

---

---

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

---

---

Landmark/District: **Mount Pleasant Historic District** (x) Agenda  
Address: **1614 Kilbourne Place NW**

Meeting Date: **October 27, 2022** (x) Alteration/Addition  
Case Number: **22-365** (x) Revised concept

---

---

The applicant, Joe Harris, architect and agent for property owner Shellys Corner LLC, requests the Board’s review of a concept to remove a sleeping porch, construct a two-story side addition in its place, and undertake various site work and alterations to a 1910 residence to convert it to a two-family flat.

The Board reviewed this project in July and September. It did not approve the concept as submitted, but requested revisions, including reducing the amount of proposed structural demolition after further studying its condition. The Board found that demolition of the sleeping porch might be found sufficiently compatible in itself, if it were replaced with an appropriate addition. The Board encouraged the applicant return with alternatives for the addition, suggesting that the top floor of the addition be eliminated or at least have a setback of at least five feet from its primary elevation.

**Demolition**

The revised plans now state that the floor framing would be generally retained, while interior bearing walls and partitions are being removed. It remains to be seen how this will be accomplished, but staff can review that as the project develops.

**Roof deck**

A deck is still proposed atop the primary roof, something that has not changed appreciably from the earlier versions. The applicant has presented photos of a mockup, but the railing will likely be slightly higher, as the deck will presumably be superimposed on the roof. A one-to-one setback does not render the deck entirely invisible—without considering the furnishings that might be placed upon the finished deck. As expected, the deck would be visible from Mount Pleasant Street to the east. Seeing it over 3170 Mount Pleasant Street seems less an issue than from the intersection of Mount Pleasant and Kilbourne, below, although the house’s bay projection will cut off most views from this angle (while, as we see in the photo below, trees are not an adequate year-round screen for such appurtenances).

**Fence**

HPO would normally not support a tall privacy fence that comes forward of the front corner of a building, let alone forward of a projection, but the present fence is one of longstanding, and the proposed one is an improvement as it relates to the bay. A fence would conceal a number of

items that call for concealment: mechanical equipment, a window well, and a parking space. It should not be left raw wood but should be painted or stained a dark color.



### **Side addition**

The principal revision is to the proposed side addition at the second and third floors, which would replace the side sleeping porch but have an alley-side parking space beneath. Although a character-defining feature, the Board did not appear to object to demolition of the somewhat altered porch, similar to the typical treatment of rear porches within the historic district. The question is how the addition is to be done. The choice to build up against the attic story presents a challenge. Additions to mansarded buildings are frequently mansarded themselves, but here that seems massive and inappropriate, especially because the addition will remain porch-like—elevated over the parking space—no matter its roof type.

The applicant now presents the progress of this addition design, showing all of the schemes previously considered in-house. Staff had preferred last month's approach of taking the front wall straight up to any version in which the upper floor was set back (see Scheme 6 and the present Schemes 9 and 10), because the former had a design unity and simplicity of massing, and carrying it straight up placed the entire addition behind the return of the cornice.<sup>1</sup> The current renderings may not show the latest schemes in their most favorable light, as the shadowing makes them read heavier than they are likely to appear. In the interest of resolving this case, the Board may consider whether any of the approaches depicted—contemporary/historicist, frame/masonry, wall/post-and-beam, set-back/flush—is sufficiently compatible.

### **Recommendation**

*HPO recommends that the Board approve the concept and delegate to staff further review, with the conditions that: 1) the roof deck and its railing not be visible from Kilbourne Place; 2) the addition is compatible in design and materials to the satisfaction of the Board; 3) the addition's windows be similar to each other in type and configuration; 4) replacement windows and doors meet the Board's regulations and guidelines; 5) additional meters for the addition unit be concealed from view from Kilbourne Place; 6) the fence be painted a dark color or stained with an opaque stain; and 7) the demolition of floors and bearing walls be minimized.*

---

<sup>1</sup> The Board will note that the present porch projects beneath the cornice.