



HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS STAFF REPORT

TO: Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB)
FROM: Serena Bolliger, Historic Preservation Planner
DATE: November 10, 2021
SUBJECT: CoA 21-28, 2329 North Edgewood Street, Maywood Local Historic District

Background Information

The *Maywood National Register Nomination* describes the dwelling at 2329 North Edgewood Street as follows:

The likely wood-frame dwelling, clad in six-course Flemish bond, sits on a solid concrete foundation and is capped by a side-gabled roof with asphalt shingles. The dwelling measures three bays in width and features a central entry, one-bay gabled portico with metal supports, two gabled wall dormers, an exterior end brick chimney, slightly overhanging eaves, and 6-6 wood windows. Other details include rowlock sills, weatherboard cladding in the portico peak, and a molded wood cornice.

It lists the house as post-1956; however, building permit records show that it was likely built in 1944 and moved to the current site, subdivided from a larger lot, in 1963 from 2738 23rd Road North across the park. The nomination also notes a non-contributing playhouse.

The property is non-contributing to the Maywood Local Historic District (LHD). The *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not differentiate between contributing and non-contributing houses; therefore, all homes within the LHD are subject to the design guidelines.

Proposal

The applicant is requesting to modify the existing dwelling by adding a two-story (south) side addition with a sub-level garage. The roofline of the addition would meet the current dwelling's roofline but the main addition would be set back 5' from the front of the original dwelling with the eave of the 4' deep proposed porch therefore 1' from the façade of the original dwelling. The proposed second level façade would have two sets of double 3' x 5' six-over-six Weathershield wood windows. The first level would have a set of French doors, one double set of 3' x 5' six-over-six Weathershield wood windows, and a front porch with 8" square columns and a 36" metal rail to match the existing porch railing. The sub-level garage originally was proposed with two doors as shown on the drawings, but the applicant has since changed the proposal to a one-car garage per DRC feedback (not shown in drawings.)

The proposed right (south) side of the addition includes a fireplace vent bump-out, three 3' x 5' six-over-six Weathershield wood windows, two smaller six-over-six windows in the basement, and one clerestory

window in the top story. The rear elevation would only have one small four-over-four wood window in the addition, with an existing handrail demolished to allow for a small porch over the rear door with a single 10" square column.

The proposed materials include horizontal Hardie fiber-cement lap siding, parged and painted concrete for the foundation, vertical board-and-batten Hardie siding in the side gables, and asphalt roof shingles.

The applicant is also requesting to replace all the windows in the original house with matching six-over-six wooden windows and had proposed to paint the dwelling but may not pursue paint at this time because of the effect on land disturbing activity coverage according to County guidelines

DRC Review

The Design Review Committee (DRC) considered this application at its November 3, 2021 virtual meeting. Neither the property owners nor their representative were available to attend. However, in the interest of providing constructive and timely feedback to the applicant, the commissioners and staff reviewed the proposal and gave comments in their absence.

Mr. Dudka thought that a side addition could be appropriate for a neo-colonial house. However, he noted that the proposed addition was too big and too wide. He said the proposed two-car, front-facing garage was problematic as none have been allowed in the Maywood LHD. He questioned the awkward appearance of the side gable roofline. He thought the addition should be smaller and set back feature a smaller version of the main house gable with a low-sloped roofline, or even have a terrace with a balustrade on it. He believed the addition should be about 2/3 of the size currently proposed.

Mr. Wenchel did not support the proposed porch over the garage. He acknowledged the site constraints and challenges, but thought the addition overwhelmed the original house. He stated that the ridgeline of the addition needed to be significantly lower than the original house and thought the current design looked like two separate houses stuck together. He also asked how people and their vehicles would access the site. Mr. Wenchel requested additional information about the existing property, its topography, and setback lines to help determine if there were other possible siting options for the addition.

Mr. Davis agreed with the other commissioners and stated that the proposed massing of the addition was overwhelming. He also noted that the proposed porch should be deep enough to function like a proper porch. He asked for a site plan to better understand the site constraints. Mr. Davis questioned why the rear elevation did not have any windows and pointed to the large fireplace bump-out as uncommon in Maywood.

The Historic Preservation Program Supervisor Cynthia Liccese-Torres suggested that the fenestration pattern should change so as not to replicate the window pattern on the main house. She also recommended a smaller window size on the addition.

Recommendation

The lot is a 1963 subdivision of a larger parcel and as such is quite small and topographically steep. Constructing an addition on the rear would not be feasible. Therefore, the applicant is requesting to build a side addition. The Historic Preservation staff believes a side addition could be appropriate in this case provided it is secondary to the main house.



HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

Staff met with the applicant before their CoA submission and appreciates the changes the applicants already have made to reduce the height of the roofline of the addition. Staff remains concerned that the proposed massing is still too large and requests a better understanding of the massing from the right-of-way. Staff believes the setback for the addition is appropriate and would allow the addition to read as secondary to the original house (however, this is not clear in the drawings and should be made so).

Based on the DRC's feedback, the applicant's contractor stated that the applicant was willing to reduce the proposed garage to one-car, which staff finds as a more appropriate size. Staff does recommend screening for the garage opening, as was required for the street-facing garage for the new house at 2322 N. Fillmore Street (CoA 15-01).

Staff recommends several refinements to the façade elevation of the addition, particularly the porch and windows. Staff believes that the porch should either be deeper and functional or be removed from the design. The proposed windows seem too large, and staff advises a different pattern. The proposed six-over-six windows are too similar to those on the original dwelling; instead, staff suggests either six-over-one or one-over-one windows to further differentiate the design elements of the addition from the original dwelling. If the window size cannot be changed because of egress code requirements, then staff suggests reducing the overall number of windows. Additionally, staff agrees it would be helpful to see versions of the front façade with different combinations of the reduced fenestration and porch (i.e., reduced fenestration with porch, reduced fenestration without porch, current fenestration without porch.)

On the proposed right (south) side elevation of the addition, staff recommends a smaller-sized fireplace bump-out. This would be more in keeping with the character of the LHD and would allow the first and second story windows on this side to align as they are currently asymmetrical.

Staff also questions whether the proposed board and batten vertical siding is appropriate for the gable ends of the addition, as wall treatments in this area typically would have been horizontal or some kind of decorative shingle. Given that this is a modern addition to a non-contributing house in the LHD, staff defers to the HALRB on whether this wall treatment is appropriate.

Staff finds that the other materials proposed for the addition are appropriate as per Appendix 9 of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Such materials have been approved and used in the Maywood LHD, as well as meet the intent of Standard #9 of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*:

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* do not recommend painting brick. The original dwelling is unpainted, and staff strongly recommends respecting the original material especially since the proposed addition will greatly impact the view of the property from the right-of-way. However, there is precedent in the Maywood LHD for coating unpainted brick with paint or tinted mineral coating on non-

contributing brick dwellings (i.e., CoA 12-19 at 2305 N. Kenmore St.; CoA 13-10 at 2821 23rd St N.; CoA 21-08 at 2206 N. Nelson St.)

Lastly, staff does not recommend replacing the existing windows on the original house as their condition appears to be fair. Historic windows can be maintained regularly with cleaning and paint, and new glazing for the exterior if UV rays are causing them to crack. The National Park Service has developed useful guidelines for window maintenance and repair <https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/9-wooden-windows.htm> For additional insulation, staff recommends storm windows that could be installed without staff or HALRB review and would also protect from UV rays.

Staff recommends that the proposal return to DRC and HALRB to address the concerns outlined by commissioners and staff.