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

Landmark/District: **Park View Christian Church** (x) Agenda
Address: **625-633 Park Road NW**

Meeting Date: **July 23, 2015** (x) Alteration
Case Number: **14-522**

Staff Reviewer: **Tim Dennée** (x) Concept

The applicant, property owner 633 Park, Inc. (Mubashir Khan), with Tom Nyein, architect, requests the Board's review of design development of a three-and-a-half-story, multi-family building as an addition to the recently landmarked Park View Christian Church, plus alterations and repairs to the church for its conversion to apartments. The new construction would stand next to—but about twelve feet from—the church, attached by a small hyphen at the rear of the lot. The addition would replace the existing parking lot and a demolished rowhouse (shown in the photograph on page 2).

Previous Reviews

In June 2014, the Board designated the church and its original 50-foot-wide lot a landmark, but that lot had previously been consolidated into a larger one that includes the site for the new building. This building would stand twelve feet west of the church, but it would attach to it by a low hyphen, making the whole project subject to the Board's review.

In July 2014, the Board approved the concept's site plan, height and general massing as compatible with the character of the landmark, but it expressed a preference for further setback of the building, so that its front wall would align with those of the rowhouses immediately to the west. The Board requested a preservation plan for the church building that would address the condition, significance and feasibility of salvaging the windows, especially the stained-glass ones, as well as the maintenance and repair of the masonry. The Board also asked for more detail, with particular attention to: repairs, replacements and alterations of the front steps and entrances; window repairs and replacements; any areaways or alterations to basement windows; the design of proper, efficient and unobtrusive roof drainage; the concealment of mechanical and electrical equipment; and the landscaping of the front yard.

Current Proposal

Church

The applicant has provided additional information on the treatment of the landmark church. The stained-glass windows of the façade would be restored by Weisser Stain Glass Studio, with the exception of the arched central one, which has been determined to be beyond salvaging. That window and those on the sides and rear would be replaced with Trimline DR-300 (requiring complete unit replacement) aluminum-clad operable windows with vision glass to match the

existing configurations. The semicircular upper windows would be fixed, because operable windows in those openings would not permit egress and would add too much thickness to the sash. These windows would open into a mezzanine level of units that are entered on the main floor.

Most of the remainder of the exterior work would be relatively minor repairs and the replacement of the stair rails with code-compliant rails.

The site plan on Sheet L-1 depicts a plan for landscaping the front and side yards.

It is not clear that the plans have accounted for all the mechanical related to the church building.



The 2014 concept.

New building

The front of the new building would not align with the rowhouses to the west. The legal standard is that the construction be compatible with the landmark, rather than with adjacent undesignated buildings.

Aside from maximizing the development potential of the lot, the project's central idea is that it is an apartment building that incidentally stands next to the church. The church's deep setback is somewhat unfortunate in the context, but that has been its historic condition; it was constructed behind an older chapel that was then demolished, so it was always more deeply set than the block's other buildings.

The lower two floors of the new building are to be of brick, with a color change at the base, and the upper floors covered with metal cladding. For reasons of cost, the rear would clad with EIFS, a material that the Board has supported only sparingly in inconspicuous locations. If such cladding is approved at rear, it would be better if there were a logic to the location of the joint between it and the brick—such as entirely behind the penthouse so that from the east the rear of the buildings looks like an addition.

The front entry stairs would be steel.

The window specification information for the product selected, Andersen Eagle, suggests that the finished condition may look different from that in the schematic depiction. The window product has sash dimensions similar to wood windows, and the units will presumably be separated by wider mullions than those shown, including on the front of the projecting bays. The drawings of the bays suggest that the lowest lights may be an operable hopper unit, although the entire height may instead be casements. It is difficult to be sure what will be the finished depth of the windows in the masonry openings; the wall-section drawings (Sheet A-15) suggest that the frames would be set in just the depth of the brickmold.

The proposed projecting eaves at each floor make the roof drainage easier than having roof drains or scuppers. However, as they would just consist of a piece of aluminum wrapping the rafter ends, for the longevity of the building it would probably be better if they did *not* project, and there was just typical cap flashing.

The “Colonial White” color selected for the metal panels may be tastefully coordinated with the brick below, but even an off-white metal is probably going to be fairly dazzling in its reflectivity.

The railing around the third-floor roof would be metal with clear-glass panels bounding the roof deck and rooftop HVAC units. The air-conditioning units would be installed on the northeast corner of the third-floor roof (Sheet A-7). They are not shown in the side elevation, but they would be somewhat visible from the ground through the railing (A-8).

The connection between the buildings would be brick in front and EIFS-clad at rear. It is a very low structure and narrow.

Recommendation

The HPO recommends that the Board approve the concept, conditioned upon any Board comments, and delegate to staff further review.