



HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD  
ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS STAFF REPORT

**TO:** Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB)  
**FROM:** Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Associate Planner  
**DATE:** May 7, 2024  
**SUBJECT:** CoA 24-13, 2904 22<sup>nd</sup> St. N., Maywood Local Historic District (LHD)

### **Background Information**

The *Maywood National Register Nomination* describes the pre-1923 contributing dwelling at 2904 22<sup>nd</sup> St. N. as follows:

The two-bay-wide, wood-frame dwelling rests on a solid parged foundation. It is clad in lapped wood siding and has a hipped roof sheathed in asphalt shingles. It has an enclosed one-story, two-bay, wood-frame front porch. Window and door surrounds are beaded. Other notable features include a hip-roof dormer, wide, overhanging eaves, and a shouldered brick exterior end chimney.

In June 2008, the HALRB approved CoA 08-20 to redesign the enclosed front porch. The front porch, which had been an open porch, at some point was screened. In 1978, the owners enclosed both the rear and front screened-in porches by replacing the screens with windows and vinyl siding. It was in this same year that vinyl siding was added to the entire house. CoA 08-20 included the removal of the entry door and roof, as well as the relocation of the interior entry door, sidelights, and transom to the outer wall of the enclosed porch. This is the doorway that is visible from the front exterior elevation today.

In October 2010, the HALRB approved CoA 10-20 for the installation of standing-seam metal on the front porch roof and an alteration to the metal roof caps. That same month, the HPP staff approved Administrative CoA 10-14 for the installation of a fence in the rear yard. In August 2019, the HALRB approved CoA 19-11 for the replacement of three basement windows and the conversion of a wall penetration containing an A/C unit back into a window.

In July 2023, a storm impacted the Arlington region which caused a large tree in the back yard to fall on the rear of the house. The current proposal, in part, is a response to the ongoing repairs needed due to the storm damage.

### **Proposal**

The applicant is proposing several alterations to both the existing roof and front entryway. The proposal includes the reconstruction of the existing roof using a new truss system which would increase the overall height of the house by 1'. The new roof would be clad in architectural asphalt shingles. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to install a new roof dormer on the west elevation; the rear roof elevation would

remain without a dormer. Each dormer would have a front-gable roof, a switch from the hipped roofs on the existing dormers. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to replace the existing vinyl casement windows in the dormers with French casement, Anderson E series windows (aluminum-clad wood) with simulated-divided-lites. Any replacement siding on the dormers, including the siding used in the gable end of the roof, would match the existing vinyl siding on the house (that was installed in 1978).

Regarding the front entrance, the applicant is proposing to replace the entire front entryway (door, sidelights, and transom) with a “replica.” The applicant desires to resolve energy efficiency and security issues with the existing door. The existing door handle would be re-used. If possible, the existing decorative woodwork underneath the door glazing will be salvaged; if not, it will be replicated. The existing bevel-edged glass in the door and the insulated glass in the sidelights and transom also will be replaced as will the existing deadbolt hardware.

### **Design Review Committee (DRC) Review**

The DRC considered this application at its May 1, 2024, hybrid meeting. The applicant described how the new truss system would work and the limitations they faced with the design; the existing roof truss system does not allow code-compliant insulation to be installed to make it to be a usable space. Mr. Wenchel and Mr. Davis did not have any questions or issues with the proposed changes to the roof, the new dormer and replacement windows, and proposed height of the house. They felt the installation of the new dormer on the west elevation would enhance the symmetry of the house.

The Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff asked about the front entryway replacement. The applicant explained the issues they have had with the door over the past few years, the measures they have taken to address draft issues with the door, and some of their security concerns. The DRC members did not have any questions or concerns about the front entryway replacement. Given that the proposed changes to the house would alter its front elevation, the DRC agreed it was most appropriate to place this item on the Discussion Agenda for the May 15, 2024, hybrid HALRB public hearing. They stated an intent to note their support for the project at the meeting.

### **Recommendation**

The HPP staff recommends partial approval of this application as presented. Staff is sympathetic to the applicant’s desire to make repairs to their home after it was damaged by a storm last year and agrees that most of the proposed work is appropriate for the LHD.

Although the installation of a new roof truss system largely would be an interior change, it still would result in a slight increase to the overall height of the house to accommodate the new system. Staff feels the proposed change in height is minor and would not be largely discernible from the public right-of-way, thereby complying with the spirit of Chapter 6: New Addition/Building of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. There is also precedent in the Maywood LHD for modest height alterations to houses to accommodate livable spaces (CoA 22-14A – 2317 N. Kenmore St.; CoA 03-27 - 2305 N. Fillmore St.).

Staff also finds the installation of a new dormer on the west elevation appropriate. This new dormer would complement the overall symmetry of the house. In fact, several new dormers have been installed throughout Maywood in recent years (CoA 22-14A for 2317 N. Kenmore St.; CoA 21-07 for 3501 21<sup>st</sup> Ave. N.; CoA 21-27 for 3313 22<sup>nd</sup> St. N.; CoA 22-4 for 2309 N. Kenmore St.). The *Maywood Design Guidelines* state that because of a dormer’s importance “in helping define the character of the neighborhood, their original design should be maintained.” (pg. 24). Although the subject proposal does include a change in the roof-type of the original dormers, staff finds the change appropriate in this case



HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD  
ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

because the new roof type “gable” is noted as appropriate for Maywood in the *Design Guidelines* and the change in the dormer roof-type is necessary for the installation of the new roof truss system. Furthermore, staff agrees that this change in dormer roof-type would complement the home’s four-square form and would not have a large visual impact on the streetscape in Maywood.

The existing vinyl siding on the house was first installed in 1978 prior to the LHD designation. Today, the use of vinyl siding is not allowable in Maywood. The owner shared that the original siding is not underneath the vinyl siding. Per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*, “if the removal of modern substitute materials reveals that the original siding material no longer remains, then replacement with wood siding is preferable, with requests for replacement with alternative materials considered on a case-by-case basis (excluding vinyl and aluminum siding and any simulated wood grain product).” (pg. 15). This indicates that vinyl could not be considered as a replacement material; however, staff finds that the use of vinyl siding would be permitted in this case because it would be a replacement in kind matching both existing material and design. The replacement siding is only being installed in areas where repairs need to occur; it would not be an entire replacement of the siding of the house. Requesting that the owner use wood siding for the repairs would render two different siding materials being used on the house, thereby creating a visual disconnect.

Staff finds that the replacement of the vinyl windows with new windows to be appropriate; however, staff advocates that the windows should be wood rather than the proposed aluminum-clad wood windows. The *Maywood Design Guidelines* state, “Vinyl or aluminum (or vinyl- or aluminum-clad) windows are inappropriate to Maywood.” (pg. 19). The switch to wood windows rather than aluminum-clad would be most compliant with the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Since all the existing dormer windows need to change to comply with state code standards allowing for egress, the switch to a new window type for the dormers would not result in two different materials being used. Additionally, in August 2019, the HALRB approved CoA 19-11 for the replacement of basement wood windows at this house with new wood windows indicating that window replacements have been permitted at the property before and would be consistent with previous changes made to the house.

Finally, the HPP staff finds the requested replacement of the front entrance door to be appropriate, but not the entire entryway. As noted previously, in June 2008, the HALRB approved CoA 08-20, which included the removal of the entry door and roof and the relocation of the interior entry door, sidelights, and transom to the outer wall of the enclosed porch. The relocated entryway is what is visible from the front elevation today. The HPP staff could not discern whether the entryway is original to the house; however, the style, design, and material of the entrance indicate that it is older. The *Maywood Design Guidelines* state, “Original entry features such as sidelights, transoms, pediments, and canopies are important elements in defining the sense of entry and should be retained.” (pg. 21). It is for this reason that the HPP staff advocates for the retention of the surrounding features of the entryway (sidelights and transom). The applicant’s main reasoning for the replacement of the front door is to resolve energy efficiency and security issues with the door itself. Staff is sympathetic to those needs, especially since the door will be replaced in-kind. However, staff agrees that replacing the door, rather than the entire entryway, would resolve those issues.