HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Landmark/District: U Street Historic District (X) Agenda Address: 1722 10th Street NW () Consent

Meeting Date: **December 17, 2020** (X) Concept () Alteration

Case Number: **HPA 21-100** (X) New Construction

() Demolition

The architect, John Linam Jr seeks conceptual design review for construction of a three-story rowhouse on a vacant lot in the U Street Historic District. The site is set within a row of two-story Italianate frame rowhouses that have remained intact in massing with only minor alterations to the front façades resulting in various punched window sizes and door placements.



Proposal

The proposal calls for construction of a three-story rowhouse above a partially raised basement. The front façade would be clad in Hardie-plank and feature a two-story faux (essentially flat) bay with paired windows. The bay and cornice would be clad in Hardie-panel. A deck would be located on the roof of the third story. The architectural details, such as the single light casement

windows and bay, is inspired by a contemporary design rather than a traditional Italianate rowhouse.

Evaluation

The proposal is not compatible in terms of height, massing, and rhythm. In this particular location – in the middle of a row of houses of uniform height, flat elevations with no bays, and an established rhythm of window and door openings – it is more important to closely relate to those characteristics than in would be in a more varied context. The additional third story, in particular, appears discordant and out of character with this. Lowering the height to match the existing historic buildings, eliminating the faux bay, and providing a spacing of windows that relates to the rhythm of openings on the row would restore continuity rather than sticking out as being wholly dissimilar. In order to ensure that the end result is compatible with the character of the U Street Historic District, careful attention will also need to be paid to the execution, materials, and detailing.

The HPO recommends that the Board find the proposal incompatible in height, massing and rhythm of openings, and to encourage the applicant to redesign the proposal and return to the Board when ready.

Staff contact: Imania Price