms. Blank discussed that the Comprehensive Plan recommends identifying and surveying historic properties and to remind the BOS of historic concerns and issues.
- Mr. Daniel suggested that the two issues be combined so that the demolition of a historic building could be avoided.
- Mr. Burns noted that these redevelopments will provide a large amount of tax revenue for the county.
- Mr. Plumpe noted that the buildings may not be saved in time.
- Mr. Burns noted that the county is losing cultural landscapes and open space.

**MOTION: Mr. Mobley made a motion to adjourn at 9:13 pm**

**Respectfully Submitted,  
*Laura Arseneau*  
Substitute ARB Secretary**