



**HERNDON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Work Session Minutes
Wednesday, June 3, 2026**

1. Call to Order

Chair Blaker-Glass called the Architectural Review Board Work Session to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Herndon Council Chambers Building, 765 Lynn Street, Herndon, Virginia. Board Members in attendance: Amy Oleinick; Vice Chair Melody Fetske; and Chair Leslie Blaker-Glass.

Board Member Tamim Chowdhury was absent.

Staff present during the meeting: Lesa Yeatts, Town Attorney; Bryce Perry, Deputy Director of Community Development; and Becky Skillin, Deputy Town Clerk.

Chair Blaker-Glass determined there was a quorum with three members present.

Disclosures for the Record

Chair Blaker-Glass asked for transactional disclosure declarations from the Board on any items listed on the agenda.

Vice Chair Fetske stated that she serves on the board of the condominium association associated with the application and filed a Transactional Disclosure Declaration pursuant to §§ 2.2-3112(B)(2)(3) and 2.2-3115(G) of the Code of Virginia. Vice Chair Fetske stated that she was unable to participate in the transaction fairly, objectively, and in the public interest and recused herself from discussion on the matter. She left the room at 7:32 p.m.

2. Public Hearings

- a. APPLICATION FOR ALTERATION TO AN EXISTING STRUCTURE, ARB #26-006, 259 Sunset Park Drive, Herndon, Virginia, to consider an application for the installation of a new storefront and other minor site improvements, located on the south side of Spring Street west of the intersection with Sunset Park Drive and consists of an undetermined area of land**

Chair Blaker-Glass opened discussion to review upcoming public hearing items and recognized Bryce Perry, Deputy Director of Community Development, for the staff report.

Vice Chair Fetske recused herself from the discussion on this item, due to the previously stated conflict of interest.

Mr. Perry stated the application proposes modifications to the commercial building at 259 Sunset Park Drive, including replacement of the door storefront system and primary entrance door, installation of rooftop mechanical units, and construction of an accessibility ramp. Mr. Perry showed photos of the current images and plans associated with the property located within Sunset Business Park and noted the applicant is concurrently pursuing the required site plan process. He stated staff evaluated the application using the design criteria in Section 58-96 of the Town Code and summarized the analysis included in the staff report. He noted there were no overall design concerns.

Mr. Perry recommended that the Board waive the requirement to view the site plan, as the site plan process is not expected to substantially alter the proposed exterior modifications. He discussed the proposed design, including the visibility and location of rooftop mechanical units, potential screening requirements, site plan considerations related to the ramp and parking areas, and transparency of the storefront system.

There was discussion between staff and Board regarding:

1. The location of the proposed accessibility ramp in relation to the primary entrance.
2. The visibility of the proposed rooftop mechanical units and potential screening requirements.
3. The setback of the building from the public right-of-way.
4. Consistency in rooftop screening throughout the development.

Chair Blaker-Glass invited the applicant for comments.

The applicant, Bob Dunning, from Dunning Group Architects, stated that the proposed entrance door would be approximately seven feet in height, that the frame would be replaced, and that no tinting was proposed beyond what may be required by code. He stated that ramp construction is to adhere to accessibility requirements.

There was discussion among staff, Board, and the applicant regarding:

1. The distinction between a waiver allowing the Board to review the application prior to approval of a site plan and a waiver of the site plan requirement itself.

5. Potential screening designs, materials, and requirements for rooftop mechanical equipment.
6. Whether rooftop screening would be necessary on all sides of the mechanical equipment given the surrounding development pattern and adjacent building heights.
7. Consistent screening solutions throughout the development rather than multiple individual screening elements.
8. Sight lines from adjacent properties and the visibility of rooftop equipment.
9. The Board's request to review the revised screening materials and designs prior to final consideration.

Vice Chair Fetske returned to the room at 7:50 p.m.

b. APPLICATION FOR SIGNAGE, ARB #26-007, 621 Alabama Drive, Herndon, Virginia, to consider an application for freestanding signage, located on the south side of Alabama Drive west of the intersection with Van Buren Street and consists of 1.9425 acres of land

Chair Blaker-Glass opened discussion of the public hearing item and recognized Bryce Perry, Deputy Director of Community Development, for the staff report. Mr. Perry stated the application proposes a new sign for Montessori Country School to replace a deteriorated freestanding sign previously located on the property. Mr. Perry described the proposed location, design, height, and material, noting the sign would be constructed of high-density urethane foam designed to resemble brick.

Mr. Perry stated the applicant received a site plan waiver due to the minimal site impacts associated with the proposal. However, staff was unable to administratively approve the sign because the proposed material does not meet the Uniform Sign Standards requirement for durable materials with a proven reputation for longevity. Mr. Perry stated the sign design was coordinated with the architecture of the building, but noted staff concerns over the durability and appearance of the faux-brick material. He stated staff was not making a recommendation at that time and requested additional information and material samples. Mr. Perry noted that material samples and examples of similar installations could assist in evaluating the proposal.

There was discussion between Staff and the Board regarding:

1. The percentage of the sign proposed to be constructed of high-density urethane foam.
2. The weight of the sign, anchoring methods, and resistance to weather and wind conditions.

3. Comparable materials that were approved in previous cases (e.g., the sign at 830 Dranesville Road), and ways to increase the foundation or base treatment.
4. The overall sign design.

Chair Blaker-Glass invited the applicant, Burton Francois, for comments.

Mr. Francois stated that high-density urethane foam is stress-tested, durable, and has been used in similar applications in the area. He also discussed the proposed sign depth and anchoring methods.

There was discussion among the staff, Board, and applicant regarding:

1. Providing brick material samples for review at the public hearing.
2. Simplifying the sign design by removing the decorative peaks on the vertical elements, lowering the height of the posts, and increasing the visual prominence of the blue sign panel.
3. Adding a brick wrap or treatment that more closely reflects traditional masonry construction.
4. Correcting the referenced sign location on the site plan.

3. Old Business

a. Architectural Review for DP #25-01, 535 Herndon Parkway

Chair Blaker-Glass recognized Bryce Perry, Deputy Director of Community Development, to update the Board on developments in DP #25-01, 535 Herndon Parkway. The Architectural Review Board (ARB) last reviewed this design proposal at its April 1, 2026, work session. Mr. Perry stated that the general design and form remains mostly unchanged; however, additional information includes elevation drawings with exterior material callouts and more perspective rendering from different angles/distances.

Mr. Perry reviewed updated architectural materials submitted for DP #25-01 and discussed building massing and scale, construction timing relative to surrounding properties, design consistency throughout the development, shadow impacts on the courtyard, zoning compliance, proposed exterior materials, and garage screening.

Mr. Perry noted concerns regarding the use of vinyl windows, the durability and maintenance of proposed fiber cement paneling, the use of fabric screening within

the parking garage, and the extent to which the proposal reflects the architectural character of Herndon.

There was discussion among staff and the Architectural Review Board Members regarding:

1. Concerns that the Board's comments from the April 1, 2026, work session had not been fully addressed in the revised submission and the applicant's response to the Board's comments.
2. The durability of proposed materials, including: cladding, windows, garage screening
3. Outstanding layout considerations, including circulation patterns, arrangement of the parking and courtyard spaces, easements, and the potential effect of design modifications on those elements
4. The need for architectural elements that establish a clear base, middle, and top to reduce the appearance of vertical monotony to include additional fenestration throughout the complex.
5. Preferred cladding materials within the HTOC District and the use of complementary materials to provide architectural interest and preserve Herndon's character through distinctive design choices.
6. The pedestrian experience along the south elevation and opportunities to improve the streetscape through building articulation, landscaping, and other design elements.
7. Opportunities to improve the functionality and appearance of the courtyard and provide greater differentiation throughout the building design.

4. Comments

a. Comments from the Staff Members

Chair Blaker-Glass recognized staff members for additional comments. There were no additional comments from staff members.

b. Comments from the Board Members

There were no additional comments from the Board.

5. Adjournment

There being no further business, and without objection, Chair Blaker-Glass adjourned the June 3, 2026, Architectural Review Board Work Session at 8:19 p.m.



Becky Skillin
Deputy Town Clerk



Minutes approved by the Architectural Review Board: June 17, 2026.

[Note: Approved resolutions are on file in the Department of Community Development.]