

## HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD

### STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

---

Property Address:	<b>1710 10<sup>th</sup> Street NW</b>	Agenda
Landmark/District:	<b>U Street Historic District</b>	<b>X</b> Consent Calendar
Meeting Date:	<b>June 23, 2016</b>	<b>X</b> Concept Review
H.P.A. Number:	<b>16-447</b>	New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	<b>Anne Brockett</b>	<b>X</b> Alteration

---

Working with architect Ron Schneck of Square 134 Architects, owner Lock 7 Development proposes to add to the rear and roof of this two-story rowhouse in the U Street Historic District. The house was constructed in a dogleg form c. 1870. A 1-story addition infilling the dogleg space was in place by 1888. By 1959, the original two-story dogleg had been removed, with the one story ell remaining. It is likely that this occurred in relation to the construction of the abutting flats in 1953.

#### **Project Description**

The project proposes a rear addition of approximately 19 feet in length that replaces the rear one-story ell. The roof addition would be set back 18" from the new rear wall and approximately 35' from the front elevation, occupying a minute slice of the original roof. Like the lower floors of the addition, it would be clad in cementitious board siding. A front deck would extend roughly 7' forward of the addition, well back from the façade.

Work proposed on the front includes replacing non-original windows and doors, repairing the cornice, replacing the front stoop, and enlarging the basement door.

#### **Evaluation**

Because of the low height of the existing building and its neighbors, and the intersection with French Street just to the north, visibility of the roof addition and deck were of concern. An initial mockup showed that the addition would be visible from multiple vantage points. In response, the plans have been re-worked to set the roof back further from the front. Pursuant to an additional mockup to ensure that it will not be visible, the addition is compatible in its form, massing, materials, and its position at the rear of the original building footprint.

On the rear, the setback from the rear wall is successful in alleviating the mass of the addition slightly at the dead end alley. A cornice line between the second and third floors also helps break down the height and relieve the scale.

The work proposed on the historic façade needs refinement. The plans are not clear whether the front stoop assembly is proposed for repair or replacement. The HPO recommends repair or replacement in-kind. While guard railings in front of new areaways are discouraged by the Board's guidelines, the depth of this existing areaway requires a railing. The HPO recommends that it be kept simple in design and the minimum height necessary, and should be mitigated with a landscape plan that helps screen the railing and areaway. Windows on the front should be 2-over-2 wood sashes and the door should be largely solid wood, although some glass may be permissible. Consideration should be given for restoring the missing door surround and first floor window hoods. The non-original basement door may be too narrow to meet code, and, if so, could be widened to the minimum necessary, and contain full glass. A double width door as proposed would not be compatible, but adding a window in line with the first floor window above to bring more light into the space would be compatible in composition.

#### **Recommendation**

*The HPO recommends that the Board find the project compatible with the historic district and consistent with the purposes of the act pursuant to the following a flag test that shows the addition not to be visible and consideration of the comments above for the treatment of the façade. The HPO further recommends delegation of final review to staff.*