

---

---

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

---

---

Landmark/District:	<b>Capitol Hill Historic District</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agenda
Address:	<b>108-110 8<sup>th</sup> Street NE</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Consent
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concept
Meeting Date:	<b>February 23, 2017</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alteration
Case Number:	<b>16-694</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	<b>Gabriela Gutowski</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition
		<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision

---

---

Applicant Utka Aslanturk, with plans prepared by architect Jennifer Fowler, seeks concept review for a three-story rear addition and construction of a one-story garage at this property in the Capitol Hill Historic District.

**Property Description**

108 and 110 were constructed as two houses but are currently combined as one tax lot. The houses appear on the 1857 Boschke map, indicating that their date of construction predates 1857, and are the oldest structures on the block. The block, bound by A, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> Streets, and Massachusetts Avenue, has a diagonal shaped alley that is accessed from 7<sup>th</sup> Street and terminates at the entrance to the property's one-story garage.

108 features a painted brick façade. 110 has a brick foundation and is currently clad in horizontal wood siding. Visual inspection of the exterior and interior walls revealed that 110 is constructed of conventional wood framing with wood stud walls. Although not discernable from the street due to the continuation of the horizontal siding and roofline, the northern exterior wall at 110 is detached from the neighbor at 114. Both houses feature six-over-six double-hung wood windows, wood window surrounds, and single-leaf wood entrance doors. The rear elevations have continuous horizontal siding and regular spaced four bays of one-over-one double-hung windows at the second floor. An "L" shaped one-story rear wing with an asphalt shingled shed roof currently exists at the rear. The two houses share a side gable roof.

A two-door wood-frame garage clad in corrugated metal is located at the rear of the property. The garage dates from 1904-1928, and a 1928 Sanborn map labels the structure as an Auto Repair shop. The rear façade and garage are not visible from any streets.

As presented to the board at the December 2016 meeting, the proposal called for the construction of a full width three-story rear addition clad in Azek panels and brick. The top-most floor of the addition opened up onto a roof deck. Additionally, the plans showed the complete removal of the secondary northern façade at 110 and the construction of a side addition.

The existing one-story garage was proposed to be demolished and replaced with a newly constructed one-story garage at a new location on the lot. The proposed new garage was to be irregularly shaped, measuring 10'0" wide at the alley façade and 17' 0" wide at the façade facing the rear yard, and clad in brick.

The Board found the concept incompatible with the character of the historic district and suggested the applicant: (1) limit the amount of demolition and specifically to not demolish the north wall at 110; (2) decrease the size of the rear addition; (3) improve the compatibility of the rear elevation through materials and fenestration; and (4) rebuild the one-story garage within the footprint of the existing garage.

### **Proposal**

The revised plans call for the rear addition to now extend across three bays of the rear elevation for three-stories, leaving the back wall of the house exposed for the fourth bay. The top-most floor of the addition would open up onto a roof deck, but neither the deck nor the addition would extend on to the existing gable roof. The rear elevation of the addition would be clad in horizontal Hardi-plank siding and feature two-over-two double-hung aluminum clad wood windows. Two bays at the third floor would feature a mansard roof clad in an aluminum standing-seam roof and feature a shed-roof dormer with two windows. The ground floor would feature French doors leading to a deck and stair. The plans also call for the partial removal of the north side elevation at 110 and infilling the side court; the infill would be set back 10'0" from the street.

The new one-story garage would be constructed within the existing footprint. The alley façade elevation would feature two roll-up paneled garage doors each with mounted goose-neck light fixture. The rear yard facing elevation would feature two single-leaf doors and two one-over-one double-hung windows. Neither the south or north elevations would feature fenestration and all four elevations would be clad in brick.

### **Evaluation**

The revised rear addition has been reduced in size, and the materials and fenestration designed to be compatible with the character of the house and historic district. The proposed continuous horizontal siding and regular fenestration pattern at the rear addition maintains the shared relationship of these buildings while still reading as two separate rowhouses. The use of a mansard roof for a portion of the rear elevation breaks up the massing and relates to the historic standing seam roof at 108. The addition has been reduced in size to no longer extend the full length of the rear elevation or the north elevation, and these reductions allow the historic massing of the two homes to remain evident.

The demolition of the north wall raises two preservation issues: the extent of demolition to the building, and the compatibility of infilling the side court by reconstructing the side wall on the side property line.

The applicant has provided an structural engineer's report prepared by Roger Chebib, P.E. The report describes the extent of deterioration and concludes that the north elevation is in poor condition and beyond repair, and recommends that the wood wall and brick foundation be

removed and rebuilt. HPO visited the site and was able to access the north wall from the rear of the property, as well as to see the wall from the interior, to confirm the conditions described in the report. Given these deteriorated conditions, HPO recommends that the Board approve removal and reconstruction of the wall.

It is not uncommon in Capitol Hill for there to be a space or passageway between two buildings. These passages are reflective of the variety of development patterns and building forms that characterize this historic district. Specifically to this block, the gap between 110 and the neighbor at 114 (built in 1904) reflects the block's layers of development and is a reminder of the early construction date of 110 and 108. However, currently the passageway and 110's side elevation is covered by a roof and siding and is completely concealed from street view. Not only does this condition conceal the passageway and wall, it also elongates the perceived length of the primary elevation, creating awkward proportions.

Removing the siding and roof will be a benefit to the building and streetscape, as it will allow the historic width of the primary elevation to be evident to the public and will also expose the passageway. As reconstruction of the wall is necessary given its deteriorated condition, rebuilding the first ten feet of the side wall at its historic location and allowing infill of the court beyond is a reasonable compromise that will create enough shadow for the historic volume of 110 be discernable as well as maintain the rhythm and sense of massing within the streetscape.

While dating from within the period of significance for the historic district, the existing garage does not contain distinctive character-defining features and is in a dilapidated condition, therefore warranting reconstruction. The new garage has been located in the same location to structure's relationship to the alley as was requested by the Board, and the design, materials, and detailing of the proposed garage are compatible with the character of the alley and with the historic district.

### **Recommendation**

*The HPO recommends that the Board approve the revised concept as consistent with the purposes of the preservation act and delegate final approval to staff.*