
HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD

STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Landmark/District:	Capitol Hill Historic District	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) Agenda
Address:	316 G Street NE	(<input type="checkbox"/>) Consent
		(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) Concept
Meeting Date:	May 25, 2017	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) Alteration
Case Number:	17-227	(<input type="checkbox"/>) New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	Gabriela Gutowski	(<input type="checkbox"/>) Demolition
		(<input type="checkbox"/>) Subdivision

Owners Ed and Lauren Hild, with plans prepared by Architect Jennifer Fowler, seek concept review for a three-story rear addition and one-story rooftop addition at a property in the Capitol Hill Historic District.

Property Description

The subject property is one of fifteen rowhouses fronting G Street, NE between 3rd and 4th Street, NE. All fifteen were originally owned and built by Joseph M. Carmody. Architect Arthur M. Poynton designed houses 302-318, and architect George S. Cooper designed the remainder of the block, 320-330.

316 G Street, NE is located at the northern-most boundary of the “Swampoodle” Capitol Hill Historic District extension, which was designated in 2015. The rear façade has a two-bay wide wing, and is painted brick with one-over-one double-hung windows and single-leaf doors. A number of other houses within the row have filled in their dog-legs and built full-height two-story rear additions clad in stucco and various types of siding. These additions were built prior to 2015 before the extension’s designation. There are three-story rowhouses built in 1988 located within the interior of the square outside the boundaries of the historic district. The rear elevations of these modern rowhouses face the rear elevations of the buildings on G Street. No other house on the block currently has a rooftop addition.

Proposal

The applicant presented to the Board plans for a rear and rooftop addition in March. At that time the plans called for the demolition of the rear and west wing elevations and the construction of a full width rear addition extending approximately 4 feet towards the rear yard. The rear addition would be three stories in height and clad in brick with three banked one-over-one double-hung windows at the second and third floors. The plans also show the construction of a third floor addition at the roof. The addition would be clad in brick with French doors, side-lights and Azek panels at the street-facing elevation. The floor to ceiling heights at the interior of the rooftop addition would be 8'0" and the addition would be set back from the primary elevation 16'0". The rooftop addition would not be visible over the primary elevation.

At that time, the Board found the concept of an addition generally compatible, but asked that the applicant better maintain the existing dog-leg, limit the amount of demolition, and reduce the size of the rooftop addition.

The proposal now calls for the construction of a side addition at the rear dogleg set back 4' 0" from the rear elevation. The existing west wing wall would be maintained and incorporated into the interior of the building. The rooftop addition similarly has been reduced in size and pulled 4'0" away from the historic rear elevation. A single-leaf door at the rear of the rooftop addition would lead to a small deck at the roof of the rear extension. The cladding material at the rear elevation at the addition has been revised to Hardi-plank siding and will feature two bays with one-over-one double-hung windows.

Evaluation

By insetting the side addition the memory of the dogleg is retained. The existing west wing wall will no longer be demolished but instead become an interior wall. Setting back the rooftop addition 4' 0" from the rear elevation allows the historic two-story volume of the house to remain intact and the continuous rear roofline in the alleyscape maintained. The use of Hardi-plank siding and two bays of double-hung windows is in keeping with other rear extensions within the row.

Recommendation

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