# HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Landmark/District: Address:	Cleveland Park Historic District 2820 Ordway Street NW	<ul><li>(x) Agenda</li><li>( ) Consent</li></ul>
Meeting Date:	January 22, 2015	<ul><li>(x) Concept</li><li>(x) Alteration</li></ul>
Case Number:	15-138	() New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	Frances McMillen	<ul><li>( ) Demolition</li><li>( ) Subdivision</li></ul>

Applicants Paul and Nancy Piho, with drawings prepared by Moore Architects, seek conceptual design review for a side addition to 2820 Ordway Street NW in the Cleveland Park Historic District.

### **Property Description**

Designed by Sherman Lockwood & Paschel for owner S.L. Spitzer, 2820 Ordway Street was constructed in 1905. The subject property is a two-story, porch-front, stone and stucco clad house occupying a large corner lot. A two-story, largely windowless, stone bay with a flat roof projects above the roof line on the east elevation. The lack of fenestration suggests another house was intended for the neighboring lot, but map research reveals that the land has remained empty since the subject property was constructed.

### Proposal

The proposal calls for a two-story side addition, expanded basement and new areaway. The side bay would be demolished to accommodate the addition. Two options for the gable roof are included in the proposal. Fenestration consists of two-over-one double-hung windows. The addition would be clad in stucco, stone, MDO panels, and PVC trim.

### Evaluation

The house is set back from the street and located on a lot that can accommodate a good sized addition, and setting the addition back from the front elevation of the house is an appropriate siting strategy for a side addition. However, as currently designed the proportional relationship of the addition is not subordinate or secondary to the main mass of the house; it is nearly the same height and width as the original building. While the applicant has worked with staff on refining aspects of the design to reduce the perceived size of the addition, including lowering the roof height so it falls below the house's ridgeline and breaking up the massing by introducing a bay to the façade, these refinements have not solved the inherent design challenge of relating this size of addition compatibly with the house. Further study of the addition's size, width, massing and placement is recommended to create a more subordinate relationship between the new construction and the historic building.

## Recommendation

The HPO recommends that the Board find the concept for the addition incompatible as presently designed with the historic district, and that alternative siting, massing and design solutions be explored.