

MEMORANDUM

TO: District of Columbia Zoning Commission

FROM: ^{JLS}
Jennifer Steingasser, Deputy Director Development Review & Historic Preservation
David Maloney, State Historic Preservation Officer

DATE: May 22, 2014

SUBJECT: Supplemental Report - Preservation Covenant

McMillan Slow Sand Filtration Site Planned Unit Development ZC Case 13-14

In 1987, as a condition of transfer to the District of Columbia from the General Services Administration (GSA) and prior to its local and National Register listing, a preservation covenant was attached to the property. The covenant required that any rehabilitation and renovation work be undertaken in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and that the project be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

The covenant states that if the SHPO did not "agree with" the plans, the District would request the comments of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.

On October 31, 2013 the Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB) found that:

- *The revised master plan has been developed to retain important character-defining features of the site sufficient to convey its historic characteristics. The requirements for buildings on the north maintenance corridor to have a masonry base and setbacks for upper floors should be specifically codified in the master plan and design guidelines to ensure that these will be consistently applied to future projects; and*
- *The concept designs to represent an architecturally coordinated and cohesive approach that specifically relates to the character of the McMillan site.*

To "agree with" is not standard terminology in either the federal Section 106 or DC municipal review processes and is an imprecise term in regards to preservation review. Recognizing the findings of the HPRB, and that the applicant will need to establish that the proposed demolition will result in a project of special merit before the Mayor's Agent for Historic Preservation, the SHPO does not disagree with the plans and has no reason to conclude that the project will not be in compliance with the covenants.