HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Landmark/District: Mount Pleasant Historic District (x) Consent calendar

Address: 1768 Kilbourne Place NW

Meeting Date: January 30, 2020 (x) Addition

Case Number: 20-115 (x) Concept

The applicant, Erik Hoffland, architect and agent for property owners Julie Straus and Adam Harris, requests the Board's review of a concept application for the construction of a two-story rear addition on the footprint of the present porches, and a third-floor addition. The project would involve demolishing much of the 1911 rowhouse's roof framing as well as the ell's rear wall. The drawings indicate no alterations or repairs at the façade or in front of the house.

Not extending the footprint of the house, the rear addition is small enough that, alone, it could have been cleared by staff. Simple, and similar to many previous enclosures of rear porches, it is compatible. The proposed demolition does not reach the level of demolition of the building in significant part.

At 647 square feet, the third-floor addition is larger than the footprint subject to staff delegation. Its approach is similar to many such additions approved by the Board in the past, extending attics rearward while attempting to keep them invisible from the street. As this home is attached on both sides, the principal concern is that the addition not be seen over the roof ridge. The sightline study indicates that the addition would be invisible from directly across the street, but only narrowly. Because of difficulties in measurement, the availability of other points of view, and construction usually proceeding without reference to some perspective on the street, such additions tend to become visible. The stepping of the houses suggests that the addition may be slightly visible from the perspective of the photo on the next page. Any permit must be conditioned on the addition being invisible from Kilbourne. The final drawings should both show and state the same. To achieve this, unobtrusive roof drainage over the ridge requires great care. That is not detailed, and it is unclear how the forward addition roof would drain over a ridge mold that projects forward at its top.

A secondary but important concern is the roof addition's appearance at rear. Such additions should not too greatly alter the roofline of the row, and for that reason, they are typically required to be set forward of a house's rear wall. In this instance, the addition would sit wholly atop the main block, and the projection of the ell and the rear porches/addition would cut off much of the view. The ell's side court would allow some visibility from the alley and from 18th Street (see photos on applicant's Sheet A0.1), but the impact should be minor. This is consistent with previous approved projects.

Recommendation

HPO recommends that the Board approve the concept, with the conditions that the third-floor addition and its appurtenances (heightened chimneys, solar panels, mechanical, etc.) not be visible from any point in the Kilbourne Place right-of-way; that the siding on both additions not exceed six-inch exposure; and that there be no work on the front of the building beyond somehow unobtrusively providing drainage from the third-floor addition's front roof.

