

# APPROVED MINUTES

February 11, 2021

---

## THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

### Virtual Meeting- Using Webex Fairfax County Platform 6:30 p.m. meeting start

#### Members Present:

Christopher Daniel, Chairman  
Jason Zellman, Vice Chairman  
Michele Aubry, Treasurer  
John A. Burns, FAIA  
Kaye Orr  
Steve Kulinski  
Samantha Huang  
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA\*

#### Members Excused:

Susan Notkins, AIA  
Elise Murray  
Mike McReynolds

#### Staff Present:

Nicole Brannan,  
*Senior Historic Preservation  
Planner*  
Kyra Davis,  
*Planning Technician*  
Ryan Johnson,  
*Recording Secretary*

*\*Arrived after the commencement of  
meeting.*

**Mr. Daniel opened the February 11, 2021 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:32 p.m. using the Webex Fairfax County Platform. Mr. Daniel started the meeting with emergency motions related to the COVID-19 pandemic.**

#### COVID-19 SPECIAL MOTIONS (Summary)

1. A quorum of the ARB must be participating remotely;
2. A vote to ensure that each member of the ARB may be adequately heard and that all members can hear each other;
3. A vote to verify that the usual FOIA procedures cannot be implemented safely or practically;
4. A vote to verify that every item on the agenda is either related to the emergency or necessary to assure continuity in government, or both; and
5. Public comment time limitations.

#### COVID-19 SPECIAL MOTIONS (Motions)

**Mr. Daniel so moved:**

To conduct this meeting wholly electronically and to effectuate both the emergency procedures authorized by FOIA the ARB needs to make certain findings and determinations for the record. It's a bit cumbersome, so I ask you in advance for your patience.

#### **1. Audibility of Members' Voices**

First, because each member of this ARB is participating in this meeting from a separate location, we must verify that a quorum of members is participating, and that each member's voice is clear, audible, and at an appropriate volume for all of the other members. Accordingly, I am going to conduct a roll call, and ask each ARB member participating in this meeting to state your name and the location from which you are participating. I ask that each of you pay close attention to ensure that you can hear each of your colleagues. Following this roll call, we will vote to establish that every member can hear every other member.

(Mr. Daniel continued with a roll call of Members, in accordance with above instructions):

- **Ms. Aubry- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Mr. Burns- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Ms. Huang- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Mr. Kulinski- aye, office, can hear**
- **Ms. Murray- no response, not present**
- **Ms. Notkins- no response, not present**
- **Ms. Orr- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Mr. Plumpe- no response, not present**
- **Mr. Zellman- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Mr. McReynolds- no response, not present**
- **Mr. Daniel- aye, private residence, can hear**

Mr. Daniel passed the virtual gavel to the Vice-Chairman (Mr. Zellman), so that he could be heard to make the requisite motion.

**Mr. Daniel moved that every member that is present can be clearly heard. The motion was seconded by Ms. Orr, and passed unanimously.**

## **2. Quorum of ARB members-**

**Mr. Daniel so moved:**

As determined by the roll call, 7 members of the ARB are present and therefore satisfy the ARB quorum minimum. The ARB by-laws state that a minimum of 6 members are required to determine a quorum.

**The motion was seconded by Ms. Aubry, and passed unanimously.**

## **3. Need for an Electronic Meeting**

**Mr. Daniel so moved:**

Third, having established that each member's voice may be heard by every other member, we must next establish the nature of the emergency that compels these emergency procedures, the fact that we are meeting electronically, what type of electronic communication is being used, and how we have arranged for public access to this meeting. Therefore, I move that the State of Emergency caused by the COVID-19 pandemic makes it unsafe for this ARB to physically

assemble and unsafe for the public to physically attend any such meeting, and that as such, FOIA's usual procedures, which require the physical assembly of the ARB and the physical presence of the public, cannot be implemented safely or practically. I further move that ARB may conduct this meeting electronically through Webex, a county virtual meeting platform and available for access through the ARB county website or through phone at: 1-408-418-9388 with Access code: 1 344 7433. It is so moved.

**The motion was seconded by Ms. Orr, and passed unanimously.**

**4. Need to dispense with FOIA's Usual Procedures to Assure Continuity in Government/Continue Operations**

**Mr. Daniel so moved:**

Finally, it is next required that all of the matters addressed on today's agenda are statutorily required or necessary to continue operations and the discharge of this Board's lawful purposes, duties, and responsibilities. It is so moved.

**The motion was seconded by Ms. Huang, and passed unanimously.**

**5. Public Comments:**

Mr. Daniel moved that the ARB needs to determine how long each member of the public will be able to speak during the public comment periods. The public will be allowed to comment after the consent agenda items and after each action item, as is standard ARB practice.

**Mr. Daniel moved that each member of the public will have 3 minutes to speak. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kulinski, and passed unanimously.**

Mr. Zellman handed the virtual gavel back to Mr. Daniel.

**VIRTUAL MEETING WEBEX INFORMATION- Staff (Nicole Brannan)**

- Ms. Brannan informed all attendees that the meeting is being recorded, and it will be posted online in 10 days. She directed attendees to use the Q&A box or chat function in the Webex Platform for inquiries and staff would monitor accordingly, and that attendees that are experiencing technical issues to please call Webex Technical Assistance at 1-866-799-3293.

**READING OF STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND INTENT OF HOD'S**

**Ms. Aubry read the opening Statement of Purpose.**

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA- Chair**

- **Ms. Orr moved to approve the agenda, and was seconded by Mr. Burns. The motion passed unanimously.**

**INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS (Based on Webex attendees list)**

Sarah Vonesh  
Benjamin Walker

Katherine Wallace  
Laura Hughes

**CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS:** None

**ITEMS FOR ACTION:** None

**ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:** None

**PRESENTATIONS:**

- **EHT Traceries- EHT Traceries HOD Design Guidelines.**
  - Update on revised Overall Design Guidelines and Bull Run Stone Bridge Design Guidelines
    - Presentation/Discussion:
      - Sarah Vonesh of EHT Traceries presented:
        - Overall design guidelines (revised since last draft)
          - Ms. Vonesh provided an overview of the content: background, context, project review process, types of reviews that involve ARB, submission materials checklist, examples of site plans and elevations, ARB standards, Sec. of Interior standards, general preservation standards, and design principles and guidelines.
          - The revised document has more images and photographs
          - Edits:
            - Text revised; removed column format, revised images and captions, included images and photographs of HOD's
            - Shows district core boundaries and overall district boundaries
            - Design principles are separated by page and have been supplemented with more information for each principle
        - Mr. Daniel asked ARB Members for comments:
          - Ms. Aubry: Thanked presenter for all of the improvement efforts.
          - Mr. Burns:
            - Mentioned that the Sully aerial photographs do not include Dulles Discovery 4, worried that newer aerials should be used.
              - Ms. Vonesh mentioned the latest aerial is from 2019, and a newer one could be provided.
            - There should be perspective correction due to distorted image quality on some of the photos used.
            - Slide 10- the illustration of the house out of scale shows an apartment building- Mr. Burns

recommends more of a McMansion look to show a traditional house.

- This is a significant improvement over the previous set of draft guidelines.

- Ms. Huang: No comments.
- Mr. Kulinski: Much improved over previous draft guidelines.
- Ms. Orr: No comments.
- Mr. Zellman: This latest revision is much more user-friendly for applicants.

**\*\*Mr. Plumpe joined the meeting at 6: 56 p.m.\*\***

- Mr. Plumpe: The revision looks great, and nice pictures have been used.
- Mr. Daniel: Mentioned that there are pictures of Hollin Hills in here, and that is a pending HOD, but there should be substitute photos just in case the HOD is not approved.
  - Ms. Vonesh mentioned there are plenty of substitute photos.
- Ms. Vonesh mentioned for the next 30 days—send comments to Nicole Brannan who will forward them on to EHT Tracerics.

○ Draft Bull Run Stone Bridge HOD Design Guidelines

- Introduction to guidelines, overlay district, and design review process, historical significance, aerial photographs, timelines, maps, photos, views within HOD, and information of development and potential development, character defining districts, preservation objectives, Sec. of Interior standards for rehabilitation
- Guidelines cover 3 main topics:
  - Topography
  - Architectural Character
  - Compatibility for Additions and New Construction
- Revised maps include more detailed topography and natural features; added references to National Register nomination
- Presentation/Discussion:
  - **Mr. Daniel asked ARB Members for comments:**
    - Ms. Aubry: Impressed with document, suggested revision: p. 34- 5<sup>th</sup> line from bottom- word “reservation” instead of “preservation”. Enjoyed reading the document.
    - Mr. Burns: No comments.
    - Ms. Huang: No comments.
    - Mr. Kulinski: No comments.
    - Ms. Orr: No comments.
    - Mr. Zellman: No comments.
    - Mr. Plumpe: No comments.
    - Mr. Daniel: Appreciates all of the improvements. This particular HOD does not have much activity.



- Mr. Zellman: No comments.
- Mr. Plumpe: No comments.
- Mr. Daniel: Reiterated that the Wawa imagery should be removed. Appreciates the zoning information because it is very helpful to have in the document when analyzing a proposal in the HOD. Interesting how close one of the buildings was built to the HOD boundary.
  - Mr. Daniel would like to have more guidance for preferred types of lighting, cutoffs, intensity, etc. There is a lot of light pollution in the Sully HOD vicinity.
  - Mr. Daniel would encourage Ms. Notkins to provide comments, given her previous involvement with the child care center project.
    - Mr. Burns mentioned that there was a lot of attention paid to a previous review of the Ferguson Property and lighting. The Zoning Ordinance also requires full cut-off lighting.
    - Mr. Plumpe mentioned that there should be recommended photometric studies and color ranges.
- Draft Dranesville Tavern HOD Design Guidelines
  - Similar outline to previously covered HOD guidelines in her presentation. Mr. Daniel asked ARB Members for comments:
    - Ms. Aubry:
      - p. 19: There are several references to golf, but the golf ranges, etc. have been gone for many years. References should be removed.
      - p. 20: Brief discussion about contributing resources. Discussion should be more elaborative about why these structures have that status.
      - p. 23: McDonald House, outbuildings and barn: there needs to be more description- the significance of these properties needs to be fleshed out more.
      - References section- there is not a reference or URL to the 1972 document that is proposing the Dranesville HOD. Add that link.
      - There is not a link to the 1991 memo.
        - Ms. Vonesh mentioned that that 1991 memo has some conflicting information.
    - Mr. Burns:
      - Need more recent aerial photographs- there has been development in the SE corner of the HOD that is not shown (single-family home development)
      - The 1991 document being available online may not be the best idea because of its conflicting guidelines and potential to confuse future applicants.
    - Ms. Huang: No comments.

- Mr. Kulinski: No comments.
- Ms. Orr: No comments.
- Mr. Zellman: No comments.
- Mr. Plumpe: No comments.
  - Mr. Daniel: p.5- “Require” missing from “Projects That Do Not \_\_\_ Review”
- Mr. Daniel mentioned maybe some of the “mud” properties on the aerials were stormwater ponds. New imagery should be added that shows newer single-family homes that have been developed- ARB provided a lot of guidance. Mr. Daniel has a general concern about landscaping given the HOD’s proximity to Leesburg Pike.
- Overall response from EHT Traceries to ARB Members:
  - **Within next 30 days (preferably by March 9, 2021) provide comments on the draft guidelines to Nicole Brannan.**
  - After receiving ARB comments, EHT will revise the drafts
  - DPD staff will have public meetings
  - District-specific design guidelines will be finalized.

Mr. Daniel thanked the presenters.

- **Wellington at River Farm Potential HOD: Nicole Brannan**

- Address is 7931 East Blvd. Immediately adjacent to GW Pkwy., Mount Vernon District, currently owned by American Horticultural Society.
- 11/17/20- Board authorized staff to study the establishment of a HOD
- Project components: Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Board of Supervisors’ Own Motion Rezoning, and Draft Design Guidelines.
- Property and zoning information: 24.69 acres, zoned R-2, governed by a Special Exception granted for a public benefit association use
  - Conservation easements- National Park easement on western portion to preserve viewshed along G.W. Pkwy.; Virginia Outdoors Association- easement on eastern portion to preserve viewshed towards Potomac River
  - Surrounded by R-2 residential subdivisions
  - George Washington ownership: not a lot of information currently
  - Not a lot of information about who constructed the house and when
  - Period of significance: 1919-1973, Mr. Matheson, son designed Mclean CIA and Mount Vernon Visitor’s Center
    - Colonial revival architectural style
  - 1969- listed on County Historic Inventory
  - 10 structures/viewsheds that are contributing: manor house, ballroom, various caretaker houses, viewshed to river
  - Non-contributing: James Monroe gates, ha-ha wall, newer items such as driveway
- Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment
  - R-2 zoning limitations: Staff is proposing to allow all uses in R-2 with the exception of animal, vehicle, and industrial- related uses—all in an attempt to both allow flexibility and to prevent noncompatible uses.
    - Any proposed use must be compatible with existing structures



- Height- 35' max.
- Rather than list out specific uses- the proposal will allow the Board to consider specific uses patterned after the alternative use of historic structures in the zMOD proposal.
- Specific use limitations: encouraged to use existing historic resources, new structures must be in harmony, and compatible
- No use/activity can result in removal from HOD or Historic Inventory designations
- Comprehensive Plan Amendment
  - Editorial to denote HOD boundaries on comp plan map
- Timeframe:
  - Planning Commission Land Use Process Committee- 2/11/2021; March 2
  - Planning Commission 3/17/21
  - Board of Supervisors 4/13/21
  - Presentation/Discussion: Mr. Daniel asked ARB Members for comments:
    - Ms. Aubry: Interesting that the period of significance is Matheson only (the owner before the American Horticultural Society)
      - Staff stated that because of expedited nature of this HOD, an archaeological survey has not been completed.
        - Future studies, cultural landscape studies can still occur and the HOD could be updated as necessary
    - Mr. Burns: Also concerned about the limited period of significance. It is important that the Board not get locked into preserving just Matheson's residence on the property.
    - Ms. Huang: Not familiar with this area. In this particular case, there is no buffer around the HOD, and it is all owned by one entity (one property).
      - Mr. Daniel mentioned that staff did mention the idea of a buffer would bring in additional homeowners and slow down the process.
    - Mr. Kulinski: Asked is there an organized resistance to this HOD.
      - Ms. Brannan mentioned no, but understood that the American Horticultural Society could believe if the HOD is adopted that the property would be harder to sell.
      - Asked what about if the property sold before the HOD is approved. The response was that that would not halt the process.
        - Ms. Brannan mentioned there is a Save River Farm friends group, and if the ARB would be open to being a part.
    - Ms. Orr: No comments. Staff worked fast on this, and that is impressive.
    - Mr. Zellman: No comments.
    - Mr. Plumpe: No comments.
    - Mr. Daniel: Agreed with Mr. Burns and Ms. Aubry, could be a lot of large landscape and archaeology that is overlooked by rushing this- and then there could be a future owner that is not as amenable to updating the HOD should cultural resources be further discovered.
      - Mr. Daniel is unsure if the ARB could be involved in the advocacy group such as the Save River Farm friends group.

- Mr. Zellman mentioned legally—it is not the best appearance since the ARB will be regulating the HOD.
- Mr. Daniel mentioned several Board members, State officials, are already in the friends group.
  - Ms. Aubry mentioned she was blind-copied about this and only mentioning as information.
  - Mr. Burns mentioned if the ARB joins this friends group, where does one draw the line. For example, there are friends groups related to other upcoming HOD's.
  - Mr. Daniel said since ARB is operating in a regulatory, quasi-judicial function, it is best to not join the friends group.
  - **Nicole Brannan will respond that the ARB is not interested in joining the friends group, however, commends the group for its commitment to preserving historical resources.**

**BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:**

- **Review and action on approval of previous months minutes** (January 2021) and authorization of payment to Recording Secretary.
  - Ms. Burns had 2 editorial comments which were forwarded to staff.
  - **Mr. Burns moved, and Mr. Kulinski seconded, to approve the January 2021 meeting minutes, with Mr. Burns' editorial revisions forwarded to staff, and to authorize payment to the Recording Secretary. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Treasurer's Report:** Staff – 2/1/2021 Balance – \$20,581.81
- **Administrative: None.**
- **Discussion/Update Reports:**
  - **Soapstone Connector:** Nicole Brannan: Sent latest update about 4(f) process. More information will be available soon with regard to mitigation efforts.
  - **Holmes Run Acres HOD:** Nicole Brannan: Work Group Meeting was January 27, 2021. zMOD staff presented on accessory living units and other zoning topics. EHT Tracerics presented on the design guidelines process. **Next meeting is 2/24 at 6:30 p.m. and will cover contributing and non-contributing structures, and boundaries.** Meeting will also be to discuss parks and group of Cape Cod homes on Executive Drive as a buffer from Gallows Road as potential contributing structures.
    - **Mr. Burns asked about a list of addresses. Ms. Brannan mentioned that they have changed, and she will provide updated information.**
  - **Hollin Hills HOD:** Nicole Brannan: Community meeting was January 25, 2021. There was a lot of questions about how the design guidelines would work. Questions about how they would affect mortgages, mortgage insurance, and make it more expensive to live there.
    - Mr. Daniel thinks the County should really combat the misinformation-National Trust has information as to benefits of listing, and this is well-

publicized research. Hopes the County can share those resources. Answers need to be conveyed.

- Mr. Burns mentioned the research on listing and homeowner insurance effects is not entirely on-point as it mostly covers old buildings, not recent past buildings, where the building materials are all readily available.
- Mr. Daniel says the County needs to look holistically at how to package living in a potential HOD. Information pamphlets etc.
- Ms. Brannan stated that staff is working on posting that type of information on the project website, if not already.
- Gum Springs: Denice Dressel, Department of Planning and Development- Slight holding pattern for now after the Mount Vernon District town hall held on 2/6/21. Supervisor Storck's office will be setting up a community group. There will need to be a state survey.
- Reston Survey: Expecting final draft any day now, and once received, it will be posted on the project website. The survey results will be presented at March 2021 ARB meeting, and at the Reston Comprehensive Plan Task Force in April.
  - Mr. Daniel is excited that this survey is now being considered as part of the Task Force.
- Rezoning Cases:
  - Mr. Burns- SSPA- Belle View shopping center project withdrawn after considerable local resistance. Glad to see that.
- State Grants- County-wide architectural survey and survey of African American history underway. ARB has been asked if they want to put in funds to help complete this initiative.
  - **Mr. Daniel responded asking what could the ARB give. Ms. Brannan mentioned that she would talk with Denice about an appropriate amount.**
- **Correspondence, Announcements:** (Staff). None.
- **Old Business-**
  - Mr. Kulinski mentioned his involvement on the Laurel Hill park restroom project. There was robust discussion from the Lorton Heritage Society. The architect was charged to come back with a more modern design with more "prison-centric" material, more masonry instead of pre-fabricated panels. The more unique, contemporary columns may be played down in the final design.
- **New/other business:**
  - Mr. Burns- Preservation Virginia put out a call for submissions to Virginia's most endangered historic places list. Mr. Burns suggested Association Drive in Reston be added to the list, and potentially, the whole Reston commercial industrial corridor. No action was taken.

**Mr. Burns made a motion to adjourn at 8:35 p.m.**

***The ARB Administrator will stamp and sign copies of approved drawings or other application documents following the meeting at which approvals are granted, or at such time as drawings amended to reflect ARB actions are received by the administrator. Applicants may be required to submit additional copies of approved drawings or other application documents. Applicants may request copies of meeting minutes within 2 weeks of the meeting at which the ARB approved the minutes. Stamped drawings, letters from administrator documenting ARB action or copies of relevant minutes are required prior to projects being approved by county review and permitting agencies.***

For further information contact, Nicole Brannan, Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Architectural Review Board Administrator, Fairfax County Department of Planning and Development (DPD), at 703/324-1380