

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Property Address:	3409 Woodley Road NW	Agenda
Landmark/District:	Cleveland Park Historic District	Consent Calendar
Meeting Date:	January 27, 2011	X Concept Review
H.P.A. Number:	11-102	X Alteration
Staff Reviewer:	Anne Brockett	New Construction

On behalf of owners Philip West and Barbara Yellen, architects at Cunningham Quill seek concept review for a one-story side addition, two-story rear addition, driveway widening, and front window alteration at this Cleveland Park home. The house was constructed in 1922 for D.E. Harrison. It was designed by Claude Norton and built by William Hoover for a cost of \$15,000.

The house has a cross gambrel form with shed dormers on both sides. The attic level window was significantly enlarged during renovations in the 1980s.

Project Description

The project calls for a total reconfiguration of the house, altering the front entrance from the west side to the east side along the existing driveway. The driveway would be widened at the street end, from 7'9" to 9'7", necessitating reconstructing the original grapevine-joint granite stone wall that runs along its west side. The driveway widening would also cut into the berm on which the house is built, altering the house's relationship to its environment.

In addition, the driveway would be shortened due to the construction of a side addition. The addition would project out about 2' from the original east side wall. It would align with an existing side projection located toward the rear of the house. The addition and the existing projection would be clad in solid wood panels with transom windows above. A new set of steps and a bike ramp would lead into two side-by-side doors.

Towards the rear of the property, the east addition is proposed to continue in the plane of the existing side projection at the first floor and step back for a second floor and attic level addition. A one-story addition projects to the rear, stepped in at the sides. The overall depth of additions into the rear yard is 20'7". The design of the rear addition maintains the character of the existing house, using horizontal siding and shingled roofing on the gambrel roof. Here, the addition repeats the form and elements of the façade, using a gambrel roof end punctuated with a Palladian window in the attic, a tripartite second floor window, and the projecting one-story addition, which mimics the front porch in form and open character.

Finally, on the front, the proportionally oversized window in the attic will be made into a smaller, Palladian style window with a center 6/6 sash with semicircular transom, flanked by 4/4 sashes.

Evaluation

The reduction in size of the front attic window to a more compatible form and type is appropriate and returns a balanced appearance to the fenestration of the facade. The rear addition is consistent with traditional home expansions in the Cleveland Park Historic District. It is deferential to the main house in scale and utilizes frame construction with siding material that matches the original. The architect has worked with the HPO to slightly lower the roof to create a visual break between new and old and to keep

the existing window configuration on the side walls. In its form, scale, and materials, the rear addition is compatible with the subject house and the character of the Cleveland Park Historic District.

The HPO has concerns about changes to the driveway and to the east side of the house. In early suburbs such as Cleveland Park, car parking and storage was typically designed to be out of public sight so as to not intrude on the neighborhood's garden aesthetic. Where there was no alley access, narrow drives typically extended to a garage at the rear of the site. Here, the driveway was presumably constructed at the same time as the house, in 1922, and reflects the narrower requirement for automobiles of the day. The driveway originally extended to the rear of the lot, where a garage was located. The HPO has concerns that the driveway widening may significantly alter the character of this property by cutting into the front yard berm, by altering the relationship of the house to the street, and by creating a forced relationship between the front porch and a driveway that directly abuts it.

However, the HPO can consider the proposal with more visual studies of its visual impact. Perspectives of the existing and widened driveway would assist the HPO and HPRB in better understanding its potential impact on the character of the district. In addition, should the Board determine the driveway's appropriateness, the HPO asks for review of past projects and a mockup of the current wall by a qualified stonemason. Preservation of the historic patina of the wall is important to its setting on this property and within the historic district.

The proposed east addition also impacts the driveway and the owners' parking considerations. Although shallow, the side addition would force cars to park toward the front of the lot, forward of the front plane of the house. The intrusion of cars within the historic streetscape and in front yards is generally discouraged by the Board. Cars are most appropriately parked at the rear of the house or directly adjacent to the house in the side yard.

As well, the addition requires demolition of a portion of the original side wall of the house and introduces a new one-story element to this composed, balanced edifice. Although the HPRB has been lenient regarding alterations and demolition for rear additions, side additions are usually placed behind the primary wall of the original house, where the demolition of significant fabric is lessened and visual presence can be minimized. In the context of such a large project, the HPO is confident that there is an opportunity to gain the approximately 22 square feet of interior space in another, less prominent area of the property instead of in a side addition pushed toward the front of the house. Such visible side additions are generally discouraged where they affect the overall proportions of the house and/or can be incorporated elsewhere in the design. In addition, the solid panel siding with transom windows is out of context and considered an incompatible exterior treatment. Siding on the existing or any new side projection should be compatible with the existing house.

Recommendation

The HPO recommends that the Board take the following actions:

- Approve the rear addition as designed
- Direct the applicants to work the side addition into the overall scope of the project in a less visible location and more compatible manner and to delegate final approval to staff
- Submit perspective studies, a model, or other visual aids for the driveway widening for further consideration by the Board.