

---

---

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

---

---

Landmark/District:	<b>Capitol Hill Historic District</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agenda
Address:	<b>142 D Street SE</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Consent
ANC:	<b>6B</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permit
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alteration
Meeting Date:	<b>September 26, 2019</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction
Case Number:	<b>19-329</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition
		<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision

---

---

Applicants Carter and Julia Collison, with plans prepared by architect Adam Carballo, seek concept review for new rear, side, and rooftop additions on a property located in the Capitol Hill Historic District.



*Contextual views of 142 D Street, SE*

### **Property Description**

The subject property was built in 1885 alongside its matching twin, 140 D Street SE, as a brick two-story bay-front house. The houses were originally approximately 12 feet wide and 30 feet deep. 142 D Street is largely intact on its front and rear elevations, retaining its original dogleg at the rear. 140 D Street has been altered through a large rear, side, and rooftop addition built around 2000.

### **Proposal**

The stepped dogleg would be infilled to the lot line and an additional 10 feet would be added at the rear. A small porch would be added for access to the rear yard from the house. The rear elevation would be clad in hardie plank siding and have four one-over-one windows. A full third story rooftop addition is proposed with a slope-back front mansard and a flat face at the rear. The front elevation of the third story would be clad in composite slate shingles. The third story addition would have a four-foot, seven-inch setback from the front building line and

approximately nine foot floor-to-ceiling height. The new roof would have three skylights and a hatch for roof access.

### **Evaluation**

The intention of this project is to replicate the addition at 140 D Street SE, giving the Board a rare chance to see a proposed project already built. Twenty years ago, the third story at 140 D Street was one of the first rooftop additions considered by the Board. At that time, the novelty of adding height was attempted using traditional and traditional-inspired roof shapes. This is an example of an instance where a traditional roof form has been applied in a somewhat non-traditional way, as mansard roofs are not usually set-back from the front of the building. While more visually recessive than if set flush with the façade, even with the setback, the addition is clearly visible from multiple points of view along the D Street right-of-way.

In the ensuing years since this concept was considered in 1999, the number of rooftop additions has substantially increased to the point of becoming commonplace. As more of these have been built, the impact of visible rooftop additions on historic districts has become better understood. As a result, the Board's policy has evolved to no longer find visible rooftop additions – particularly on rowhouses – to be compatible. In the rare instances where visible roof additions are still found to be compatible, they are typically on buildings of unusual character or type, such as industrial buildings, or buildings of nominal architectural character, such as alley-facing one-story garages.<sup>1</sup>

The Board's current policy on roof additions is set forth in its handout *Roof Decks and Additions: Design Considerations and Submission Requirements*. The handout states, "Under most circumstances, roof additions that are visible from a public street are not appropriate, as they would alter an historic building's height, mass, design composition, cornice line, roof, and its relationship to surrounding buildings and streetscape – all of which are important character-defining features that are protected for historic property."

### **Recommendation**

*The HPO recommends the Board find the rear and side addition compatible with the Capitol Hill historic district, but that the visible rooftop addition is inconsistent with the Board's standards for compatible additions. It is recommended that the roof addition be eliminated or pulled further back so that it is not visible from street view.*

*Staff contact: Moira Nadal*

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, in March and April of this year the Board heard a case at 620 C St SE where a visible rooftop mansard addition was proposed. The Board did not support the mansard form and asked the applicant to return with a set-back contemporary design but allowed a somewhat visible addition based on the building being a former blacksmith shop that had always had a unique position within the streetscape and had been added onto previously with its second story.



*Visible rooftop addition at 140 D Street SE*