



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:** September 6, 2024  
**SUBJECT:** CoA 24-09A, 2725 23<sup>rd</sup> Rd. N., Maywood Local Historic District (LHD)

### **Background Information**

The *Maywood National Register Nomination* describes the pre-1916 contributing dwelling at 2725 23<sup>rd</sup> Rd. N. as follows:

The three-bay-wide, wood-frame dwelling is clad in weatherboard and has a side-gable roof sheathed in asphalt shingles. It has a one-story, three-bay, wood-frame front porch on posts and both nine-over-one and six-over-one wood-sash windows. Other notable features include a gable-roof front dormer with three six-over-one wood-sash windows, and wide, overhanging eaves with exposed rafter tails.

According to the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) records, no Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) projects have been applied for or completed at the subject property prior to 2024. In April 2024, CoA 24-09 was approved by the HALRB. The application included the construction of a two-story rear and side addition to the existing house that would connect it with the existing detached garage. The project required the partial demolition of about one-third of the rear of the existing house, the partial demolition of the rear portion of the existing garage, the partial demolition of the existing rear patio space, and the removal of a 23" Japanese Cryptomeria tree.

It should be noted that the house is situated at the end of 23<sup>rd</sup> Rd. N. and at the edge of the Maywood LHD boundary. There are no neighboring houses to the east and south of the property; the closest neighboring building is situated to the west at 2729 23<sup>rd</sup> Rd. N., a non-contributing house. Thrifton Hill Park, a public park, borders the house to the south, east, and portions of the north.

### **Proposal**

The current application is an amendment to CoA 24-09; the applicant is proposing four changes to the project. The first is the elimination of four windows at the basement level of the rear elevation of the house. These four windows would have been situated in the addition of the design and are not historic windows. The second is changing the rear deck flooring material from wood to a composite material (Trex); the framework and railings would remain wood. The deck size would not change, and it would continue to span the length of the new addition at the rear of the house. The third proposed change is a difference in the size of the windows on the addition due to the use of a different manufacturer. The windows would remain all wood (Marvin Signature Ultimate Wood series windows) and largely match the configuration and

placement of the addition's windows in the original design; however, the sizing of each window has changed by a few inches (depending on the window type) as has the casing for the windows which will now measure 3 1/2" x 5/4" flat with a standard subsill. For example, one of the casement windows in the addition was originally approved to measure 35" x 35" but is proposed to now measure 36" x 24". The largest difference is for a window on the rear addition which was originally approved to measure 66" x 32" and is now proposed to measure 66" x 52". The fourth change is the in-kind replacement of all the windows in the original house. The replacement windows would match the existing in material, design, dimensions, and location. The casing of the windows would also be replaced but match the existing. The casing would be composed of primed pine and measure 4 3/8" x 5/4" flat with a backband with a 2" extended simulated thick subsill. These windows would also be from the Marvin Ultimate Wood series.

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

The DRC considered this application at its September 4, 2024, hybrid meeting. The commissioners did not have any questions or concerns for the change in windows on the addition (both the elimination of four from the design and the change in sizing) nor for the proposed window replacement for the original core of the house. The conversation largely centered on the proposed changes to the deck design. Originally, the amended design of the deck included the use of a tension-cable system for the railings. Mr. Wenchel expressed concerns that this design would be too modern, but that it could also be a potential fall hazard for the occupants. Mr. Davis agreed with Mr. Wenchel in that it would be modern in design for Maywood. Ms. Foster asked if the back deck would be attached to the original house at all or if it was just on the addition. Ms. Tawney and the applicant, Mr. McKenna, confirmed that the back deck would only be on the addition, not the historic house. Mr. McKenna explained the intent of the design which was to further highlight the fact that this was a new addition to a historic house and to create visual transparency so a more continuous view of the surrounding nature would be available to the homeowners. Ms. Foster agreed that the transparency was important and felt that the design was appropriate because it was not on the contributing portion of the house and was on the rear elevation; she felt comfortable with the design. Mr. Dudka said he understood the motive behind the design choice, but pointed out that he did not think such a design choice had been approved in Maywood or was allowable per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Ms. Tawney offered that there were no specific guidelines for decks in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. The commissioners felt that if the design of the deck was to remain then it would need to be placed on the Discussion Agenda so that the full HALRB could decide. Mr. McKenna stated that, based on the conversation, he wanted to change the deck design back to that of the original wood design, but retain the composite decking material in the application. With that update to the project in mind, the DRC placed this item on the Consent Agenda for the September 18, 2024, hybrid HALRB public hearing.

### **Recommendation**

The HPP staff recommends approval of the subject application. The elimination of four windows at the basement level from the addition's design as well as the minimal change in sizing of the addition's windows overall due to a change in manufacturer are minor amendments to the project overall and would not have a discernible impact from the streetscape or on the historic house.

Per Appendix H: In-Kind Window Replacement Guidelines of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*, the HALRB "will permit in-kind, identical window replacements for typical windows in Maywood." (pg. H-1). Typical windows are described as having typical sash configurations (one-over-one, six-over-six, single-pane casement windows, etc.); all the windows proposed to be replaced in this project would be categorized as "typical" per the definition outlined in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Furthermore, the window replacements would match the existing windows in material, design, dimension, profile, and appearance, fit properly in the existing window openings, replicate the existing pane configuration, replicate the



HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD  
ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

dimensions and profiles of the existing sash, framing elements, and muntins, and match the finish and visual qualities of the existing windows. The proposed window replacement project fulfills the replacement requirements outlined in Appendix H of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Regarding the use of composite materials for the rear deck flooring, the *Maywood Design Guidelines* allow for the use of composite materials for porch or deck flooring when historic materials or skilled craftsmen are unavailable, when code requires it, or when there are inherent flaws to the original material (see Chapter 6: New Addition/Building, pgs. 40-41). Additionally, the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not offer specific guidance for decks in the neighborhood. Since the use of this material would be on the rear deck of a new addition to a contributing house, the conditions outlined above would not be present; however, there are examples of the use of composite materials for decks in Maywood. Most recently, the HALRB approved CoA 24-01 at 2900 22<sup>nd</sup> Street N. for the use of composite flooring on the rear deck of a newly built, non-contributing house. Other examples of the use of composite deck flooring include the rear addition at 2309 N. Kenmore Street (CoA 22-09) and the rear deck at 2821 23<sup>rd</sup> St. N. (CoA 21-06). Given the use of composite materials elsewhere in Maywood, the proposed use of it for this project would be appropriate.