



**HERNDON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Work Session Minutes
Wednesday, July 1, 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, 765 Lynn Street, Herndon, Virginia. Board Members in attendance: Tamim Chowdhury; Vice Chair Melody Fetske; and Chair Leslie Blaker-Glass.

Board Member Amy Oleinick was absent.

Staff present during the meeting: Lauri Sigler, Deputy Town Attorney; Angelina Jones, Lead Planner / Design and Development; and Becky Skillin, Deputy Town Clerk.

Chair Blaker-Glass stated that three Architectural Review Board Members were present, which constituted a quorum.

2. Public Hearings

- a. 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 (continued from the June 17, 2026 regular meeting)**

Chair Blaker-Glass opened discussion of the public hearing item and recognized Angelina Jones, Lead Planner / Design and Development, for the staff report. Chair Blaker-Glass noted that this item was continued from the June 17, 2026, Architectural Review Board (ARB) Regular Meeting.

Ms. Jones presented ARB #26-007, an application for a new non-illuminated monument sign for the Montessori Country School at 621 Alabama Drive, Herndon, and outlined the proposed size, location, design, and materials, noting that high-density urethane foam designed to resemble brick does not meet the Uniform Sign Standards. She stated that the design preferred by the ARB in previous meetings was included in the staff report; since the ARB had requested possible alternative materials, she shared a sample of the proposed materials provided by the applicant. Ms. Jones also presented examples of comparable signs used in Fairfax

and Chantilly using similar material, noting these signs were less than a year old and that the site plan had already stipulated that landscaping materials be included in the site plan waiver.

Staff withheld a recommendation, pending further Board discussion of the case and the applicant's provision of examples of other similar applications of HDU foam in nearby jurisdictions. Ms. Jones requested feedback from the ARB on its preference and noted that staff does not have comparable cases as the ARB has no record of approving use of this material previously.

Chair Blaker-Glass asked the Board for questions.

1. Board Member Chowdhury asked about the effect of temperature changes on the material and noted that examples provided are of new construction. Ms. Jones pulled up the agenda materials that demonstrate tensile strength at moderate and cold temperatures.
2. Vice Chair Fetske asked about how authentic the faux brick materials appear from the street view. She noted the costs and expressed concern about the appearance of setting a precedent before seeing the effects of weathering.
3. Chair Blaker-Glass noted that she was open to the use of new materials but was concerned about the longevity and authentic appearance. She asked if there are any specifications that answer the question of longevity.

Chair Blaker-Glass invited the applicant forward to address the Board.

The applicant, Burton Francois, 504 Shaw Road, Suite 209, Sterling, provided comments on the application, including:

1. Current signs in Herndon. Ms. Jones confirmed that historic imagery shows current signs in Herndon made of the same material. She also stated that though they were installed a while ago, there is not a record of those signs coming before the Board.
2. Tensile strength. The applicant discussed tensile strength against wind and other areas of the United States that utilize this material.
3. The cost of brick. The applicant thanked the Board for the opportunity to continue review of the application.

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

1. The five-year warranty. Chair Blaker-Glass noted the manufacturer advertises its products to last for 15–20 years with 500 pounds of impact resistance.

2. Cost and the Board's purview. Chair Blaker-Glass noted that cost is not a consideration under the applicable guidelines. She stated that the applicant's collaboration with staff and the Board addressed the prior concerns. She further noted that the proposed materials are appropriate for this application, that each application is reviewed on a case-by-case basis, and that the Board's consideration of this application does not establish precedent.

Vice Chair Fetske stated that her questions had been satisfied.

Ms. Jones asked for feedback from the Board, noting that context guides decisions. She discussed what may fall under administrative review and asked whether signs using the same material should move forward administratively or return to the Board.

1. Vice Chair Fetske stated that the Poly-Armor brand appears to meet the standard under the Uniform Sign Standards, but that similar materials should still be reviewed moving forward. She noted that use depends on the application; signs may be acceptable, but siding or roofing material may not be, and samples should be reviewed. She stated that these applicant-supplied materials indicate a certain tensile strength, but lower levels may not hold up as well.
2. Chair Blaker-Glass stated that this example gives the same feel and look as brick since this Poly-Armor foam is a professional architectural grade. She stated that this architectural grade was appropriate in place of brick, considering the location and associated neighborhoods. She commented that other cladding styles would not portray the same sense of authenticity as the brick, so each case would still need to come to the Board.
3. Board Member Chowdhury stated that other faux appearances would likely not be as acceptable as this case and favored Board review.
4. Ms. Jones noted that staff asks for samples during the administrative review process.

Ms. Jones noted that the next step was consideration at the regular meeting.

3. Comments

a. Comments from the Staff Members

Angelina Jones, Lead Planner / Design and Development, stated that a training would be held on August 13, at 7:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers. She explained that the flyer distributed included additional information and background on the presenter, who has experience with sustainable retrofits in historic districts.

Ms. Jones also commented on the Historic District social media push, noting that it described the influence of historic districts, the reasons for having them, and the role of the Historic District Review Board.

b. Comments from the Board Members

Chair Blaker-Glass: noted that there is growing collaboration among Town meetings. She stated that she had her quarterly meeting with Mayor LeBlanc and discussed the need for greater public awareness of upcoming projects and active construction. She suggested highlighting ongoing development and the importance of communicating Herndon's brand strength, including both old and new elements of the Town.

Vice Chair Fetske: noted that businesses should be aware of the growing impact of development and the opportunities for increased foot traffic. She stated that activity extends beyond downtown and that areas of the Town will become more densely populated and highly walkable.

Board Member Chowdhury: suggested that social media feature the Architectural Review Board to explain how community members serve on the Town's boards and the amount of work required of Board Members.

4. Adjournment

There being no further business and without objection, Chair Blaker-Glass adjourned the July 1, 2026, Architectural Review Board Work Session at 8:05 p.m.



Becky Skillin
Deputy Town Clerk



Minutes approved by the Architectural Review Board: July 15, 2026

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