

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS STAFF REPORT

To: Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB)
From: Serena Bolliger, Historic Preservation Planner
Date: July 14, 2021
Subject: 2326 North Jackson Street, CoA 21-05, Maywood Historic District

Background

The single-family residence at 2326 North Jackson Street is a 1.5-story minimal traditional vernacular dwelling (called Colonial Craftsman in the *Maywood National Register Historic District Nomination Form*) built before 1923. The nomination form describes the contributing building as follows:

The two-bay-wide, wood-frame dwelling rests on a solid rock-face concrete-block foundation. It is clad in lapped wood siding and has a hipped roof sheathed in diamond-shaped asphalt shingles. It has a one-story, three-bay, wood-frame front porch on Tuscan columns and both one-over-one and six-light wood-sash windows. Window and door surrounds are unmolded with a projecting sill. Other notable features include a hip-roof front dormer with flared eaves, wide, overhanging flared eaves, and a wood soffit.

After first proposing and then withdrawing a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) application for a second story addition (CoA 05-34) to the historic dwelling, the owners applied for a CoA to demolish the extant house (CoA 06-04). The HALRB denied that CoA on February 15, 2006. The owners appealed the denial to the Arlington County Board, which upheld the HALRB's decision on October 24, 2006. The owners then took steps to satisfy the requirements of both Section 31A.F.6 (current Section 15.7.11) of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance (ACZO) and Code of Virginia Title 15.2-2306.A.3 to list the property for sale for a period of one year, and filed for a County building permit to demolish the house. Arlington County also hired a real estate appraiser in August 2007 to ensure that the property had been on the market at an appropriate price for one year. The County denied issuance of the demolition permit on the basis that the prerequisites spelled out in the ACZO for the demolition of historic properties had not been satisfied.

Consequently, the owners appealed the denial of the demolition permit to the Arlington County Building Code Board of Appeals and provided additional information in support of their case. The Building Code Board of Appeals then requested that the County's Acting Zoning Administrator make a formal determination regarding whether Section 31A.F.6 had been fulfilled in order to entitle the owners to a demolition permit.

The state enabling legislation regarding demolitions (§15.2-2306.A.3) reads as follows:

In addition to the right of appeal hereinabove set forth, the owner of a historic landmark, building or structure, the razing or demolition of which is subject to the provisions of subdivision 2 of this subsection, shall, as a matter of right, be entitled to raze or demolish such landmark, building or structure provided that: (i) he has applied to the governing body for such right, (ii) the owner has for the period of time set forth in the same schedule hereinafter contained and at a price reasonably related to its fair market value, made a bona fide offer to sell the landmark, building or structure, and the land pertaining thereto, to the locality or to any person, firm, corporation, government or agency thereof, or political subdivision or agency thereof, which gives reasonable assurance that it is willing to preserve and restore the landmark, building or structure and the land pertaining

HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

thereto, and (iii) no bona fide contract, binding upon all parties thereto, shall have been executed for the sale of any such landmark, building or structure, and the land pertaining thereto, prior to the expiration of the applicable time period set forth in the time schedule hereinafter contained. Any appeal which may be taken to the court from the decision of the governing body, whether instituted by the owner or by any other proper party, notwithstanding the provisions heretofore stated relating to a stay of the decision appealed from shall not affect the right of the owner to make the bona fide offer to sell referred to above. No offer to sell shall be made more than one year after a final decision by the governing body, but thereafter the owner may renew his request to the governing body to approve the razing or demolition of the historic landmark, building or structure. The time schedule for offers to sell shall be as follows: three months when the offering price is less than \$25,000; four months when the offering price is \$25,000 or more but less than \$40,000; five months when the offering price is \$40,000 or more but less than \$55,000; six months when the offering price is \$55,000 or more but less than \$75,000; seven months when the offering price is \$75,000 or more but less than \$90,000; and twelve months when the offering price is \$90,000 or more.

On July 31, 2008, the County's Acting Zoning Administrator made a final determination that the owners had met the letter of the law and fulfilled the requirements as expressed in then Section 31A.F.6 (current Section 15.7.11) of the ACZO, thereby establishing permission to raze the contributing house. In December 2020, the Historic Preservation staff confirmed with the County Attorney and the current Zoning Administrator that this demolition approval from 2008 was indeed still valid.

Proposal

The applicant proposes to build a new single-family two-story house with a front shed dormer in a modern vernacular style inspired by the contributing dwelling. The proposed house would be three bays wide with a central entrance and an open front porch across the first floor. The dwelling will have smooth fiber cement Hardie siding with a 7" overlap and PVC Azek trim, and the dormers and gable ends will have vertical board and batten Hardie plank. The front façade's square painted wood columns will have square block footings and capitols, and the porch floor will be synthetic Azek Timbertech TnG. Beneath the porch there will be a painted PVC privacy lattice. The front entry door will be a Thermatru painted fiberglass 4-lite door with sidelites.

Throughout the home there will be Pella clad wood, simulated divided lite windows in a four-over-one design with additional fixed four-lites. The roof will be composed of Tamko composite shingle. The driveway pavers will be EP Henry pervious cobble bricks in a square and rectangular herringbone-type pattern. The rear screened porch will be inset into the massing and will have Azek Timbertech decking and the rear landing will have a painted wooden handrail with square balusters. The gutters will be Seamless field-extruded 6" ogee gutters with 3" x 4" downspouts.

The proposed shed will be an 80-square foot side-gabled structure with the same vertical board and batten siding proposed for the dwelling with an asphalt shingle roof. It will have no windows and one wooden door. Three stormwater planter boxes will be installed around the house per stormwater requirements. One at the right side of the front porch, one at the right side of the rear, and one on the left near the mechanical equipment.

Design Review Committee

The project was presented at the July 7, 2021, Design Review Committee (DRC) meeting. Mr. Dudka inquired whether stormwater planters would be required given the amount of ground disturbance on the property. He also expressed concern about the front shed dormer windows and asked if the trim between the windows could add a differentiation between each window casing. Mr. Davis suggested that the front porch columns be made slightly more substantial in width. Mr. Dudka asked if the front door sidelights could either be removed or changed since the height of the glass pane matched neither the top nor the bottom of the door. Lastly, Mr. Dudka suggested widening the front porch steps across the width of the central porch bay.

The applicant's architect agreed to address the DRC comments as part of the final submission packet. The DRC placed this item on the discussion agenda for the July 21, 2021 HALRB public hearing.

Discussion and Recommendation

The Historic Preservation staff appreciates the design changes that the applicants made after discussions with both the HALRB and DRC. Staff recommends approval of the subject application. The applicants have pursued a modern design inspired by the historic contributing home as suggested by staff and commissioners at the April 2021 HALRB hearing. In response to the July DRC comments the applicants changed the sidelite to match the height of the door lite, widened the porch stairs to match the column opening, added dimension to the porch columns, and added white casing between the dormer windows.

In terms of materials, smooth fiber cement siding and asphalt shingles have been deemed appropriate for new construction and additions in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. While vertical boards are not considered appropriate for siding on dwellings, the proposed vertical boards are being used in the gable ends and dormers, and decorative shingle patterns are considered variable design features which contribute to the architectural interest in the Maywood LHD as per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Since this project is for a modern home inspired by a historic dwelling, staff agrees it would not be inappropriate to evoke a typical shingled gable end or dormer with a modern take on the design.

The Materials Section of Chapter 6: New Addition/Building of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* states that artificial materials may be considered for decks or porch flooring in new construction and non-historic additions. Staff finds that the proposed trim could be appropriate according to Appendix D of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Azek PVC trim has been approved in the past in the LHD (CoA 18-03, 2314 N. Kenmore St.) and PVA trellis was approved for 2322 N. Fillmore St. (CoA 15-01A). The applicants changed the proposed rear handrail material from vinyl to wood, which is considered an appropriate material as per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. The use of permeable pavers is permitted in Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Staff recommends solid wood windows with true divided lites even in new construction. While fiberglass doors are allowed on non-historic sheds, they are not considered appropriate for homes in Maywood and should be solid wood.

The proposed shed would be appropriate for staff approval per Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. It is at the boundary of the acceptable footprint for a shed in an interior lot and will have vertical board and batten siding and asphalt roof shingles to match the proposed new dwelling.

HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA