## HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Property Address: 1829 13<sup>th</sup> Street NW Agenda

Landmark/District: U Street Historic District X Consent Calendar

Meeting Date: September 18, 2014 Concept Review

H.P.A. Number: 14-559 X Alteration

Staff Reviewer: Anne Brockett New Construction

On behalf of owner 1829 13<sup>th</sup> Street, NW LLC, architect KC Price seeks concept review to construct a roof addition and roof deck at this non-contributing property in the U Street Historic District. Built in the 1950s, the apartment building stands three stories high and is constructed of brick with an off-center, projecting entranceway clad in fake stone.

## **Project Description**

The proposal would add a partial fourth floor to the building, which measures roughly 64 feet in width by 72 feet in depth. The addition, which is pushed in from the roof edge on all sides, would measure 42 feet wide and, at its longest, 34 feet deep. The addition is set back 17½ feet from the front and 28 feet from the rear and roughly 11 feet from each side. It will stand approximately 9 feet above the current roof.

Roof decks would extend in front of the addition to the building's face and toward the rear of the addition. At the front, no railing is necessary because of the sufficiently high existing parapet wall. The addition will be clad in cementitious board siding with wide openings for roof access. The addition will be visible from oblique angles along 13<sup>th</sup> Street and also from the rear across several parking lots.

## **Evaluation**

The period of significance for the U Street Historic District extends through 1948. Because the subject property was constructed after that date, it is non-contributing. Although alterations should be generally compatible with the historic district, a more flexible standard is applied to such buildings.

The addition will be visible at oblique angles, although the further to the north and south, the visibility will be blocked by the taller buildings that stand to either side. While cement board can be a compatible material for rear elevations, a material that has a masonry appearance may be more compatible on top of a masonry building. Alternative materials, such as brick, stucco, or metal panel, hardipanel, or stone veneer to resemble the stair tower, should be considered.

## Recommendation

The HPO recommends that the Board find the proposed concept for an addition compatible with the character of the historic district and consistent with the purposes of the preservation act, in consideration of the comments above. The HPO further recommends delegation of further review to staff.