



ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

County Board Agenda Item Meeting of July 09, 2011

DATE: June 29, 2011

SUBJECT: Adoption of the Phase 1 Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) list of ranked historic garden apartments, shopping centers, and commercial buildings.

C. M. RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the Phase 1 Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) list of ranked historic garden apartments, shopping centers, and commercial buildings (Attachment A).

ISSUES: The outreach process undertaken to date for the HRI revealed that the community is in favor of the HRI and understands the urgency of and need for the study. Some affected property owners are concerned about the impacts of the HRI on their future by-right development rights and potential. Other owners expressed interest in having their properties re-evaluated in hopes of either demoting their ranking status within the HRI or removing their buildings from the list. At this time, only the HRI list of ranked properties will be considered by the County Board. Staff continues to refine and finalize the proposed HRI tools and strategies, which likely will come forward as a Request to Advertise in September with County Board action in October 2011.

SUMMARY: The creation of an Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) was the leading recommendation of the *Historic Preservation Master Plan* adopted by the County Board in 2006. The HRI is a groundbreaking and innovative planning tool designed specifically to assist property owners and the County in determining what are Arlington's most valuable historic resources and how best to address preservation goals and development options simultaneously. The first phase of the HRI is limited to only three types of historic buildings that are among the most threatened historic resources in the County – garden apartments and complexes, shopping centers, and commercial buildings. Nearly 400 historic resources were assessed and ranked in six different categories according to their historical and architectural significance. The categories are: Essential; Important; Notable; Minor; Altered/Not Historic; and Demolished. Phase 1 of the HRI includes two separate, yet linked components: 1) an official list of ranked properties organized by category of significance, and 2) a corresponding "tool kit" of proposed preservation incentives and strategies. At this time, only the Phase 1 HRI list of properties will be considered by the County Board (see Attachment A). The list is organized first by overall

County Manager:

County Attorney:

Staff: Cynthia Liccese-Torres and Michael Leventhal, DCPHD

51.

ranking category, then alphabetically by property type (garden apartments, commercial buildings, and shopping centers), with addresses, dates of construction, and current status (historic designations, levels of preservation in County-adopted plans, etc.) noted for each property. A version of the Phase 1 list that contains Real Property Code (RPC) numbers for the affected addresses is available in the Zoning Office and on the County website. The proposed HRI tools and strategies are currently being reviewed and finalized by staff and will come forward to the County Board in the Fall of 2011. Staff anticipates that the Request to Advertise will be in September, with County Board action in October 2011. An extensive community outreach process for the HRI was undertaken and overall public support was positive and favorable. To date, both the Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Committee (NCAC) and the Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) have taken formal actions to endorse the HRI.

BACKGROUND: In December 2006, the County Board adopted Arlington's first *Historic Preservation Master Plan*. The *Master Plan's* top priority recommendation for implementation was the creation of a Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) to fulfill two main purposes: 1) to rank the County's surveyed historic resources by historical and architectural significance; and 2) to establish proactive strategies to preserve the most vital historic resources. Arlington is the first locality in Virginia and is among only a few nationwide to create such a ranking system for historic resources. Adoption of the Phase 1 HRI list is the first step to implement the HRI, thereby reinforcing the County's commitment to historic preservation principles and planning, as well as its commitment to implementing the recommendations set forth in the *Master Plan*.

This first phase of the HRI is limited to only three types of historic buildings, all of which were built prior to 1962: 1) Garden apartment buildings and complexes (low-, mid-, and high-rises); 2) Early shopping centers; and 3) Individual commercial buildings. These particular properties represent the County's most threatened types of historic resources. The buildings range in date of construction from 1909 to 1962 and represent key periods and innovations in Arlington's and the nation's historical, architectural, social, cultural, and transportation history and planning trends. These building types include 394 historic resources, providing a meaningful test for the methodology used in the HRI ranking study.

The basis for the HRI survey phase was the collective data from the 12-year Countywide architectural survey completed in 2009. Arlington was the first locality in Virginia to complete a professionally-directed reconnaissance-level architectural survey of its historic resources. The survey systematically recorded more than 10,500 historic buildings all across the County. The *Master Plan* describes the architectural survey results as an "untapped asset that will become a valuable planning tool."¹ The property-specific data is extensive and includes physical descriptions of each resource, but offers no insight as to how properties compare to one another or which resources are the most historically or architecturally important, the most threatened, or the rarest. Given the volume of the survey data, the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff and the Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) recognize that it would be an impossible feat to preserve each and every identified historic resource and not every identified historic resource is worthy of being preserved. Yet a system is needed to determine which historic resources should be given priority for preservation in order to preserve Arlington's most

¹ *Historic Preservation Master Plan*, p. 19.

important aspects of its overall history and architectural story. The proposed HRI establishes an objective and methodical process by which to determine those answers for a finite number of historic resources that are among the most susceptible to redevelopment.

A team of planning and historic preservation experts and County staff, led by Mary Means, devised the HRI methodology and created the survey criteria and forms as part of the *Master Plan* development process. The criteria focused on the themes of integrity of neighborhood, setting, and building(s), as well as the cultural association of the resource(s). Each resource could be awarded up to two adjustment or bonus points to recognize an important physical or historical aspect that was not captured by the other themes (e.g., the first or largest garden apartment complex built in the County, the work of a noted architect, or the only or last example of a resource type, etc.). Maximum point values for each criterion and a range of total point values were established for the four main ranking categories of Essential, Important, Notable, and Minor. Upon completion of the survey, each resource's total points were added to determine its overall HRI ranking. Attachment B of this Board report is a technical memorandum prepared by Mary Means as part of the *Master Plan* process. This report offers a detailed explanation of the need for the HRI, as well as the methodology and survey criteria.

During the fieldwork for Phase 1 of the HRI, 394 historic resources were surveyed, assessed, and ranked. The survey team was comprised of Michael Leventhal, County Historic Preservation Program Coordinator, and Laura Trieschmann, Principal, E.H.T. Traceries. Each of the three building types was surveyed as a collective grouping and then according to date of construction within that group. The HRI survey took approximately eight months and was completed in October 2009. Next steps involved detailed analysis of the data, creation of a full inventory list of properties, and preparing written significance summaries of the Essential properties.

The completion of the Phase 1 HRI survey resulted in two separate, yet linked products: 1) an official HRI list of ranked properties organized by category of significance, and 2) a corresponding HRI "tool kit" of proposed preservation incentives and strategies. The HRI list consists of the following six ranking categories (with the number of resources per category indicated in parentheses):

1. **Essential** – County's top priorities for preservation that include the most significant, best preserved, and key resources that best define Arlington history (23);
2. **Important** – Central to understanding the County's history, but less distinctive than and/or have less physical integrity than Essential (134);
3. **Notable** – Have historic elements related to the County's history, but lack sufficient historic context, integrity, and/or significance compared to Essential and Important (81);
4. **Minor** – Altered substantially over time and/or not distinctive examples of their building type (22);
5. **Altered/Not Historic** (35); and
6. **Demolished** (99).

At this time, only the Phase 1 HRI list of properties will be considered by the County Board. The complete list, found in Attachment A, is organized first by ranking category, then alphabetically by property type. Addresses, dates of construction, and current status (historic designations, levels of preservation in County-adopted plans, etc.) are noted for each property. A version of the Phase 1 list that contains affected addresses and RPC numbers is available in the Zoning Office and on the County website at:

www.arlingtonva.us/departments/CPHD/ons/CPHDOnsHistoricPreservation.aspx.

DISCUSSION:

Purpose and Benefits of the HRI

The HRI is an innovative and unprecedented planning tool in Virginia and the greater Washington, DC region. Only a handful of other jurisdictions in the country have undertaken similar studies of ranking historic resources for planning purposes, including the City of Chicago and the City of Oakland, CA. Detailed information about both surveys is available online.²

Arlington's proposed HRI will not change the existing zoning of any individual property, nor will inclusion in the HRI affect property owners' by-right development rights. The HRI was designed to inform property owners, architects, developers, County staff, and County officials about Arlington's most valuable historic resources and how best to address preservation goals and development options simultaneously. It is envisioned that the HRI will make the Countywide architectural survey data and the HRI rankings both usable by and accessible to a wider audience beyond the HPP staff. This comprehensive study of historic garden apartments, shopping centers, and commercial buildings is invaluable to the County planning processes and brings transparency to the development process wherein historic resources of these types will be affected. As an information-sharing tool, the HRI is intended to initiate open dialogue between property owners and the County in the early planning stages of development projects. The ranked HRI list of properties provides clear preservation priorities for the County for a specific grouping of historic buildings. The forthcoming set of proposed creative tools and strategies within each category will allow owners to become proactive stewards of their historic properties and help them take advantage of a range of available options for preservation, redevelopment, or a combination of both. Several success stories, including the recent renovation of the former Dan Kain Building (now Lyon Hall), the Joseph L. Fisher U.S. Post Office, and the Gates of Ballston within Buckingham Village among others, clearly prove how historic preservation and new development can coexist and provide lasting community benefits.

Additional advantages of the HRI, particularly in regards to the forthcoming preservation strategies, correlate to sustainability and the creation of a true sense of place for Arlington. The most sustainable type of design involves retaining that which is already built and viably reusable. There is an underscored, yet distinct, relationship between historic preservation principles and

² For Chicago, see: <http://webapps.cityofchicago.org/landmarksweb/web/historicsurvey.htm>.
For Oakland, see:
www2.oakland.net.com/Government/o/CEDA/o/PlanningZoning/s/Historic/DOWD009155

“green” design strategies, as reflected in these statistics available from the National Trust for Historic Preservation:³

- New construction requires a lot of new energy. To construct a 50,000-square foot commercial building requires the same amount of energy needed to drive one car 20,000 miles per year for 730 years.
- Buildings are not disposable, but rather renewable resources. A 2004 report by the Brookings Institution projects that by 2030, we will have demolished and replaced 82 billion square feet of our existing building stock, which equates to losing nearly one-third of our total building stock in the next 20-25 years.
- It will take 35 to 50 years for an energy efficient new building to save the amount of energy lost in the demolition of an existing building (“embodied energy”).

The HRI also will help define and promote Arlington’s identity and sense of place. The concepts of “urban village” and the County’s collection of neighborhood-centric communities help define Arlington as Arlington. Contributing to that sense of place, as both foreground and background buildings, are the hundreds of historic garden apartments and commercial buildings identified in Phase 1 of the HRI. These specific types of historic buildings are integral to understanding Arlington’s 20th century development and its evolution from a rural, agricultural community to a vibrant, commuter-oriented suburb of the 21st century. In particular, the garden apartment as a genre basically was invented here in Arlington and is among the most character-defining elements of the County’s historic built environment that influenced national planning and housing trends. Without these important visual reminders of the County’s residential and commercial past, Arlington will lose its link to the most significant trends in architectural, planning, and transportation development that have shaped its overall heritage.

The urgency of why the HRI is needed is clear. The Phase 1 HRI survey data revealed that 25% of the surveyed properties have been demolished within the past decade alone – including 63 garden apartment buildings or complexes, four shopping centers, and 32 commercial buildings. The significant number of demolitions either by-right or as part of County-approved site plans underscores the critical need to: 1) know which historic resources are the most significant; and 2) develop forward-thinking strategies and incentives to protect these most important historic buildings sooner rather than later. The timing of the HRI initiative is also critical, as the economic climate will likely rebound again in the near future – increasing the risk of additional demolitions of these already vulnerable historic building types.

The Phase 1 HRI list of ranked historic properties is simply that – a list of historic properties identified in the County. The HRI list represents detailed data from the County’s evaluation of three very specific types of historic buildings and the County’s opinion as to which are the most significant to Arlington’s history and why. Just as the County maintains lists and data of natural resources, large specimen trees, or bridges, among other assets, the HRI is a list of noteworthy cultural resources identified by the County. The point values earned by individual properties during the Phase 1 survey were based on objective criteria created exclusively for the HRI project and reflective of the property types and architectural styles represented. As such, these

³ National Trust for Historic Preservation’s “Sustainability by the Numbers.” Available online at: www.preservationnation.org/issues/sustainability/sustainability-numbers.html.

point values are fixed and non-negotiable, and thereby those buildings included within each HRI ranking category likewise are fixed. However, there will be a range of options and flexibility available in the proposed tools and strategies that can be applied to encourage the preservation of buildings included in the HRI.

Implementation

Adoption of the Phase 1 HRI list will represent a significant step forward in the implementation of the Historic Resources Inventory, yet adoption of the list is only the initial step in the implementation process. In order for the HRI to become a viable planning tool, consideration must be given to how it will be integrated into both the County's daily planning practices and future long-term planning efforts. To achieve this, the HRI list first must become part of the County's standard internal processes, especially as related to planning, zoning, and permitting. To make the HRI data easily accessible to property owners, staff, and the general public, those historic properties in the Phase 1 HRI list should be identified by ranking category in the County's real estate assessment database. This will allow the HRI rankings to be listed along with all of the relevant property data, including RPC numbers, zoning classifications, owners, legal property descriptions, etc. Additionally, all of the properties identified in the Phase 1 HRI list have been cross-referenced by their RPC numbers. This will allow the HRI list to be linked to the County's GIS database for data-sharing purposes. Assorted maps or searchable lists could be generated easily, arranged by ranking category, building type, date of construction, etc.

In conjunction with making the HRI data readily available as detailed above, it is imperative that the County forms and applications that are related to planning and zoning processes be updated to allow for a property's HRI status to be indicated and then verified by staff. This would affect the general zoning application checklist available in the Zoning Office, as well as applications for building permits, alterations, demolitions, use permits, and site plans. Updates to these documents will ensure that a property's HRI status is identified upfront at the beginning of the planning process and will initiate conversations about preservation options and incentives amongst owners and staff in the early stages of project development.

Once the Phase 1 HRI list is adopted, consideration also needs to be given to maintaining the existing list and possibly expanding the HRI initiative to capture additional types of historic resources. At a minimum, the Historic Preservation Program staff will update the Phase 1 HRI list biannually (January and July) to reflect demolitions, historic designations, identification in new County-adopted plans, or other changes as necessary. The revised list will be available on the County website, as well as in the HPP office, Planning Division, and Zoning Office. Semi-annual review of the list will ensure that the property data remains as current and relevant as possible.

As stated previously in this report, the HRI currently includes only a finite number of historic resources – a total of 394 garden apartments, shopping centers, and commercial buildings. Subsequent phases of the HRI should be considered to address the study and protection of additional types of historic resources, for example, those that are County- or publicly-owned, institutional buildings, or extant single-family homes on the few remaining large lots. Additional phases of the HRI will increase public awareness of a broader range of historic building types

and engage the community in planning for their continued stewardship. Staff seeks input about which types of historic resources should be studied next.

Community Process

The public outreach process for the HRI was launched in Winter 2011. The outreach approach was phased, beginning first with posting detailed information on the HRI on the Historic Preservation Program's website, then by sending mailings to property owners and hosting meetings with select property owners and staff, and finally culminating with a public community forum. Additional discussions were held with the Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Committee (NCAC), the Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB), the Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission, and the Northern Virginia Building Industry Association and the National Association of Industrial and Office Professionals.

County Website: In early January 2011, staff created an HRI section on the HPP's website (www.arlingtonva.us/departments/CPHD/ons/CPHDOnsHistoricPreservation.aspx). First available was a brief project summary and detailed information about the 23 Essential properties (including property name and address, construction date, current photographs, a GIS link, and narrative descriptions of each property's historical and architectural significance). In mid-February, an alphabetical list of the 134 Important properties was added to the website, including property names, addresses, and construction dates. In mid-March, the remainder of the HRI list was posted, including alphabetical lists of the 81 Notable properties and 22 Minor properties, as well as a list of those 99 properties demolished within the past decade. The website also includes promotional materials related to the community forum; a link to an overview video produced by the Arlington Virginia Network (AVN); and a link to a brief video presentation by Mary Means, of Mary Means and Associates, who drafted Arlington's *Historic Preservation Master Plan* and who first recommended that the HRI be created and implemented.

Essential Property Owners: In early January, each of the owners of the 23 properties ranked as Essential received summary information on the HRI initiative, and an invitation to attend an informational meeting with staff. Held on January 27, 2011, the meeting was conducted in two sessions, one with owners of garden apartments and the other with owners of commercial properties (individual buildings and shopping centers). Historic Preservation and Planning staff hosted the meeting and the agenda featured an overview of the HRI; a premiere viewing of the brief video highlighting the HRI and the Essential buildings that was produced by AVN; a discussion about preservation tools and incentives; and a question and answer period. Display boards featuring photographs and maps of the Essential buildings were prepared by staff. Only two residential property owners, APAH and AHC, attended the morning meeting. Four commercial property owners, representing one shopping center and two buildings in Clarendon, participated in the afternoon session. Only one property owner openly declined to attend.

All of the owners of Essential properties who attended the meetings had some knowledge and awareness of historic preservation, as their properties already were listed in the National Register of Historic Places. These owners had taken advantage of rehabilitation tax credits, or their properties had been previously identified as historic buildings in such County-adopted plans as

the Clarendon Sector Plan and the Columbia Pike Form Based Code. Owners' overall concerns were minimal, with discussion focused on existing site limitations, the long-term economics of preservation and development, and the HRI's impacts on future development potential. Owners also were receptive to the idea of receiving an official honorific plaque from the County that identified their property as an "Essential Historic Resource." For those owners of Essential properties who were not able to attend the January 27 meetings, staff sent a follow-up letter with the meeting materials and an invitation to attend the upcoming March meeting with owners of Important properties.

Important Property Owners: In mid-February, letters were sent to each of the owners of those buildings ranked in the top-third of the Important category (52 out of 134 properties). Although all of the properties in the Important category are ranked together, the large number of properties in this category meant that small-group meetings with all of the owners was not workable. This top-third grouping of owners was selected for additional notification because their historic properties represent those most closely related to the Essential buildings and that have the most historical and/or architectural significance in the largest HRI category of Important. However, all properties within the Important category will be considered as a collective grouping. Staff met with these property owners in order to explain the HRI and discuss preservation incentives for their buildings; personal consultations with staff now and in the future are available to all owners of HRI properties. The letters followed the format of the Essential category mailing, with an HRI summary, definition of the Important classification, and an invitation to an informational meeting with staff. Held on March 3, 2011, separate sessions were available for residential and commercial owners. The meeting format mirrored that of the meeting with the owners of Essential buildings, but without the video presentation. Twelve individuals representing nine different properties attended the morning briefing, while another ten owners representing six properties came to the afternoon session.

Several, though not all, of the participants were familiar with preservation tools such as historic designation and rehabilitation tax credits. The owners of Important properties had more questions than the Essential group, yet understood the purpose of the HRI and were receptive to staff's explanations and comments. The discussions focused on these key points:

- Impacts on future development of properties included in the HRI;
- Future demands by County for preservation and/or local historic district designation;
- Potential for preservation tools to help sustain and maintain historic buildings;
- Specifically how Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) could be used to facilitate preservation;
- The role of the HALRB in reviewing projects that involve HRI-listed buildings; and
- Impact of HRI categories on existing preservation language (e.g., full, frontage, facade) in the Columbia Pike Form Based Code and other County-adopted plans.

All owners of properties in the Important category were notified of the inclusion of their property within the category, and were invited to the HRI Community Forum, discussed below.

HRI Community Forum: The Historic Resources Inventory Community Forum was held on March 30, 2011 at the Navy League Building. Owners of all properties listed in the main four HRI categories of Essential, Important, Notable, and Minor were invited to attend the Forum. Other groups and organizations notified included the HALRB; Planning Commission; Housing Commission; Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Committee; Arlington Heritage Alliance; Arlington Historical Society; Virginia Room at Arlington Central Library; and presidents of all the civic/citizen associations. Information about the meeting was posted on the online County calendar, AVN's Community Bulletin Board, and the HPP website.

Historic Preservation and Planning staff met with the 21 participants, including property owners, one developer, seven HALRB members, the Chairman and a board member of the Arlington Heritage Alliance, the president of the Arlington Historical Society, and several interested citizens. Mary Means, the consultant whose firm prepared the *Historic Preservation Master Plan*, was featured in a brief overview video that placed the HRI in the context of the *Master Plan* and Arlington's history. The meeting agenda covered the HRI as a planning tool, the purpose and goals of the HRI, survey methodology and ranking categories, and available preservation strategies and tools.

More than half of the meeting was a question-and-answer session. Those participants who spoke were generally in favor of the HRI and commended the County for its efforts to date to bring this leading *Master Plan* recommendation forward for implementation. None of the property owners in attendance expressed any reservations about being listed in the HRI. Most of the discussion focused on: 1) the need to have a robust set of HRI tools and strategies that will create viable preservation incentives; 2) general preservation questions (i.e., the Countywide architectural survey, designation of historic properties, the design review process, and rehabilitation tax credits); 3) next steps for implementation of the HRI project; and 4) plans for subsequent phases of the HRI to address other building types in the future.

Attendees offered several tools and strategies for consideration, which will be considered by staff as the complete HRI tool kit is refined and finalized. Suggestions included:

- Offering local preservation grants to serve as seed money;
- Strengthening ties between preservation and other similar County initiatives (notably sustainability, green design, and energy efficiency);
- Offering tax incentives such as local tax abatement or freezes;
- Creating a design center or offering design services as a means to encourage sensitive design;
- Offering consultation services for owners to meet with Historic Preservation and Planning staff to learn more about the specific significance of their property and/or to discuss important building features that should be retained before any renovation plans are developed; and
- Promoting the use of TDR as a proactive tool.

Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Committee (NCAC): The HPP staff spoke about the HRI at the NCAC's April 2011 meeting. Neighborhood representatives asked how Essential buildings were defined; how an Important HRI classification would impact owners; whether other types of sites/properties (including archaeological) would be addressed in future phases; about the salvage of historic building materials; and general questions about preservation in the County and conducting historic research. The membership passed a unanimous motion to support the HRI, with future phases to include neighborhoods (Attachment C).

Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB): Besides receiving regular staff updates in December 2010 and February and March 2011, the HALRB formally reviewed the HRI on its discussion agenda at its April 20, 2011, monthly meeting. Historic Preservation staff provided a brief overview of the HRI and the community outreach undertaken to date. One public speaker, a board member of the Arlington Heritage Alliance (AHA), spoke in support of the HRI and offered several suggestions (e.g., incremental phasing of the difference in increased property values after renovations, County promotion of the HRI properties so the greater community realizes their historic value, and signage for the HRI properties to celebrate them and educate the public). The AHA Board of Directors is willing to meet with County staff to further discuss preservation and implementation strategies.

The HALRB felt strongly that the County should offer or make available as many preservation tools and incentives as possible. The members agreed that it is important for the County to promote historic preservation as a lucrative planning tool, especially given the recent successes involving several Essential- and Important-ranked buildings, particularly in Clarendon. It was noted that these projects, including the Dan Kain Building, Joseph L. Fisher U.S. Post Office, and the Underwood Building, all successfully combined historic preservation with new development and all received valuable design input from the HALRB. Given the success of these prominent projects and others, the HALRB expressed interest in being involved in the administrative review of all site plan projects involving Essential and Important historic resources. The HALRB realized the importance of effectively communicating the HRI message to current and future owners. Lastly, the HALRB urged staff to ensure that the proposed HRI tools are effective enough to discourage substantial numbers of additional demolitions in the future. At its May 18, 2011, monthly meeting, the HALRB voted unanimously to endorse the HRI (Attachment D).

Planning Commission: The HPP staff presented the HRI list, the project methodology, and overall project goals to the Long Range Planning Committee on May 19, 2011. The committee members present agreed with staff that the HRI list is a valuable asset to the County and they are eager to provide feedback on the proposed tools and strategies component of the HRI. A unanimous motion of support for the Phase 1 HRI list was taken by the full Planning Commission on June 27, 2011.

Northern Virginia Building Industry Association (NVBIA) and National Association of Industrial and Office Professionals (NAIOP): On May 25, 2011, the HPP staff made a brief presentation about the HRI at the monthly NVBIA/NAIOP meeting. Staff gave an overview of the goals of the HRI and explained the different ranking categories. Attendees asked a few

questions about potential impacts on future development projects, but no major issues or concerns were raised.

Previous County Board Action: On June 11, 2011, the County Board approved the Request to Advertise for this item on the consent agenda.

FISCAL IMPACT: Adoption of the Phase 1 Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) list of ranked historic garden apartments and commercial buildings will not result in any fiscal impact to the County.

CONCLUSION: Staff recommends that the County Board adopt the Phase 1 Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) list of ranked historic garden apartments, shopping centers, and commercial buildings, as recommended in the *Historic Preservation Master Plan* that was adopted by the County Board in 2006. Adoption of the Phase 1 HRI list will provide the context needed for further discussion and analysis of preservation tools and strategies that correspond to the historic properties in the HRI list. These proposed tools and strategies will be finalized in the coming months and brought forward to the Board in the Fall of 2011.

**Phase 1,
Historic Resources Inventory (HRI)
June 2011**



➤ The HRI is a planning tool designed specifically to assist property owners and the County in determining Arlington’s most valuable historic resources and how best to address preservation goals and development options simultaneously.

- Phase 1 of the HRI is limited to only three types of historic buildings:
- **Garden apartments** and complexes (low-, mid-, and high-rises);
 - **Shopping centers**; and
 - **Commercial** buildings.

394 historic resources were assessed, with the survey completed in October 2009.

- The HRI consists of six ranking categories (with the number of resources per category indicated in parentheses):
- **Essential** – County’s top priorities for preservation that include the most significant, best preserved, and key resources that best define Arlington history (23);
 - **Important** – Central to County’s history, but less distinctive than and/or have less physical integrity than Essential (134);
 - **Notable** – Have historic elements related to County’s history, but lack sufficient historic context, integrity, and/or significance compared to Essential and Important (81);
 - **Minor** – Altered substantially over time and/or not distinctive examples of their building type (22);
 - **Altered/Not Historic** (35); and
 - **Demolished** (99).

➤ **Key to Abbreviations:**

Local HD: Arlington County Local Historic District – Provides a protective zoning overlay over an entire property and requires a special design review process for all exterior alterations, new construction, or demolition. Districts established by County Board and design review administered by the Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB).

VLR: Virginia Landmarks Register – State’s official list of historic properties. Designation is honorific, offers no protections, and does not impose any restrictions on owners. With listing, owners may be able to take advantage of Federal and/or State rehabilitation tax credits for qualified renovation work.

NR: National Register of Historic Places – Listed individually in the National Register, which is the official list maintained by the National Park Service of the nation’s most worthy historic buildings, sites, districts, structures, and objects. Designation is honorific, offers no protections, and does not impose any restrictions on owners. With listing, owners may be able to take advantage of Federal and/or State rehabilitation tax credits for qualified renovation work.

NR HD: Within a National Register Historic District – Listed in the National Register as a “contributing” building within the historic district. With such status, property may be eligible for Federal and/or State rehabilitation tax credits for qualified renovation work.

NR HD/NC: Within a National Register Historic District – Listed in the National Register as a “non-contributing” building within the historic district. With such status, property is not eligible for Federal and/or State rehabilitation tax credits.

VDHR: Virginia Department of Historic Resources – State Historic Preservation Office in Richmond that oversees the Virginia Landmarks Register, State rehabilitation tax credit program, and many other preservation-related programs.

FBC: Columbia Pike Form Based Code – Adopted by the County Board in 2003. Denotes preservation of specific historic buildings at the full and facade levels. Also identifies noteworthy historic properties that contribute to the character of the Pike and should be considered for retention as part of redevelopment proposals.

CSP: Clarendon Sector Plan – Adopted by the County Board in 2006. Denotes preservation of specific historic buildings at the full, frontage, or facade levels.

FMHN: Fort Myer Heights North Plan – Adopted by the County Board in 2008. Denotes preservation of specific historic buildings as part of the site plan process and classifies them as Essential, Important, or Contributing to the character of the neighborhood.

ESSENTIAL***Essential -- Garden Apartments***

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Arlington Village	South Barton Street and 13 th Road South	1939	VLR, NR
Barcroft Apartments	Columbia Pike and South George Mason Drive	1939-1953	
Buckingham Village Apartments	North Pershing Drive and North Glebe Road	1937-1953	Local HD, VLR, NR
Calvert Manor	1925-1927 North Calvert Street	1950	VLR, NR
Courthouse Manor	1233 North Courthouse Road	1940	FMHN (full)
Colonial Village	Wilson Boulevard and North Taft Street	1936-1955	Local HD, VLR, NR
Fairlington	South Buchanan Street & 29 th Street South; 34th Street South & South Wakefield Street	1943-1945	VLR, NR
Fillmore Gardens	8 th Street South and South Fillmore Street	1942-1948	FBC (full); portion south of 9th St. may be developed if northern portion preserved)
Lee Gardens North (Woodbury Park)	10 th Street North and Arlington Boulevard	1949	VLR, NR
Lee Gardens South (Sheffield Court)	9 th and 10 th Streets North & North Wayne Street	1942	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Wakefield Manor	1201-1203 North Courthouse Road and 1215-1223 North Courthouse Road (also known as 1216-1220 North Troy Street)	1943	Determined Eligible for NR (by VDHR), FMHN (full), Site plan application in progress

Essential -- Commercial Buildings

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Arlington Theater (Arlington Draft House)	2901-2911 Columbia Pike; 922-930 South Walter Reed Drive	1939	FBC (full - along Pike only); FBC (facade - along Walter Reed Drive only)
Joseph L. Fisher U.S. Post Office	3118 Washington Boulevard	1937	Local HD, VLR, NR, CSP (full)

Phase 1 HRI List

Glebe Center	71-89 North Glebe Road	1940	VLR, NR
Dan Kain Building	3100 Washington Boulevard	1946	Local HD, CSP (full)
Odd Fellows Hall	3169 Wilson Boulevard	1925	CSP (frontage)
Old Dominion Building (Leadership Building)	1101 North Highland Street	1940-1941	CSP (full), Easement
G.H. Rucker Building	3171-3181 Wilson Boulevard	1925	CSP (frontage)
Texaco Service Station (Joyce Motors)	3201 10 th Street North	1949	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2836 Wilson Boulevard	1941	CSP (facade)
Woolworth Building (Clarendon Ballroom)	3185 Wilson Boulevard	1936	CSP (frontage)

Essential -- Shopping Centers

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Arlington Village Shopping Center	2500-2530 Columbia Pike	1939	FBC (full), VLR, NR HD (Arlington Village)
Colonial Village Shopping Center	1711-1731 Wilson Boulevard	1937	

IMPORTANT

(*) Denotes that the property ranks within the top third of the Important category.

Important -- Garden Apartments

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Admiralty Apartments	2000-2020 North Calvert Street	1953	
Arlco Apartments	1423-1427 North Nash Street	1951-1952	
Arlington Courts	2800-2912 and 2801-2913 16th Road South	1948	
Arlington Towers (River Place)*	1011, 1021, 1111, 1121 Arlington Boulevard	1954-1955	
Boulevard Courts Apartments	2300 Washington Boulevard	1940	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Buchanan Gardens Apartments	914-934 South Buchanan Street	1949	
George Washington Carver Homes	1707-1717 and 1725-1735 13th Road South; 1300-1334 and 1344-1362 South Rolfe Street; 1324-1330 South Queen Street	1945	
Carydale Apartments (Rolfe Street Apartments)*	1200-1218 North Rolfe Street	1942	
Clarendon Courts	3814 and 3832 7th Street North; 3829 7th Street North	1940-1941	
Columbia Heights	5212-5228 and 5310-5320 8th Road South; 830-834 South Greenbrier Street	1950	
John E. Delashmutt Apartments	1931 and 1941 North Cameron Street	1954	
Dominion Arms*	333 South Glebe Road	1954-1955	VLR, NR HD (Arlington Heights)
Dominion Terrace Apartments	2030-2036 North Woodrow Street; 4635-4641 and 4701-4705 20th Road North	1952-1954	
Engleside Cooperative Apartments*	2125-2133 19th Street North	1954	
Fort Bennett Apartments (Fort Georgetown Apartments)	21st Street North and North Pierce Street	1953-1954	
Fort Henry Gardens	2409-2488 South Lowell Street; 2424-2440 South Lincoln Street	1940	

Phase 1 HRI List

Fort Strong Apartments*	2000-2012 North Daniel Street	1954	
Frederick Courts*	Columbia Pike, South Frederick Street, and South Columbus Street	1947-1948	
George Mason Apartments*	4315-4319 4th Street North; 4304-4320 Henderson Road	1945	
Glebe Apartments	210-212 North Glebe Road	1947	
Glenayr Apartments*	4400-4429 4th Road North; 421-437 North Park Drive	1944	
Highland Hall Apartments (Arbors of Arlington)*	20-30 South Old Glebe Road	1942	VLR, NR HD (Arlington Heights)
Irving Apartments*	605 North Irving Street	1936	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
E.R. Keene Apartments (Westover)	Washington Boulevard and North Kenilworth Street	1941	VLR, NR HD (Westover)
Key Boulevard Apartments*	1537-1545 Key Boulevard	1942	
Lee High (Cambridge Courts Condominiums)	2401-2813 Arlington Boulevard and North Fillmore Street	1943	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Leewood Apartments	1712 21st Road North	1953	
Le-Mar Apartments*	1720-1726 North Quinn Street	1940	
Lyon Village Apartments*	3111 20th Street North; 3000 Lee Highway	1939	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Village)
Magnolia Gardens	5201-5205 8th Road South; 830-856 and 831-857 South Frederick Street	1948	
Marlow Apartments (Rosslyn Heights)*	1220-1224 and 1300-1304 North Meade Street	1953	
Mason Apartments	4030 Washington Boulevard	1943	
McClaine Apartments*	1515-1519 North Barton Street; 2416-2424 16th Street North	1939	
McClaine Courts*	2500-2502 Lee Highway	1939	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Village)
Nalbert Apartments	1301-1319 Fort Myer Drive	1950	
Oak Springs	2000-2024 and 2013-2025 5th Street South	1941-1942	VLR, NR HD (Penrose)
Oakland Apartments*	3804-3814 Columbia Pike	1954-1956	
Palisade Gardens	North Scott Street and 21st Street North	1947	
Park Glen Apartments	700-708 and 800-822 South Arlington Mill Drive	1947	

Phase 1 HRI List

Pierce Queen Apartments	1600-1610 16th Street North; 1520 North Pierce Street; 1515 and 1521 North Queen Street	1942/1947	FMHN (full)
Pomar Apartments	1123-1125 North Randolph Street	1953	
Quebec Apartments	1000-1020 and 1005-1023 South Quebec Street; 4010-4012 Columbia Pike	1953	
Queen Anne Apartments	518-532 North Thomas Street	1944	
Queens Court Apartments*	1801-1805 North Quinn Street	1941	
Quinn Apartments	1410 North Quinn Street	1942/1952	
Radnor Apartments	1400-1402 12th Street North	1953	
Rahill Apartments	16th Street North; North Quinn Street; North Queen Street	1940-1942	FMHN (full, on north half of block)
Redferne Gardens	5611 Washington Boulevard; 1401-1407 North Kenilworth Street	1940	
Stratford Courts	1336 North Ode Street	1943	
Swansen Apartments	1601 North Rhodes Street; 1600 North Quinn Street	1942	
Taft Manor Apartments	2005 Fairfax Drive	1953-1954	
The Thomas Apartments	540 North Thomas Street	1953	
Unnamed Apartment Building*	2634 Lee Highway	1940	
Unnamed Apartment Building	2040 North Vermont Street	1947	
Unnamed Apartment Building	2060 North Vermont Street	1947	
Unnamed Apartment Building*	500 South Courthouse Road	1954	VLR, NR HD (Penrose)
Unnamed Apartment Building	319-323 South Wayne Street	1940	VLR, NR HD (Penrose)
Unnamed Apartment Building	200-204 South Veitch Street	1940	VLR, NR HD (Penrose)
Unnamed Apartment Building	2116-2120 2nd Street South	1940	
Vale Apartments*	4751-4753 and 4750-4752 21st Road North	1938	
The Virginian*	1500 Arlington Boulevard	1950	
Walter Reed Apartments (Commons of Arlington)*	1301-1305 and 1315-1319 South Walter Reed Drive; 2900-2914 13th Road South	1948	VLR, NR
Washington and Lee Apartments*	Arlington Boulevard and 2nd Street North	1948	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)

Phase 1 HRI List

Westmoreland Terrace*	1320-1322 Fort Myer Drive; 1301-1313 North Ode Street	1947	
Westover Apartments*	Washington Boulevard and Patrick Henry Drive	1939-1941	VLR, NR HD (Westover)
Westover Courts	Washington Boulevard and North Lancaster Street	1940	VLR, NR HD (Westover)
Windsor (Whitefield Commons)	100-110 and 200-204 North Thomas Street	1942	

Important -- Commercial Buildings

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
A & P Grocery Store	3012-3014 Wilson Boulevard	1937	CSP (facade)
Arlington Market	1142-1144 North Stuart Street	Circa 1935	
Barber Building	2722-2728 Washington Boulevard	1947	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
C & P Telephone Building	1025 North Irving Street	1938	
Charles Building	3008-3014 Columbia Pike	1937	FBC (full)
Cherrydale Hardware*	3805 Lee Highway	Circa 1936	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Cherrydale Motors	3412 Lee Highway	1962	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Clarendon Building*	2901-2909 Wilson Boulevard; 1408 North Fillmore Street	1949	CSP (full)
Clarendon Citizen's Hall*	3211 Wilson Boulevard	1921	Local HD, CSP (full)
Elkins Building*	2801-2811 Columbia Pike; 927 South Walter Reed Drive	1941	FBC (facade)
First Federal Savings and Loan Building	2050 Wilson Boulevard	1953	
High's Dairy	5517 Wilson Boulevard; 841 North Jefferson Street	1940	
Investment Building	2049 15th Street North	1949	
Kenyon-Peck Chevrolet Showroom (Walgreens)*	2825 Wilson Boulevard	1939	CSP (full)
Kirby's Service Station (Zolly's)*	3237 Wilson Boulevard	1936	CSP (full)
Little Tavern	3125 Wilson Boulevard	1939	CSP (facade)
Loflin Building*	2420 Wilson Boulevard	1946	
Masonic Building*	3195 Wilson Boulevard	1909	CSP (frontage)
Moore Exxon Service Station	3413 Wilson Boulevard	1952	
Motel 50 (Inn of Rosslyn)*	1601 Fairfax Drive	1940	
Mr. Tire*	2505 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1930	
Public Shoe Building	3137 Wilson Boulevard	1940	CSP (facade)
Rees Building*	3141 Wilson Boulevard	1929	CSP (frontage)
Underwood Building*	3028 Wilson Boulevard	1939	CSP (full), Easement

Phase 1 HRI List

Unnamed Commercial Building	2338-2344 Columbia Pike	Circa 1930	FBC (full)
Unnamed Commercial Building	2406-2408 Columbia Pike	Circa 1930	FBC (full)
Unnamed Commercial Building	2626-2628 Columbia Pike	1947	FBC (full)
Unnamed Commercial Building*	2630-2634 Columbia Pike	1945	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3612 Lee Highway	Circa 1910	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	4040 Lee Highway	1953	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	4763-4773 Lee Highway	1939	
Unnamed Commercial Building	4801 Lee Highway	1947	
Unnamed Commercial Building	5053 Lee Highway	1946	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2507-2509 Franklin Road	1940	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1220 North Hudson Street	Circa 1940	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1110-1114 North Irving Street	Circa 1938	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1227 North Ivy Street	1950	
Unnamed Commercial Building	4625 Old Dominion Drive	1947	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2626-2632 North Pershing Drive	1945	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Unnamed Commercial Building	2645-2649 North Pershing Drive	Pre-1935	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Unnamed Commercial Building	1029-1037 South Edgewood Street	1948	
Unnamed Commercial Building*	1045 South Edgewood Street; 2709 11th Street South	1953	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2716-2720 Washington Boulevard	1952	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Unnamed Commercial Building	2424 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1930	
Unnamed Commercial Building*	2711-2715 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1925	CSP (facade)
Unnamed Commercial Building*	2719 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1920	CSP (facade)
Unnamed Commercial Building*	2731 Wilson Boulevard	1937	CSP (frontage)

Phase 1 HRI List

Unnamed Commercial Building	3131 Wilson Boulevard	Pre-1935	CSP (facade)
Unnamed Commercial Building	4617 Wilson Boulevard	1949	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3411 5th Street South	1953	VLR, NR HD (Arlington Heights)
Unnamed Commercial Building	805 20th Street South	1938	VLR, NR HD (Aurora Highlands)
Unnamed Commercial Building*	420 23rd Street South	Circa 1936	
Unnamed Commercial Building*	4800 31st Street South	1943	VLR, NR HD (Fairlington)
Unnamed Commercial Building*	3201-3205 Washington Boulevard	1925	CSP (frontage)
Unnamed Service Station	4601 Columbia Pike	1951	
Veterinary Hospital	2624 Columbia Pike	1941	FBC (full)
Whitey's (Tallula)*	2761 Washington Boulevard; 701 North Daniel Street	1937	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Whitlow's*	2854 Wilson Boulevard	1950	CSP (facade)

Important -- Shopping Centers

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Arlington Forest Shopping Center*	4801-4831 1st Street North	1941	VLR, NR HD (Arlington Forest)
Barcroft Shopping Center	4700-4714 Columbia Pike	1950	
Buckingham Shopping Center*	North Pershing Drive and North Glebe Road	1937/1939/1941/1945-1946	Local HD, VLR, NR
Garden City Shopping Center	5123-5183 Lee Highway	1954	
Lee Highway-Woodstock Shopping Center*	4500-4550 Lee Highway	1946	
Shirlington Shopping Center	South Randolph Street and Campbell Avenue	1944	
Westover Shopping Center	5841-5885 Washington Boulevard	1940	VLR, NR HD (Westover)
Westover Shopping Center	5900-5912 Washington Boulevard	1948	
Williamsburg Shopping Center	2900-2920 North Sycamore Street	1956	

NOTABLE**Notable -- Garden Apartments**

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Aurora Hills Apartments	2701-2705 South Fern Street	1953-1954	
Bedford Garden Apartments	35-39, 45-49, 55-59, and 65-67 North Bedford Street	1942-1943	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Briarcliff Manor (Marlaine)	1300-1304, 1318-1320, and 1301-1309 North Pierce Street	1942/1946-1947	
Chateau Arms Apartments	1727 North Fairfax Drive	1944	
Columbia Garden Apartments	800 South Greenbrier Street	1950	
Fort Craig Gardens	2201-2209 2 nd Street South; 100-120 South Courthouse Road	1940	
Greenbrier Apartments	841-871 South Greenbrier Street	1949	
Kenmore Apartments (Erdo Community)	740 North Monroe Street; 726-738 and 737 North Nelson Street; 727-739 and 730 North Oakland Street; 3606-3610 Wilson Boulevard	1940	VLR, NR HD (Ashton Heights)
Larchmont Gardens	10 th Street South and South Frederick Street	1953-1954	
North Quinn Apartments	1210-1250 North Quinn Street; 1230 North Queen Street	1940-1946	
North Thomas Street Apartments	470-480 North Thomas Street	1948	
Parkview Manor Apartments	1310 North Meade Street	1954	
Rosslyn Manor Apartments	1735 North Fairfax Drive	1955	
Rosslyn Ridge Apartments	1501 North Pierce Street	1954	
Sylvester	1516 North Rhodes Street (1800 16 th Street North)	1942-1943	
Taylor Apartments	1660-1670 21st Road North	1952	
Tyroll Hills Apartments	741-751 and 801-821 South Florida Street	1950	
Unnamed Apartment Complex	617-619, 624-626, and 632-634 North Monroe Street	1940	VLR, NR HD (Ashton Heights)
Unnamed Apartment Complex	700-724 North Monroe Street	1940	VLR, NR HD (Ashton Heights)
Unnamed Apartment Complex	1235 North Quinn Street and 1220-1230 North Queen Street	1946	

Phase 1 HRI List

Unnamed Apartment Complex	461-469 North Thomas Street	1949	
Unnamed Apartment Complex	2000-2011 4 th Street South	1952/1955	
Unnamed Apartment Complex	2100-2106 and 2101-2107 5 th Street South	1942-1943	VLR, NR HD (Penrose)
Unnamed Apartment Complex	3710-3718 7 th Street North	1940	
Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1215-1217 North Quinn Street	1950	
Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	401 South Courthouse Road	1942	
Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	4940-4946 19 th Street North	1954	
Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	702-710 22 nd Street South	1936	VLR, NR HD (Aurora Highlands)
Vermont Terrace Apartments	2026-2030 North Vermont Street; 2051-2055 North Woodstock Street	1952-1953	
Virginia Gardens Apartments	1700-1714 South Taylor Street	1949	
Washington Vista (Carydale in Towne)	1545-1549 Colonial Terrace; Key Boulevard and North Nash Street	1954-1955	
Westover Park Apartments	Washington Boulevard, Fairfax Drive, North Kennebec Street, and North Kensington Street	1942-1943/ 1947-1948	VLR, NR HD (Westover)

Notable -- Commercial Buildings

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Al's Motors (Gold's Gym)	3910 Wilson Boulevard	1948	VLR, NR
Arva Motel (now Days Inn)	2201 Arlington Boulevard	1955-1958	
Funeral Home	3901 North Fairfax Drive	1945	
Funeral Home	2847 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1930	
Ivey Building	3436 Lee Highway	1948	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Bob Peck Chevrolet Garages	1415 North Danville Street	1954	
Unnamed Auto Showroom	501 North Randolph Street	1937	
Unnamed Auto Showroom	3200-3226 Washington Boulevard	1968	
Unnamed Auto Showroom	3924 Wilson Boulevard	1970	
Unnamed Bank	3005 Washington Boulevard	1970	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2900 Columbia Pike	Circa 1900	FBC (full)

Phase 1 HRI List

Unnamed Commercial Building	3206 Lee Highway	1951	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	3811 Lee Highway	Circa 1957	VLR, NR HD/NC (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	4624 Lee Highway	1948	
Unnamed Commercial Building	4745-4753 Lee Highway	1939	
Unnamed Commercial Building	4807 Lee Highway	1940	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1039-1041 North Highland Street	1948	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1122 North Irving Street	Pre 1935	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2616-2622 North Pershing Drive	1959	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Unnamed Commercial Building	2113 North Quebec Street	1953	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	601 North Randolph Street	Circa 1945	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2731 Washington Boulevard	Pre 1935	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Unnamed Commercial Building	2820 Washington Boulevard	1938	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Unnamed Commercial Building	2824 Washington Boulevard	1953	VLR, NR HD (Lyon Park)
Unnamed Commercial Building	3201-3217 Washington Boulevard	1925	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3471 Washington Boulevard	1954	
Unnamed Commercial Building	4332 Washington Boulevard	Circa 1935	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1836 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1935	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1900 Wilson Boulevard	1941	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3127 Wilson Boulevard	1939	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3133 Wilson Boulevard	1929	CSP (facade)
Unnamed Commercial Building	3240 Wilson Boulevard	Pre 1935	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3260 Wilson Boulevard	1940	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3298 Wilson Boulevard	1947	

Phase 1 HRI List

Unnamed Commercial Building	3425 Wilson Boulevard	1958	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3530 Wilson Boulevard	1955	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3540 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1920	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3804 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1950	
Unnamed Commercial Building	507 23 rd Street South	Circa 1928	VLR, NR HD (Aurora Highlands)
Unnamed Commercial Building	523-525 23 rd Street South	Circa 1925	VLR, NR HD (Aurora Highlands)
Unnamed Commercial Building	555-561 23 rd Street South	1950	VLR, NR HD (Aurora Highlands)
Unnamed Service Station	3203 Lee Highway	1959	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Service Station	1032 North Garfield Street	Circa 1930	
Unnamed Service Station	3211 10 th Street North	1950	

Notable -- Shopping Centers

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Barcroft Shopping Center	4801-4821 Columbia Pike	1950	
Columbia Pike Shopping Center	5001-5037 Columbia Pike	1957-1958	
Fillmore Gardens Shopping Center	2601-2707 Columbia Pike	1950	
Shirley Park Shopping Center	2901 block South Glebe Road	1958	
Westmont Shopping Center	3233 Columbia Pike	1940	

MINOR

Phase 1 HRI List

Minor - Garden Apartments

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Meyerwood Apartments	416 South Veitch Street	1950	VLR, NR HD (Penrose)

Minor - Commercial Buildings

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
U.S. Post Office (Ski Chalet)	2704 Columbia Pike	Circa 1935	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1801 Clarendon Boulevard	Circa 1930	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2915-2919 Columbia Pike	Circa 1936	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3200 Lee Highway	1946	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3510-3512 Lee Highway	1952	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	3514-3516 Lee Highway	1953	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	4001-4003 Lee Highway	Circa 1925	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	4050 Lee Highway	1948	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	4308 Lee Highway	Circa 1920	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	5050 Lee Highway	1930	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1105 North Glebe Road	Circa 1936	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1127 North Hudson Street	1936	
Unnamed Commercial Building	954-956 North Monroe Street; 3601 Fairfax Drive	Circa 1945	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2311 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1920	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2317 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1920	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3902 Wilson Boulevard	1940	
Unnamed Commercial Building	549 23 rd Street South	Circa 1930	VLR, NR HD (Aurora Highlands)
Unnamed Commercial Building	3210 10 th Street North	1953	
Unnamed Service Station	4530 Washington Boulevard	Circa 1940	
Virginia Hardware	2915 Wilson Boulevard	1953	CSP (full)

Minor - Shopping Centers

Phase 1 HRI List

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Parkington Shopping Center	North Glebe Road and Wilson Boulevard	1951	

ALTERED/NOT HISTORIC

Phase 1 HRI List

Altered/Not Historic - Commercial Buildings

Property Name	Address	Construction Date	Existing Status
Arlington Hardware	2920 Columbia Pike	Circa 1920	FBC (facade)
Sears Roebuck and Company	2800 Wilson Boulevard; 2801 Clarendon Boulevard	1942	
<i>The Sun</i> Building	2609-2629 Wilson Boulevard	1946	
Unnamed Commercial Building	4611 Columbia Pike	1954	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3003 Columbia Pike	1938	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3520 Lee Highway	1950	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	4036 Lee Highway	Circa 1950	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	4038 Lee Highway	Circa 1945	VLR, NR HD (Cherrydale)
Unnamed Commercial Building	4736 Lee Highway	Circa 1936	
Unnamed Commercial Building	5555 Lee Highway	1948	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1105 North Irving Street	1920s	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1121-1123 North Irving Street	1938	
Unnamed Commercial Building	932 North Kenmore Street	Circa 1950	
Unnamed Commercial Building	1019 North Nelson Street	Circa 1920	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2440 Wilson Boulevard	1963	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2519 Wilson Boulevard	1938	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2521-2523 Wilson Boulevard	1938	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2525 Wilson Boulevard	1946	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2527-2529 Wilson Boulevard	1947	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2531-2533 Wilson Boulevard	1947	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2601 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1936	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2605 Wilson Boulevard	1936	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2607 Wilson Boulevard	1945	

Phase 1 HRI List

Unnamed Commercial Building	2701-2707 Wilson Boulevard; 1521 North Danville Street (Addition)	1925-1935	
Unnamed Commercial Building	2828-2832 Wilson Boulevard	1940	
Unnamed Commercial Building	3016-3020 Wilson Boulevard	1938	CSP (facade)
Unnamed Commercial Building	3017-3019 Clarendon Boulevard	1938	
Unnamed Commercial Building	509 23 rd Street South	Circa 1935	
Unnamed Commercial Building	513 23 rd Street South	Circa 1935	
Unnamed Commercial Building	519 23 rd Street South	Circa 1936	VLR, NR HD/NC (Aurora Highlands)
Unnamed Commercial Building	529 23 rd Street South	Circa 1936	VLR, NR HD/NC (Aurora Highlands)
Unnamed Commercial Building	542 23 rd Street South	Pre-1935	
Unnamed Commercial Building	553 23 rd Street South	1959	VLR, NR HD/NC (Aurora Highlands)
Unnamed Commercial Building	701 23 rd Street South	Circa 1930	VLR, NR HD/NC (Aurora Highlands)
Unnamed Service Station	4035 Old Dominion Drive	Circa 1955	

DEMOLISHED

Demolished - Garden Apartments

Phase 1 HRI List

Property Name	Address	Construction Date
Arlington Boulevard Apartments	1534 16th Road North	1952-1953
Arlington Courts	1310-14 North Courthouse Road	1941
Arna Valley	South Glebe Road off Shirley Highway	1941
Bedford Street Apartments	North Brookside Drive and North Bedford Street	1943
Cherokee	1512-1532 17th Street North	1939-1943
Christine Apartments	2912 17th Street South	1952
Fairfax Drive Apartments	Fairfax Drive and Wilson Boulevard at 9th Street North	1944
Fletcher Gardens	4020-4022 9th Street North	1946
Fort Myer Heights	1506 North Scott Street	1948
Fort Myer Manor	2001 15th Street North	1954
Frank Lyon Apartments	1007-1011 North Highland; 1009 North Hudson Street	1935
Glenelg	2300-2306 Lee Highway	1948
Hillside Gardens	13th and 15th Streets North; North Scott and Taft Streets	1949/1953-1954
Lee Terrace Apartments	2608 Lee Highway	1939
Manor Court	14th and 16th Streets North; North Quinn and Queen Streets	1952-1954
McClaine Gardens	1600-1606 North Rhodes Street	1941
Nield Apartments	1510 18th Street North	1950
Oakridge	13th and 14th Streets North; North Taft and Troy Streets	1940
Parkland Gardens	North Glebe Road & 20th Road North	1943
Paul Dunbar Apartments	3501-3541 South Four Mile Run; 3400 South Kemper Road	1942
Pollard Gardens	North Pollard Street and Fairfax Drive	1948-1949
Quincy Gardens	1002-1008 North Quincy Street	1948
Randolph Courts	1011-1017 North Randolph Street	1948
Rhodes Manor	1325 North Rhodes Street	1953
Twin Oak	1511 18th Street; 1800-1806 North Oak Street	1953
Unnamed Apartment Complex	North Scott and Rolfe Streets; 14th and 16th Streets	1938/1944/1952-1953/1958

Phase 1 HRI List

Unnamed Apartment Complex	1512-1516-1520 Clarendon Boulevard	1940
Unnamed Apartment Complex	4305-4340 Fairfax Drive	1941
Unnamed Apartment Complex	1301 North Courthouse Road; 1314 and 1322 North Troy Street	1942
Unnamed Apartment Complex	1509-1511 and 1521-1523 16th Road North	1947-1952
Unnamed Apartment Complex	1215 North Scott Street; 1800-1802 13th Street North; 1314-1316 North Rolfe Street	1949/1952
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	2807 North Pershing Drive	1935
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	2647-2649 North Pershing Drive	1935
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	2753-2757 Washington Boulevard	1935
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1601 North Randolph Street	1938
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1021 Vermont Street	1939
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1545 17th Road North	1939
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1449 17th Street North	1939
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1609-1617 North Queen Street	1940
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1016 North Vermont Street	1940
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1811-1813 North Veitch Street	1942
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1628-1636 North Oak Street	1943
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1527 17th Street North	1944
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1219 North Taft Street	1946
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1209 North Taft Street	1946
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1556-1558 16th Street North	1947
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1112A North Stafford Street	1947
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	515-517 North Piedmont Street	1948
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1233 North Scott Street	1949
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1721 17th Street North	1950
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1635-1637 North Oak Street	1950
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1600 North Pierce Street	1950
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1601 16th Street North	1950
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1405 North Scott Street	1952
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1127-1129 North Stuart Street	1952
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1029 North Stuart Street	1952
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1500-1502 16th Road North	1952
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1516 16th Road North	1952
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1545 16th Road North	1953
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1602 Fort Myer Drive	1953-1954
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1804-1808 North Quinn Street	1954

Phase 1 HRI List

Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1600 North Quinn Street	1942
Unnamed Low-Rise Building	1631 North Ode Street/1524-1532 Clarendon BoulevardStreet North (Clarendon Boulevard.)	1944

Demolished - Commercial Buildings

Property Name	Address	Construction Date
Bob Peck Chevrolet Showroom	800 North Glebe Road	1964
Bob Peck Used Cars	2636 Wilson Boulevard	1950
Esso Service Station	2900 Wilson Boulevard	1940-1955
Food Fair Grocery Store	2900 Clarendon Boulevard	1956
Kann's Virginia Square	3401-3521 Fairfax Drive	1951
Safeway Grocery Store	2201 North Pershing Drive	1941
Safeway Grocery Store	2301 Columbia Pike	1951
Unnamed Bank	2924-2828 Columbia Pike	1948
Unnamed Commercial Building	3141 Wilson Boulevard	1920s
Unnamed Commercial Building	3143 Wilson Boulevard	1920s
Unnamed Commercial Building	3147 Wilson Boulevard	1920s
Unnamed Commercial Building	3151 Wilson Boulevard	1920s
Unnamed Commercial Building	1407 North Fillmore Street	1920s
Unnamed Commercial Building	2618-2622 Wilson Boulevard	Circa 1925
Unnamed Commercial Building	2330 Wilson Boulevard	1935
Unnamed Commercial Building	2416 Wilson Boulevard	1935
Unnamed Commercial Building	3630 Lee Highway	Circa 1935
Unnamed Commercial Building	2301 Columbia Pike	1936
Unnamed Commercial Building	1227 North Hudson Street	1940s
Unnamed Commercial Building	3409 Wilson Boulevard	1941
Unnamed Commercial Building	3620 Lee Highway	Circa 1942
Unnamed Commercial Building	3901 Wilson Boulevard	1944
Unnamed Commercial Building	3824 Lee Highway	1944

Phase 1 HRI List

Unnamed Commercial Building	2614-2616 Wilson Boulevard	1949
Unnamed Commercial Building	2701 Wilson Boulevard	1950
Unnamed Commercial Building	3614 Lee Highway	1950
Unnamed Commercial Building	3032-3040 Clarendon Boulevard	1950-1951
Unnamed Commercial Building	3865 Wilson Boulevard	1955
Unnamed Commercial Building	925-931 North Glebe Road	1959
Unnamed Service Station	3444 Washington Boulevard	Circa 1940
Unnamed Service Station	10th Street North (Intersection of North Garfield and Fillmore Street).	Circa 1940
Unnamed Service Station	1712 Wilson Boulevard	Pre 1935

Demolished - Shopping Centers

Property Name	Address	Construction Date
Arlington Towers Shopping Center	1100 Block of Wilson Boulevard	1954
Lee Shopping Center	2207-2233 North Pershing Drive	1930s
Wakefield Shopping Center	1309-1323 North Courthouse Road	1946
Washington-Lee Shopping Center	102-138 South Wayne Street	1946

ARLINGTON COUNTY HISTORIC RESOURCE INVENTORY

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM: TASK TWO

DECEMBER 1, 2005

PURPOSE & INTENT

This Technical Memorandum lays out a proposal for a ranking system—Historic Resource Inventory (HRI or Inventory) for Arlington County—to establish a dynamic hierarchy of historic resources that is easily accessible by County agencies and the public. Arlington’s effort to create the Inventory evidences a commitment to preserving the most significant of the County’s historic resources and to making historic preservation activities transparent and accountable.

Over the past nine years, Arlington has undertaken a Countywide Historic Resources Survey (Survey), currently under completion by EHT Tracerics, which has documented over 8,500 resources. Neighborhood by neighborhood, buildings at least 50 years of age have been surveyed to determine whether they are historically significant. In addition, the Survey includes a paper file of information on each historic property, including a survey form, a site plan, and black and white photographs. These have been invaluable to the work of the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff, but the information is not easily accessible by other County agencies or the public. The HRI will better utilize the records of the Survey and better relate the buildings and structures identified in the Survey to the County’s existing 29 locally designated resources and 53 National Register designations, as well as its land use and planning policies and practices. There undoubtedly will be future local and national level designations of the County’s historic resources and the HRI will be created keeping this in mind.

There are far more properties included in the Survey than can realistically be designated or protected. The HRI’s ranking system will provide the County an opportunity to recognize its varied architectural resources by placing lesser-known buildings and existing landmarks/eligible resources in a contextual framework since each category of ranking will be aligned with recommended courses of action. While local historic designation is the only mechanism to regulate and provide protection, having a structured ranking system with clear incentives and policies for ranked resources will help County staff to better provide for the preservation of many unprotected resources. Interventions are meant to provide:

- Preservationists with a system for protecting the full range of historic resources in a proactive manner that connects with other County functions. This will require enforceability for any interventions that are chosen.

- Planners and other County staff with knowledge of Arlington’s historic resources and their locations as they guide future land use planning. This will require compatibility with the County’s Geographic Information System (GIS).
- Owners with a transparent and fair set of policies and tools to guide maintenance, rehabilitation, and even demolition decisions. They will require clear understanding of the consequences and benefits of owning properties in each of the categories.
- Developers with clarity about their options for redevelopment projects involving historic resources listed in the Inventory. They desire flexibility, especially when lesser historic resources are involved.
- County officials with a system that creates harmony between preservationists, owners, and developers so that historic preservation decision-making becomes depoliticized.

PROCESS

Creating a ranking system is a difficult task due to the subjective and complex nature of determining the hierarchy of properties. Thus, a committee of experts on history and historic resources and leaders in related County agencies was convened to guide the process. This committee included a range of perspectives to ensure balance would result from the ranking process. The committee included the following members:

- Dr. David Ames, Center for Historic Architecture and Design, University of Delaware
- Jackie Barton, Mary Means & Associates
- Sophie Cantell Lambert, Mary Means & Associates
- Lisa Grandle, Parks Development Division, Department of Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources (DPRCR)
- Patty Kuhn, EHT Traceries
- Michael Leventhal, Historic Preservation Program, Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development (DCPHD)
- Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Program, DCPHD
- Dr. Randy Mason, Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, University of Pennsylvania
- Mary Means, Mary Means & Associates
- Anne Morrison, Historic Preservation Program, DCPHD
- Laura Trieschmann, EHT Traceries
- Margaret Tulloch, Planning Division
- Claude Williamson, Master Planning Team, Planning Division

Criteria to guide the ranking process were developed in the structure of an assessment form and tested in two neighborhoods and on some of the County’s key historic landmarks. Testing was undertaken in the neighborhoods of Courtlands and Westover (see attached example of a late-phase draft of the ranking forms). In addition, the assessment form was checked against iconic Arlington historic resources, such as the Harry Gray House, Fairlington, Colonial Village, Buckingham Village, the Ball-Sellers House, Reeves House,

and Glebe House, to ensure that the importance of resources of various types were reflected in the rankings.

Subsequent recommendations for preservation policies specific to each category were brainstormed and refined by the committee and are also included in this document. Original recommendations were checked for legal, political, and fiscal feasibility, but further work will be needed to refine the interventions to a finalized list that can be adopted by the County Board. This Technical Memorandum is meant to provide a jumping-off point for that work.

CATEGORIES OF SIGNIFICANCE

Four categories were determined for the Inventory. Each category is listed and briefly described below.

Essential to the historic character of Arlington County. This category will be applied to the most significant and best preserved of the County's heritage resources, those that define Arlington's history. Resources in this category will relate closely to, and best illustrate, the themes of the County's history—especially those identified in the Statement of Significance. They will also retain substantial architectural and historic integrity and as much historic context as possible. The Essential category will only contain those resources truly essential to telling Arlington's history; it will contain a selective list of properties or multiple property groupings that the County and historic preservation advocates, among others, are willing to protect despite challenges and difficulties. Thus, listing in this category signals that a property should be explored for local designation if not already designated. Properties in this category are highly likely to be listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Important to the historic character of Arlington County. The Important category will contain resources that are central to telling Arlington's story, but these may have less integrity, be less concentrated, and/or be less distinctive than those in the Essential category. There will be more properties in this category than the Essential category. It is envisioned that the County and others will advocate and work for the protection of Important resources but will do so with more flexibility than for those in the Essential category. All currently existing local historic districts should be in the Essential or Important category. Properties in this category are likely to be listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Notable to the historic character of Arlington County. This category will identify properties or multiple-property districts that have historic features related to the County's history but that perhaps lack context, have lost some integrity, are scattered rather than concentrated, and/or are similar to other, better preserved resources in the County. The County and other preservation constituents will likely advocate for sympathetic or mitigated approaches to changes related to these properties, but a flexible and pragmatic response is appropriate. Some properties in this category may be listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Minor to the historic character of Arlington County. This ranking will be applied to properties that are neither unique examples of their typology nor determined to be of

high integrity. While over the 50-year threshold for National Register consideration, properties in this category would not be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and would be inappropriate for local historic designation. Historic preservation advocates and program staff will not impede development or other activities on these properties unless it affects neighboring historic buildings in the Essential or Important categories.

CRITERIA FOR RANKING

When evaluating the wide range of historic resources contained in Arlington County, it is important to realize that the incremental construction and varied styles of early development and streetcar development differ greatly from the planned developments of the twentieth century in terms of how they derive their significance. Arlington's pre-streetcar and streetcar houses and other buildings were often built one or a handful at a time by different architects and builders and can be assessed for historic significance separate from their neighbors (ex: Harry Gray House, Glebe House, Maywood, or Cherrydale). On the other hand, the planned developments of garden apartments and nearly identical single-family homes are important for their unique financing and design and derive their significance from their story and the collection of an entire group and its setting (ex: Fairlington or Westover).

Thus, when ranking the County's 8,500+ surveyed buildings, it is necessary to use a system that recognizes the difference between the individual and the group resources. Accordingly, two forms were crafted for the task of ranking the surveyed properties into the HRI: a group form and an individual form. The individual form recognizes resources that have merit and associations that are significant on their own. The group form evaluates a collection of buildings and resources recognized as an identifiable entity that has merit and associations that are significant but is lacking distinction or merit as individual components. The criteria against which the resources will be measured focus on the theme; integrity of neighborhood, setting, and building; and cultural associations of the resource.

Each of the County's surveyed resources will be ranked into one of the following four categories:

Essential	16 to 18+ points
Important	12 to 15 points
Notable	7 to 11 points
Minor	0 to 6 points

INDIVIDUAL FORM

The ranking form for individual resources uses the following criteria to rank the resources:

- Neighborhood Theme & Integrity
- Setting Integrity
- Building Theme & Integrity
- Building Cultural Association
- Adjustment Points

While the individual form does place emphasis on the neighborhood and immediate setting of the resource, the building is evaluated individually for theme, integrity, and cultural association and receives one final score for which the resource is placed into one of the above-listed four categories.

Neighborhood Theme & Integrity

The Neighborhood Theme & Integrity criterion evaluates both the historic context of the neighborhood and also what remains of that context at the date of evaluation. Historic context refers to all those historic circumstances and factors from which the resources emerged, and evaluating a property within its historic context ensures accuracy in understanding its role and in making comparisons among similar resources. The property's theme or story is based on the County's Statement of Significance and is chosen from a list of predetermined themes, to be developed by the County before the evaluation process is undertaken. Examples of the County's important themes would include Agriculture, Civil War, Streetcar/Train/Trolley Suburb, Automobile Suburb, and Kit/Catalog Houses. Some neighborhoods will have more than one theme: a primary theme, for which the neighborhood is most significant, and a secondary theme. To evaluate a neighborhood's theme, it must be considered in comparison to other neighborhoods of the same type to determine how well it exemplifies or illustrates that theme. This comparative analysis is conducted to place the neighborhood within the framework of all Arlington neighborhoods with that theme, for it allows the evaluator to see if it is a best, worst, nondescript, or other remaining example of its theme.

In addition to the theme evaluation, this criterion is scored by examining what evidence remains of the neighborhood's theme and thus, how well it still conveys the theme. Integrity will assess what remains of the features found in the neighborhood during the time period when the theme was most significant; for example if the neighborhood is a streetcar suburb, the street form, vistas, setbacks, materials, and styles of the buildings throughout the neighborhood will be evaluated against what was built during the streetcar's lifetime.

Setting Integrity

Setting is the resource's physical environment and immediate surroundings: what is viewable from the street in front of the address. It includes such things as relationships between buildings, massing/size of buildings, topographic features, tree canopies and other vegetation, and other manmade features. Therefore, Setting Integrity attempts to measure the intactness of the original setting – paying particular attention to what remains of the street's width, vistas, setbacks, original buildings, and landscaping. Elements that would result in a lower score include a large number of historic resources replaced with new, unsympathetic houses or removal of all original manmade landscaping features and tree canopy.

Building Theme & Integrity

Similar to Neighborhood Theme & Integrity, this criterion evaluates the theme and what remains from that historic context on the individual resource level—for one property rather than an entire neighborhood. The building's theme or story is based on the County's Statement of Significance and will be chosen from a list of predetermined themes. On the

building level, the theme could also refer to the distinguishing characteristics of a style or type, be a significant example of work by a recognized architect or builder, or represent influential innovations in architectural design, engineering, materials, or craftsmanship. Some resources will have more than one theme: a primary theme and secondary theme(s). The primary theme should be the theme for which the resource has the most significance.

Once the theme has been determined, the resource will be scored for its integrity – how well it still conveys its theme. In most cases, this will be an evaluation of alterations to the building or site. In order to not be subjective, the evaluation of integrity must be grounded in an understanding of the resource’s physical features and setting and how well they still convey the resource’s significance. Resources that have been substantially altered often may not retain sufficient integrity to reflect the original theme. To determine how the resource will be scored, the building is compared to other resources with the same theme in the County. Such a comparison allows the evaluator to determine if the resource is the best remaining example of the theme, for instance.

Building Cultural Association

This criterion measures a resource’s cultural association with the people and events that make up Arlington County’s varied and dynamic history, as well as how well the resource represents this association. While some of these associations are listed in the County’s Statement of Significance, others might be related to the significance of a specific neighborhood or a group of people. This criterion could, for example, recognize that a prominent scientist or politician lived or worked in a building or that a property played an important role in a notable historic event. In addition, this category attempts to recognize the various people and events associated with the ethnographic and social groups of past and present, such as the County’s long history of African American residents and the large number of middle- and working-class local and federal government workers who populated various County neighborhoods during the twentieth century. This criterion measures not only the importance a resource has in telling the story of notable people and events, but also the lesser told stories of the County and its important class, social, and ethnic groups. As with theme, it will be important to evaluate the cultural association in comparison with other historic resources in Arlington that share the same association so that properties that best illustrate or represent the association are identified. In addition, the association must be documented and must have a direct link to the resource.

Adjustment Points

The individual resource might be eligible for one or a maximum two points under Adjustment Points. The points will be assigned uniformly and transparently and under no circumstances will be given to bump a resource up to the next highest ranking level. The rationale for giving an adjustment point must be clearly stated on the form. For individual resources, an adjustment point might be given for one of the following reasons: last remaining example of a building type or style, last remaining example of the work of a noted architect or builder, first example of a building type or style, exceptional significance to a neighborhood or group of residents, or last remaining example of a once-common building type in a neighborhood. This list could be expanded if deemed necessary before the start of the evaluation process. In addition, an adjustment point might be given to recognize a notable secondary theme that was not scored under Building Theme & Integrity.

GROUP FORM

The ranking form for group resources uses different criteria to rank resources than the individual form does:

- Theme
- Cultural Association
- Neighborhood or Group Integrity
- Setting Integrity
- Adjustment Points

In addition, the score for each resource within the same neighborhood/group is uniform on the group form for Theme, Cultural Association, and Neighborhood Integrity. The scores only differ in the Setting Integrity criterion score and in Adjustment Points. The group form awards up to two Adjustment Points to recognize unique aspects of the group. Once the final score is determined, each resource is then given the same categorization of Essential, Important, Notable, or Minor and then evaluated for its integrity as either “+” (contributing to the group) or “-” (not contributing to the group). Buildings found to be a “+” will be listed in the HRI under the ranking category of the group.

Theme Assessment

The Group Theme criterion evaluates both the historic context of the grouping and what remains of that context at the date of evaluation. The group’s theme or story is based on the County’s Statement of Significance and will be chosen from a list of predetermined themes. Examples of the County’s important themes relevant to group resources include FHA- or Defense Housing Corporation-financed developments, garden apartments, and FHA design-inspired planned subdivisions, among others. Some groups will have more than one theme: a primary theme, for which the group is most significant, and a secondary theme. To evaluate a theme, the group will be evaluated in comparison to others of the same theme to determine how well it exemplifies that theme. This comparative analysis is conducted to place it within the framework of Arlington’s group themes, for it allows the evaluator to see if it is one of many, the very best, or the very worst remaining example of its theme.

Cultural Association

This criterion measures a group’s cultural association with the people and events that make up Arlington County’s varied and dynamic history, as well as how well the resource represents this association. Some of these associations are listed in the County’s Statement of Significance, while others might be related to the significance of a specific neighborhood or a group of people. This criterion could, for example, recognize that a prominent scientist or politician lived or worked in a building in the group or that a property in the group—or the group itself—played an important role in a notable historic event. In addition, this category attempts to recognize the various people and events associated with the ethnographic and social groups of past and present, such as the County’s long history of African American residents, and also the large number of middle-class local and federal government workers who populated various County neighborhoods during the twentieth

century. Thus, this criterion measures not only the importance a grouping of resources has in telling the story of notable people and events, but also includes the less-told stories of the County and its neighborhoods' important class, social, and ethnic groups. As with theme, it will be important to evaluate the cultural association in comparison with other groups of resources Countywide that share the same association so that properties that best illustrate or represent the association are identified. In addition, the association must be documented and must have a direct link to the group.

Neighborhood or Group Integrity

The Neighborhood or Group Integrity criterion refers to how intact the group of resources is at the date of evaluation. This criterion will be measured by assessing how well the physical appearance of the group represents the original design and layout in association with the historic context of the group. For most group resources, the period when the theme derived its significance is from the date of construction since most are noted for their innovations in architectural design, urban design, landscaping, and financing. This criterion will measure what remains of the original layout, architecture, landscaping, street forms, setbacks, materials, and vistas.

Setting Integrity

Setting is the close-in physical environment of a subset of resources within the group. In most cases, the area will be limited to a short stretch of road, a cul-de-sac, or identifiable geographic unit of a group—in short, what is viewable from the street in front of the survey resource's address. It includes such things as topographic features, vegetation, manmade features, and relationships between buildings and other features. Therefore, Setting Integrity attempts to measure the intactness of the original setting – paying particular attention to what remains of the street's width, vistas, sidewalks, setbacks, and buildings from the County's historic periods, as well as landscaping and mature tree cover.

Adjustment Points

The group might be eligible for one or two of the maximum two adjustment points to recognize exceptional or unique attributes. The points will be assigned uniformly and transparently and under no circumstances will be given to bump a group up to the next highest ranking level. Documentation of why an adjustment point is given must be clearly stated on the form. For group resources, an adjustment point might be given for one of the following reasons: the work of a notable architect, first or best example of a group, or exceptional significance to a neighborhood or group of residents. In addition, an adjustment point might be given to recognize a notable secondary theme that was not scored under theme. This list may be expanded before the County undertakes the evaluation process, when the theme lists are developed.

POLICIES FOR CATEGORIES

While making the Survey records available to County agencies and the public has inherent value and stands to raise awareness of Arlington's historic resources, the Inventory will be most useful and meaningful if it includes clear County policies for its historic resources. The interventions and policies suggested below have been reviewed and refined by the

Task 2 committee, but have not been extensively reviewed or discussed outside of this committee. They have also not undergone an official legal and fiscal analysis. Thus, they should be viewed as a strong starting point for the development of category-based policies and interventions for the County.

Although policies are an important part of the Inventory, Virginia's status as a strict "Dillon-rule" state¹ translates into restrictions on what policies and limits Arlington County can apply to property owners without specific state-enabling legislation. Thus, the focus of many of the recommendations below is on voluntary action and incentives, and where restrictions or enforcement are recommended, it is acknowledged that new state enabling legislation is likely needed.

Integration with County Information Systems: All Categories

The information contained in the Historic Architectural Survey's files, summaries, and database provides a permanent written and photographic record of the County's architectural heritage; facilitates informed decision making on issues regarding preservation planning and land development; and permits evaluation of properties for nomination to the national, state, and local registers. The HRI will make these records even more valuable by serving as an effective tool for Arlington's planning functions. The Inventory records must be user-friendly and provide easy information retrieval through linkage with other systems, such as the County's GIS, a dynamic electronic database that displays information spatially. When the paper files of the historic architectural survey are converted to a GIS-compatible format, data on historic resources can be easily integrated with other County information and maps. A sample of a scanned Survey record is attached to this memo. The HRI's ranked categories can be displayed, informing preservationists, planners, and County citizens where historic resources in Arlington are located. This information can then be displayed and juxtaposed with potential pressures or threats to preservation, allowing proactive approaches by County leadership and inclusion in the County's Comprehensive Plan and in sector and neighborhood plans. Other information systems to integrate the Inventory into include those used for real estate and tax assessment information, including the Real Estate Assessment database used by Zoning and other County staff.

Technical Assistance: All Categories

Historic Preservation Program staff should offer technical assistance to all owners of historic properties listed in the Inventory. Information on National Register of Historic Places designation, Virginia and federal rehabilitation tax credits, appropriate rehabilitation or addition approaches, and more should be accessible through the HPP. While all this is not currently available in easily shared form, over time the HPP could develop guides, brochures, and online information that can be accessed by property owners with relatively little staff effort. For example, design guidelines for voluntary restoration and preservation-friendly rehabilitation work could be created for Arlington's typical historical styles and made available online.

¹ Written in 1868 by Judge John F. Dillon, Dillon's Rule established state control over cities and localities, limiting the power of municipalities to that expressly granted by the state. In Virginia, this is interpreted as state-enabling legislation, and municipalities may not undertake actions for which the state has not passed direct legislation.

Awareness Raising: All Categories

Awareness of properties in the Inventory should be heightened among citizens, as well as County staff. One easy way to accomplish this is by making available as much of the Inventory information as possible to as many people as possible. Searchable online maps with zoom capabilities, provided through the County's website, should allow residents to identify historically significant buildings in their neighborhoods. A regular newsletter, article in an HPP annual report, or online feature that highlights interesting resources in the Essential or Important categories would expand understanding of Arlington's story. Listing all Essential and Important properties in the neighborhood sector plans and neighborhood conservation plans would also raise awareness. Providing plaques at cost or partial cost to owners of Essential, Important, and perhaps even Notable resources would offer a visible reminder that historic resources are prevalent in the County.

Research & Documentation: All Categories

Full histories and photo documentation for the resources in the Inventory, especially those ranked in the Essential and Important categories, will be needed. Historical photographic and demolition documentation should be performed as staff is available to do so. Documentation and deeper research into a building's story may be triggered by an application for demolition or renovation on a resource listed in the Inventory, for many properties in Arlington were home to nationally known, significant people, but there is a dearth of current research efforts on this topic. This intervention provides opportunity for Arlington's heritage organizations to serve as partners, providing research and information on ranked properties.

Salvage: All Categories

In cases of by-right development that includes demolition of a resource on the Inventory, salvage should be sought before demolition takes place. A clear process and set of responsibilities for the collection, storage, and re-distribution of salvaged material should be established to enable historic features to be reused.

Local district designation: Essential & Some Important

Virginia's state-enabling legislation for local historic districts (Virginia Code 15.2-2306) provides localities the right to adopt ordinances and delineate historic districts. Receiving an Essential ranking in the Inventory should automatically trigger the exploration process for local designation if the resource is not already locally designated. This process would include education and outreach to property owners and an assessment of whether individual or multiple-property district designation is the best option. In addition, incentives to garner property owner interest in and support for local designation of Essential resources should be provided. One option would be to provide grants to property owners who agree to local designation; Aspen, CO, gives a \$2,000 grant to those who support designation of their properties and also provides zero-interest loans up to \$10,000 for the maintenance of historic buildings when owners demonstrate economic hardship.

Virginia Code 15.2-2306 does not require owner consent for the designation of a district, nor does Arlington's ordinance; however, it has long been the practice of the County to seek public input and owner support before creating local historic districts. Because this

practice avoids resistance to exploring the local designation process—giving neighborhoods the opportunity to look into historic district status without fearing the County will impose designation—it is recommended that public input and owner support continue to be an important feature of the County’s process. However, should an Essential or Important property that garners much interest and support from citizens come under significant threat, the County has the ability to designate that property, even if it is privately owned.

Listing in the National Register of Historic Places: Essential & Important

All Essential resources should be evaluated for eligibility for listing as individual landmarks or districts in the National Register of Historic Places and in the Virginia Landmarks Register. In addition, nationally significant Essential resources should also be assessed as potential National Historic Landmark listings. When all Essential resources have been evaluated for eligibility, the Important category should undergo a similar assessment. In cases where local designation is not feasible or advisable, listing in the National Register of Historic Places can serve as an early awareness- and support-raising step and also offers the incentive of state and federal rehabilitation tax credits. Arlington’s impressive recent performance in successfully promoting National Register of Historic Places listings indicates this strategy would be a continuation of current practice with a new focus based on the Inventory’s Essential and Important categories.

Easements: Essential & Some Important

According to Virginia Code 10.1-1009, conservation easements may be conveyed for the purposes of “preserving the historic, architectural or archaeological aspects of real property,” and easements must be donated to a charitable organization. A conservation easement is an interest in but not possession of property—normally held by a charitable organization—that imposes limitations or obligations on the possessor of said property. The purpose of an easement is typically to protect some important characteristic of the property, which can include natural resources, open-space, special use, or historical, architectural or archaeological features. The limitations or obligations are normally assigned a fiscal value, which can then be deducted from the possessor’s tax liability. Easements are long-term protections that property owners voluntarily subscribe to and, as such, are a good fit to the political landscape in Virginia.

The Northern Virginia Conservation Land Trust would be the most likely holder of such an easement as the current holder of many easements—most of which are for open space purposes but some of which are historic. The Commonwealth of Virginia is a model for using easements as a measure of protection for key resources, for the Virginia Department of Historic Resources operates an active easement program to protect Virginia Landmarks. The County may even choose to offer some incentive for owners of Essential and some Important properties to participate in an easement program, such as a low-interest loan or matching grant program for rehabilitation of a property under historic easement.

County Acquisition: Essential & Select Important

Arlington County should seek to acquire the “best of the best” and the most threatened of the Essential properties. In some cases, an Important resource may warrant acquisition for

its importance to a neighborhood's or the County's history. Current state-enabling legislation on "Preservation of historical sites and architectural areas," Virginia Code 15.2-2306, allows jurisdictions to "acquire in any legal manner" a property that is historically significant. The use of condemnation is only allowable when the historic value of said property is in danger of being destroyed. However, proactive engagement with those who own Essential and select Important resources may yield options to buy or actual sale through the voluntary actions of the owner. Some examples of desirable situations for County acquisition include the following:

- Arlington negotiates with the owner of an Essential resource in a high development area to secure a commitment to offer the property for sale to the County first whenever the property is to be sold.
- The County negotiates with a property owner who has put in a permit to demolish or seriously alter an Essential resource to find an alternative site for development and to sell the resource to the County at market value.
- The County negotiates with a property owner to purchase an Important resource that is threatened with demolition and has been determined to be integral to a given neighborhood's history and to have high support for preservation from the neighborhood's residents.

Alternatives for acquired properties include public use, public ownership with private use, and local historic district designation followed by sale to a new private owner. A conservation easement would most likely be added before the resource was sold to ensure protection. All these options are allowable under the current Virginia Code.

Property Tax Incentives: Essential & Important

State legislation requires that local taxation structures be uniform. Thus, to enact tax exemptions for specific types of properties would require enabling legislation. However, there is currently tax credit legislation that makes tax credits available to "special classifications of real estate" (defined in Virginia Code 58.1-3230), which includes agricultural, horticultural, forest, and open space uses. Virginia Code 58.1-3231 states that localities may adopt an ordinance for valuation and taxation for these special classification properties, essentially allowing for a property valuation that differs from market rate. These property tax incentives could be utilized for historic properties if Arlington County undertook the process to change this state legislation to include historically significant properties in those defined as special classifications. These tax incentives could be extended as incentives to property owners for agreeing to local designation or other protections for Essential or Important resources.

Zoning, Permitting, and Site Plan: Essential, Important, and some Notable

Changes to the Zoning Ordinance do not require any alterations of the state enabling legislation. Therefore, changes like limiting the scale, setback, building massing, and height of alterations to existing buildings and new construction could be a viable way of protecting historic resources. These features are legally regulated by the Zoning Ordinance and could be set differently in historic neighborhoods in order to encourage property owners

to retain their historic buildings. Generous upper limits on building footprint and height can create incentives for demolition or “monster additions” to modestly sized historic properties. The recently approved (under the County Board) reduced lot coverage restrictions will be a useful tool, which will hopefully encourage homeowners to make additions to smaller houses rather than demolish them.

Site plan review offers opportunities to encourage the preservation of Inventory resources. A feasibility study for preserving Inventory resources and/or historical and photographic documentation could be required in cases where resources are in Essential or Important categories and when Notable resources are significant locally or in a neighborhood and have support for preservation from the community.

The state recently passed legislation allowing the County to pursue a Transfer of Development Rights program, which is typically a density transfer program with sending and receiving zones; as the County pursues creation of this program, it should consider ways of including Inventory resources, especially those in the Essential and Important categories. Density bonuses might also be considered for incorporating a historic building into a new project, much like the Columbia Pike Form Based Code, which allows an additional two stories within the regulated maximum building height when a historic resource is preserved or incorporated as part of a development project.

Other avenues to investigate include preserving sites through the special exception process; approving conditional uses for historic buildings to ensure preservation remains a viable option; and reducing on-site parking requirements when a historic building is incorporated into a new project. The County might better educate the public about the availability of waivers to the building code if requested by the owner. Codes typically focus on new construction and thus can threaten the integrity of a historic resource; Richmond, for example, waives some fire requirements in designated historic buildings. The County might also offer expedited design review on building permits for projects including Inventory resources in chosen categories, similar to the Columbia Pike Form Based Code. Los Angeles has expedited review for projects that adaptively reuse historic buildings in its Downtown district.

Conservation Historic Districts: Some Important, Notable, and Some Minor

The Virginia Code 15.2-2306 allows localities to determine not only the boundaries of local historic districts, but also what those districts regulate. A local ordinance, which can be changed at the discretion of a municipality’s legislative body, sets forth the parameters for how districts are created and what is regulated and under what bodies. Thus, with changes to the historic districts portion of the Zoning Ordinance, Section 31A, Arlington could allow for adjustments to the County’s traditional approach to historic districts; conservation historic districts that have a heavier administrative approval load and that regulate differently from the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. This approach would be most appropriate for Important resources that do not have significant support for traditional local historic designation, Notable resources, and Minor resources that have significant importance to their neighborhood and/or significant support for designation by the public. This could be an especially effective tool for group/neighborhood resources.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR INVENTORY CREATION & MAINTENANCE

As Arlington County develops this Inventory, there are several items that must be taken into consideration.

The Inventory will require updating. The HRI cannot be static, as the significance of buildings will change over time; Essential or Important buildings that receive inappropriate additions or are demolished should be moved into a less significant category or removed from the HRI. Likewise, as time passes and perspectives change, new properties will become eligible for survey and surveyed properties may move into a higher category of significance. This implies a need for reassessment, either on a regular schedule (every X years, for example) or on an as-needed/case-by-case basis with regular monitoring to identify such opportunities.

County-owned resources may be held to a higher standard. While the Dillon Rule holds Virginia jurisdictions from imposing regulations on property owners without state enabling legislation, there is no such hold on a jurisdiction setting policy for properties within its ownership. Thus, the County can set higher standards for Inventory properties that are owned by or will be impacted by the actions of County-funded agencies. This will require the cooperation and support of the County Manager and the County Board, as well as department leaders throughout Arlington government.

Owners may wish to change their property's ranking. Arlington may wish to provide an appeals process for property owners who challenge the ranking applied to their building. San Francisco provides such an appeals process when buildings undergo evaluation, giving owners 45 days from date of notification. It may create stronger support for the ranking process if citizens know they can appeal a ranking, but it would also create an additional layer of administration and begs the question of who would settle appeals.

The County could provide assistance based on risk level. The criteria do not explicitly acknowledge risk, for the committee wished to reflect an objective measure of historic significance rather than level of risk. However, the County could provide targeted financial incentives (grants or revolving loans, for example) to encourage the preservation and appropriate rehabilitation of the County's significant resources that are most threatened. Eligibility could include requirements for easement or local designation. Likely candidates would include catalog houses and Lustron houses, but in setting up such an assistance program, Arlington would have to determine which resources are most at risk and create a system for updating that determination.

Archaeology may have a place in the Inventory. During development of the Historic Preservation Plan for Arlington County, many have voiced support for better attention to archaeological resources in the County. The County should determine whether the Inventory is the appropriate place for this attention. It could also be addressed through other County policies.

To be powerful, it must be objective and stringent. The Inventory will only have meaning if it provides an objective measure of historic significance and holds properties to a standard above politics and other subjective issues. This means that some resources that seem worth saving may not be placed in the Essential or even the Important category, but those in the highest categories will have greater meaning for it.

CONCLUSION

During the Historic Preservation Plan's early development, the idea of the Historic Resource Inventory was born through discussions with Planning Division staff, who were hoping to secure a predictable and understandable source of information on historic resources. The idea grew to include policies as well as rankings, and in the meantime, it garnered more and more support from preservation advocates, developers, County staff, and others. The creation of the Inventory is a key step to providing clear, defensible historic preservation policy and information in the County, and its inclusion in the day-to-day activities of relevant agencies promises to streamline and mainstream historic preservation in Arlington.

ATTACHMENT C

NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2100 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, SUITE 700
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201
703.228.3820 FAX 703.228.3834



HANS BAUMAN, CHAIRMAN (WAYCROFT-WOODLAWN)
JULIET HIZNAY, VICE CHAIR (ARLINGTON HEIGHTS)
JIM FEASTER, DEPUTY-VICE CHAIR (ASHTON HEIGHTS)

Michael Leventhal
Coordinator, Historic Preservation Program
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22201

April 21, 2011

Dear Mr. Leventhal:

The Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Committee (NCAC) enjoyed your presentation on the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) at our April 14, 2011 Meeting. The membership was pleased to hear about the program and appreciated your response to our questions. Following your presentation, the membership passed a motion to support the HRI with future phases to also include neighborhoods. The motion was supported by the membership unanimously.

Sincerely,

Hans Bauman, Chair

HRI MOTION – adopted unanimously at the May 18, 2011 HALRB Public Hearing

MOTION: The HALRB enthusiastically endorses the creation of the Historic Resources Inventory for Arlington County that lists ranked properties within categories by historic significance.

The HALRB further strongly recommends the County Board approve tools and strategies to assist owners in the preservation of their buildings. These would include, but not be limited to:

- Designation of structures in the Essential and Important categories as Local Historic Districts;
- Recording of Preservation easements;
- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR);
- Use of Federal rehabilitation tax credits;
- Use of State rehabilitation tax credits;
- Listing in the National Register of Historic Places;
- Historic research;
- Documentation of sites proposed for change and/or demolition;
- Architectural salvage;
- County acquisition and resale of historic buildings; and
- Expansion of existing local real estate tax exemptions to include HRI properties in the Essential and Important categories.

HALRB further encourages the County to consider implementing new tools for which we will probably need to seek legislative authority. These include:

- Local property tax “freeze” for appropriately rehabilitated buildings;
- Creation of a revolving fund for rehabilitation loans or easement donations;
- Local real estate tax suspension until sale for well maintained commercial historic buildings; and
- Creation of a grant fund for acquisition and/or renovation of HRI properties listed in the Essential and Important categories.

Finally, the HALRB requests that it be included in the review process for all site plans and any other publicly-reviewed requests for buildings in the Essential and Important categories.