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

Landmark/District:	Mount Pleasant Historic District	(x) Consent calendar
Address:	1818 Kilbourne Place NW	
Meeting Date:	February 25, 2021	(x) Addition
Case Number:	21-179	(x) Concept

The applicant, Eric Teran, agent and architect for owner Welf Dixon, requests the Board's review of a concept application to construct a third-story addition and roof terrace atop this 1910 brick rowhouse, extending the attic rearward.

The rear window and door openings would be altered, and the wall clad with stucco. Most of the front windows would be replaced. The basement would be converted to a second residential unit.

Addition and roof deck

The third story would measure almost thirty feet deep. Nearly all of that is new construction, behind the ridge of the front mansard. The addition would slope rearward from that ridge, rendering it invisible from the street. But there are presently chimneys at the party walls—one serving the subject house and the other the immediate neighbor—that would have to be extended to three feet above the addition's highest point within a ten-foot radius. These are not depicted in the roof plan, sections or elevations, except perhaps the west elevation which, like the sections, is not entirely accurate. As seen on aerial photos, the chimneys are located less than a third of the way back from the house's facade. That may be far enough to cut off view of them from the street, but it is a close call, and there is no way to judge at this point. They, and any other appurtenances of the addition should remain invisible from Kilbourne. If that is not achievable absolutely, then consideration could be given to a small flue extension above the roof, rather than a brick stack.

A roof deck is normally set forward of a rear wall, to de-emphasize it and conceal its substructure. As the roof is being rebuilt in this case, however, it becomes the deck and is relatively lower, and the deck railing is partly concealed behind a low parapet. Draining the surface of the deck through the house is probably not ideal, especially because the drawings leave unclear where the drain pipes would lead, but it is the applicant's choice to make the attempt, rather than employ scuppers or a conventional gutter below an open deck railing.

Demolition

Of the roof, only the front mansard would be retained. The second-story ceiling would presumably be removed to make way for the new third-floor framing. Nearly the entire original masonry rear wall would be demolished (the exposed, sided wall being a later enclosure of the original porches). The area of most concern is the apparent demolition of interior bearing walls,

which support the floor framing—but the section drawing does not indicate that the floors themselves would be replaced. Given the extent of demolition proposed, the floor framing should be retained (except perhaps at the rear porches), supported and sistered as necessary, to avert demolition of this building in significant part.

Alterations at the front of the house

All of the front elements would be retained, except for the replacement of the first- and second-story windows. The drawings propose the replacement of one-over-one windows with the same, but the 1910 originals were nine-over-one, as was common at that time and can be seen at several other homes on this row and elsewhere in the neighborhood. On the facades of such buildings, the historic window regulations and guidelines prescribe replacement to the original configuration.

Because a second living unit is to be added, a second electrical meter will almost certainly be necessary. The plans indicate, commendably, that meters will be placed under the front porch, to minimize public views of what is more likely to be a large double-meter cabinet.

Alterations at the rear of the house

The rear wall would be stuccoed, blending the enclosed porches with the brick rear wall of the original one-story bump-out. The stucco should be a true, three-part stucco, rather than a synthetic stucco or EIFS product. The windows and doors would be Optimum steel units. A shallow, possibly steel deck would extend the width of the first floor.

Recommendation

HPO recommends that the Board approve the project in concept and delegate to staff further review, with the conditions that: 1) the addition and its appurtenances (skylights, chimneys, solar panels, mechanical, etc.) are not be visible from the Kilbourne Place right-of-way; 2) the floor framing be retained; 3) the front window replacements be nine-over-one and otherwise meet the window regulations; 4) any electric meters be placed under the porch; and 5) the rear wall be clad with a buff-colored, true stucco.