



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:** July 10, 2023  
**SUBJECT:** CoA 23-17, 3605 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue North, Maywood Local Historic District (LHD)

### **Background Information**

The pre-1912 Queen Anne style dwelling at 3605 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue North is described as follows in the *Maywood National Register Nomination*:

The two-bay-wide, wood-frame dwelling rests on a solid concrete-block foundation. It is clad in weatherboard and has a front-gable roof sheathed in asphalt shingles. It has a one-story, three-bay, wood-frame front porch on square posts and one-over-one wood-sash windows. Other notable features include fishscale shingles and molded gable-returns in the front gable end. A large, gable-roof addition has been built onto the east elevation.

In a description about L-shaped buildings in the neighborhood included in the *Maywood National Register Nomination*, the house is described further as such: “Also exemplary of this building form is the dwelling at 3605 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue North, which features a diamond-shaped louvered vent in the gable end.”

The most recent review for this property occurred as an ACoA (12-03) in May 2012 when staff approved some repairs, replacements, and improvements of the wooden picket fence.

On March 15, 2022, the home suffered an electrical fire on the first floor. Historic Preservation Inspector Mical Tawney contacted the owner by e-mail and placard to offer support in planning any repair or renovation work. Planner Serena Bolliger also reached out to the owners by e-mail offering help in any CoA applications for repairs or improvements. The Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff received no communications or requests for help.

On June 27, 2023, a neighbor informed the HPP staff that contractors were removing siding from the home. Ms. Tawney went on site on June 27 to inspect the site and found about ¼ of the siding removed. She spoke to the contractors and informed them that they were working in a local historic district and that they needed permission for any exterior changes. She then spoke on the phone with the project manager and explained that any exterior changes would need HALRB review, and that exterior work should cease until plans had been submitted and reviewed. Ms. Bolliger followed up with a phone call on June 27 to the project manager with details on applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness, and then e-mailed the contractor and the property owner with directions and information about submitting documents so that the work could be reviewed in the July design review cycle. Through June 29, both Ms. Tawney and Ms. Bolliger communicated with the project manager by phone, by text message, and by e-mail about the

submission requirements and troubleshooting the submission packet. On June 30, the HPP staff received a notice from a neighbor that the contractor had continued removing siding from the house. Ms. Bolliger again followed up with an e-mail on June 30 confirming with the project manager that they should cease all exterior work until the proposed changes had been reviewed. Ms. Bolliger sent a reminder to the project manager on July 3 that all exterior work must cease until the review was complete, but interior work could continue. At the time of this staff report, the applicant has removed all historic wood siding, wrapped the building in Tyvek, and replaced all wooden windows with new wooden windows.

### **Proposal**

The applicant is requesting the following alterations:

1. Replace all the wooden teardrop siding on the home with smooth 4” lap Hardie cementitious fiberboard siding.
2. Replace all the windows in the home in-kind with matching one-over-one wooden windows (retroactive approval).
3. Replace all the exterior doors, including one set of French double doors onto the rear deck, one rear single door off the rear bumpout into the yard, and the front door, with identical wooden replacements. The rear single door off the bumpout would be a 36” x 80” fir single door with full glass pane. The French doors to the rear deck would be 48” x 80” fir double doors with full pane clear glass.

### **DRC Review**

The Design Review Committee (DRC) considered this application at its July 5, 2023, hybrid meeting. All the DRC members stated concern that the siding had already been removed and questioned whether all the siding had been damaged in the fire. Mr. Wenchel expressed that cementitious fiberboard did not have the same physical appearance as wooden siding and that this was not an appropriate material change. Given the concern with the proposed change to the siding material, the DRC placed this item on the Discussion Agenda for the July 19, 2023, hybrid HALRB public hearing.

### **Recommendation**

The HPP staff recommends denial of the siding aspect of this CoA application and instead recommends that the applicant pursue re-installation of extant wooden siding removed from the historic dwelling or in-kind replacement of matching wooden teardrop siding. Per Appendix C: Cement Fiberboard Siding Materials of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*, “Cement fiberboard is not appropriate as the primary siding material on existing historic buildings.” The subject house is a contributing resource to the Maywood LHD and the National Register Historic District. Wood is considered a typical material in Maywood, particularly as a siding and cladding material, and is representative of the craftsmanship and materials available during the neighborhood’s period of significance. A conditions assessment was not completed by the HPP staff before the removal of the siding; however, even if the siding on all the surfaces of the house had been damaged beyond repair, any replacement material would need to comply with Standard #6 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*:

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.



HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD  
ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

Replacement of typical windows in the Maywood LHD with identical in-kind wooden replacements is allowed per Appendix H: In-Kind Window Replacement Guidelines:

Approval by the Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) is required for all window replacement projects. The HALRB will permit in-kind, identical window replacements for typical windows in Maywood. New typical replacement windows must:

- Match the existing windows in material, design, dimension, profile, and appearance from the public right-of-way;
- Fit properly within the existing window openings;
- Replicate the existing pane configuration;
- Replicate the dimensions and profiles of the existing sash, framing elements, and muntins;
- Match the finish and visual qualities of the existing windows; and
- Applicants will be required to submit photographs and measured drawings of the existing windows, plus product data sheets and dimensioned drawings for the proposed window replacements that clearly indicate exact size and details.

Although the HPP staff does not endorse retroactive reviews, given that historic material can be lost without recourse, staff recommends approval of the window replacement in this case because it complies with Appendix H of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Historically, the HALRB has not approved replacements of historic doors without a prior conditions analysis. The doors have already been removed but given the electrical fire location on the first floor, some of the evidence of fire damage, and understanding the possible damage by fire safety officers, staff can infer that the doors were damaged by the fire. In-kind replacement of the doors therefore meets the intent of Standard #6 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.