

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Property Address:	1231 Good Hope Road	X	Agenda
Landmark/District:	Anacostia Historic District		Consent Calendar
Meeting Date:	April 28th, 2022		Concept Review
H.P.A. Number:	HP 22-149	X	Alteration Subdivision

Studios Architecture, on behalf of the Washington Area Community Investment Fund (WACIF), returns with revisions to a concept for interior renovation and construction of a two-story addition atop a one-story contributing commercial building in the Anacostia Historic District.

In March, the applicant presented two design options and reduced the height and setback of the addition. The Board expressed a preference for the “stepped façade” option and asked that the penthouse be reduced to the minimum necessary to house mechanical equipment. The Board asked that section drawings and shadow studies of the proposal be provided that showed the relationship with the houses at the rear of the property on U Street.

Property Description

1231 Good Hope Road was originally constructed as two one-story stores before it was combined and leased to the Woolworth company in the 1930s. The Moderne styled façade has large plate glass windows, recessed storefront entrances, and a façade clad in limestone panels and patterned brick culminating in a low stepped parapet roofline. The property was renovated in 2013 for the current use as an arts and retail venue. The renovation included new aluminum framed storefront windows to evoke the originals, new wood double doors and transoms, retaining the vestibule floor tiles, and repointing and repainting the exterior façade.

Revised Proposal

The applicant provides the two massing options developed in response to the Board’s earlier comments. Massing I – the preferred option of most of the Board members - proposes a stepped façade that steps back 16 to 20 feet from the street façade. Massing II proposes a “bent bar” - a prow-shaped form that cant back on each side from 12 to 20 feet. Each of the options is clad in a variegated brick, and several different glazing options are provided that show windows ranging in number and proportions. The rear portion of the roof of the historic building would be a green roof. The proposal shows the side elevations of an undefined material, with a courtyard carved out on the upper floors. The penthouse frontage along Good Hope has an increased set back of 13 feet and remains 12 feet tall.

The revised submission added a site plan and section drawings showing that the penthouse will not be visible from across Good Hope Road or from the rear yards of the residential properties on U Street. The applicant pulled-back the front setback by 4 inches and revised the roof plan to be consistent with minimum space required for the mechanical equipment.

The Board expressed support for several of the window options presented last time, including 1A (punched windows with prominent lintels), 2A (9 openings united by a continuous sill and punctuated with side panels to provide depth) and 2C (similar to 2A but with 7 larger openings). The submission includes each of those options for further discussion by the Board.

Evaluation

The Board expressed its general support for the previously reduced height and increased setbacks in both massing options as successful in decreasing the mass and bulk of the addition. While the reduction in the size of the penthouse is minimal, it has been reduced to the minimum size required for mechanical equipment and access to the roof terrace. As shown in the requested section drawings, the penthouse will not be visible from the rear yards of the U Street residences or directly in front of the building on Good Hope Road.

While HPO continues to find the “bent bar” the better of the two options, with fewer corners and appearing lighter in weight, the stepped façade is also compatible in relating to the unusual character of the underlying Moderne building and to the historic district. Of the fenestration options, HPO recommends the smaller openings in shown in 2A as the most compatible of the “bent bar” options. However, if the Board is intent on the stepped façade option, it is recommended that the fenestration in 1A continue to be refined to lessen the weight of the lintels and evaluate whether greater horizontality could be introduced, perhaps through the use of a continuous sill, as in option 2A.

Recommendation

HPO recommends that the Board approve either the “bent bar” or “stepped façade” options and a fenestration plan that follows the principles outlined in option 2A. It is recommended that final approval be delegated to staff on the understanding that the applicant will share and coordinate development of final plans with the community.

Staff Contact: Imania Price