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

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Landmark/District: | Cleveland Park Historic District | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agenda |
| Address: | 3515 Woodley Road NW | <input type="checkbox"/> Consent |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concept |
| Meeting Date: | February 25, 2016 | <input type="checkbox"/> Alteration |
| Case Number: | 16-144 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Construction |
| Staff Reviewer: | Frances McMillen | <input type="checkbox"/> Demolition |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision |

Applicant 3515 Woodley Ventures, with drawings prepared by Cunningham Quill Architects, request concept review for the reconstruction of the house formerly at 3515 Woodley Road, as well as constructing a rear addition, basement expansion, curb cut, driveway, and below grade garage to the property.

Property Description

Designed by Frederick A. Kendall for owner William L. Devries in 1911, 3515 Woodley Road was a two-story stucco-clad house with an asphalt shingle hipped roof and wraparound front porch. Fenestration consisted primarily of six-over-six double hung windows.

In November 2015 the house was demolished after suffering irreparable damage during construction of an addition approved by the Board in 2014. Building inspectors from the District's Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs issued an emergency raze permit after consulting with HPO and determining the structure presented a life-safety hazard.

Proposal

The proposal calls for the reconstruction of the subject property with a rear addition, curb cut, basement expansion, driveway and garage that were approved by the Board in 2014.

Evaluation

Though not frequently employed, reconstruction is a viable preservation approach when little to no historic fabric remains and documentary evidence is available to accurately recreate a feature or structure. This approach is also consistent with the provision of the preservation act that establishes restoring a building or structure to its appearance prior to construction as an appropriate remedy in the instance of unpermitted work.¹

While preparing plans for the addition the applicant documented the original house, including all dimensions, exterior features, and materials. The plans indicate the new building will occupy the same footprint of the original house and will replicate its exterior features, but not all materials are identified. The applicant is encouraged to work with staff on the selection of materials, including windows, doors and the stone for the foundation and retaining walls. As

more comprehensive drawings are developed it is recommended they include the dimensions and details of window openings to ensure the new windows match the size and character of the originals.

Alterations to non-contributing buildings are reviewed to ensure they don't negatively impact the character of the streetscape or the historic district rather than to preserve particular building features. Because the proposed building is a reconstruction a more stringent review of any future modifications will be necessary to ensure the features, materials, and overall design of the house are maintained. A covenant for the property is under development which limits future alterations to the building further ensuring the reconstructed house is protected.

Two modifications to original exterior features are proposed. The plans include reorienting the steps and lead-walk so they are centered on the entrance to the house; previously they were located to the left side of the property. The size of the front attic dormer windows would also be enlarged to meet egress requirements. These are both alterations that are proposed in a manner that is compatible with the character of the property. The modest enlargement of the window openings does not raise concerns, but the applicant is encouraged to work with staff on the selection of windows.

The design for the addition has been revised since it was reviewed by the Board in 2014, but remains compatible in terms of massing, size, materials, fenestration, and design. The rear elevation has a more simplified design and more uniform fenestration and the addition's roof falls further below the ridge of the main block of the house.

Recommendation

The HPO recommends that the Board find the concept compatible with the historic district and delegate final approval to staff with the condition the applicant work with staff on the selection of materials and finalizing plans.

ⁱ Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978 (D.C. Law 2-144, as amended through March 14, 2014), Section 11. Penalties; remedies; enforcement (D.C. Official Code § 6-1110), (b) *Civil remedy*. Any person who demolishes, alters or constructs a building or structure in violation of sections 5, 6, or 8 of this act shall be required to restore the building or structure and its site to its appearance prior to the violation. Any action to enforce this subsection shall be brought in the name of the District of Columbia in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia by the Office of Attorney General for the District of Columbia. This civil remedy shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any criminal prosecution and penalty. (*Note: This section is as amended by D.C. Law 16-185, effective November 16, 2006*)