HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Landmark/District: Address:	Mount Pleasant Historic District 3428, 3430 and 3432 Oakwood Terrace NW	(x) Agenda(x) Revised concept
Meeting Date: Case Number:	July 23, 2020 20-118	(x) New construction

The applicant, District Design, architect and agent for property owner Carmel Greer, requests the Board's review of a concept to construct two abutting three-story, two-unit residential buildings on two vacant lots.

At the May 28 hearing, the Board determined that the subdivision to combine two of the three lots should be cleared as consistent with the purposes of the preservation law. The Board supported the compatibility of the footprint and massing of the new construction, but requested that the project return for review of its development to address issues raised in the staff report, especially to organize the windows more regularly. It requested sections or three-dimensional modeling of the project. More perspectives have been provided.

The staff report had recommended:

1. An appropriate brick texture and red or brown color, similar to those found in the immediate area.

The brick is shown to be various shades of brown, fairly smooth in texture.

2. More detail or relief to the flat walls.

The cornice has been slightly elaborated, but there is no water table or projection to door or window surround or hoods below. The cornice will have to be carefully detailed in a permit application. There should still be some kind of relief or projection, if not a water table, then some kind of door surround or hood.

3. A sample or specification for the visible roofing.

The visible roofing has been specified as Ecostar faux slate. The module is a ten-inch width which is somewhat wider than typically found on nearby historic mansards. Getting right the detail of the ridge board atop the mansard is important for the eventual permit application.

4. Information on how the principal roofs drain over the mansard roofs.

Scuppers and leaders are shown, with leaders running from each built-in gutter at the base of the mansards. The principal roof of each of the three sections of the construction is drained through a scupper through a parapet and into a leader that runs down the sloping mansard. This is an unusual condition, somewhat ameliorated by butting the leaders against the firewalls.

5. Information on the locations of meters and mechanical units.

The mechanical unit locations are depicted. If they are as small as shown, they will be inconspicuous or invisible from vantage points on the ground by the employment of the low parapets and setbacks. Meters are not shown, but the notes state that the electric meters will be concealed beneath the stoops. This does not resolve the matter, because the drawings do not depict the stoops end-on, to demonstrate how double meters will be accommodated, and because PEPCO typically requires that the supply to the meters be at least three feet above grade. It is conceivable that PEPCO would make an exception for meters that are entirely enclosed, if that is the case here.

- 6. *Inconspicuous plumbing vent stacks*. These are not depicted. Several of the stacks would be against the exterior walls, with a couple presumably poking out at the top of the mansard, in one case near the southern apex of the project.
- 7. *More consistency in the window configurations if not the sizes.* The windows have been made more consistent in size and configuration. Two-over-two windows of this size should have external muntins that are at least 1-1/4-inch wide.
- 8. *Some treatment of the south corner of the project.* The south corner remains the same.

Recommendation

HPO recommends that the Board approve the concept as compatible with the character of the historic district, and delegate to staff further review and clearance of a permit application, with the conditions that the meters and vent stacks be adequately resolved, and that some relief be given to the exterior walls, such as door surrounds or hoods.