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Executive Summary

This report is the product of a study conducted by students in the University of Maryland’s fall 2005 Historic Preservation Studio. The report summarizes the historic resource documentation and examination of the potential for preservation within the residential neighborhood and industrial area bounded by M Street, SW, and the Anacostia River, and Canal/2nd Street, SW, and South Capitol Street; or what the students termed “Old Southwest.” The Old Southwest residential neighborhood was the only area within southwest Washington, DC, that was not redeveloped in the 1950s and 1960s. Thus, historic buildings and long-standing neighborhood social connections were erased from nearby city blocks, but live on here. Although both the residential and industrial areas of Old Southwest were overlooked for much of its history, the area is experiencing development pressure and is included in many proposed development plans.

This study attempts to document the major historic resources within the neighborhood boundaries, and to explore how the preservation of these assets could provide benefits to the residents of Old Southwest and to the District of Columbia. Both the physical appearance and the psychological character of Old Southwest are unique within both the Southwest quadrant and the nation’s capital.

The physical and psychological character of Old Southwest is divided into two parts. The dominant features of the northern portion, or residential section, are two-story, historic rowhouses and large, historic residential complexes. Large trees shade courtyards and streets, demonstrating the time taken to shape this neighborhood. The area known as Buzzard Point contains large industrial and commercial ventures. Mazes of fencing allow glimpses of machinery and operational equipment, presenting a very different landscape from the residential neighborhood a few blocks to the north.

The residents of Old Southwest face some social and economic challenges similar to other urban neighborhoods. There is also a feeling of uncertainty within the community due to the prospect of changes from impending development. Despite this, a vibrant and complex spirit defines the psychological character. Neighbors interact with each other in a familiar, walkable area. Old Southwest possesses a “small town” atmosphere within an overarching metropolis.

The team created an inventory of the 21 resources they discovered. Each inventory listing briefly describes the structure or site, identifies factors of significance, and lists pertinent facts. While in the future additional resources may be discovered by other researchers, creating the inventory establishes a record of existing structures and also helped the team find relevant patterns. For instance, most of the identified resources are two-story residential buildings built between 1892 and 1958. Most of the dwellings are of modest size and are constructed of brick. By
combining observation and research, the team determined that, for more than 100 years, Old Southwest has been an area where low-and moderate-income individuals find housing and create homes.

By asking the questions – Are there historic resources in the Study Area? What are the elements that comprise neighborhood character? How can preservation play a major role in future community development to preserve historic resources and maintain neighborhood character? – the team identified historic resources in Old Southwest needing protection and learned residents’ concerns related to existing conditions. The team’s recommendations, collectively the Old Southwest Preservation Plan, are designed to address both issues. The plan lays out a roadmap for activities that can

- Protect historic resources
- Sustain neighborhood character
- Help maintain the stock of affordable housing
- Contribute to community revitalization
- Create awareness of the special history of Old Southwest both in the community and beyond.

To answer the research questions, the study team viewed historic preservation as a tool to help moderate the change that accompanies development. Preservation strategies can protect the old while creating new opportunities.

**Preservation Strategies**

The team recommends three steps toward preservation.

1. Create awareness of Old Southwest history and historic resources among community residents. With local individuals and organizations already involved in researching the history of Old Southwest, or with a new group effort, residents will begin to learn about their neighborhood’s complex past.

2. Once interest in local history is generated, the community can take advantage of Washington, DC, regulations and incentives to protect its historic resources and neighborhood. Specialized Planning Areas, Special Treatment Areas, overlay districts, and other zoning mechanisms can protect the special historical, cultural, and physical characteristics of the neighborhood and mitigate the impact of new development. Economic incentives can help fund efforts for revitalization.

3. Lastly, designating the residential area as a historic district (or of individual buildings or groups of buildings as DC Historic Landmarks) would allow the most protection for historic resources in the neighborhood. The properties within the historic district would also be eligible for a variety of financial incentives to help maintain and rehabilitate historic structures.

The Old Southwest community may choose to pursue all three recommendations, or only the first one or two. However, the team believes that each step increases the level of protection for the historic resources, and improves the power of community residents to preserve the elements of neighborhood character that are important to them.
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Chapter One
Introduction

Every fall, second-year students in the Master of Historic Preservation Program at the University of Maryland apply their knowledge, skills, and experience to the resolution of a real-life preservation challenge in the Historic Preservation Studio. Through the studio, students contribute to the public discussion of important preservation issues in nearby communities and gain valuable experience in the preservation field.

At the suggestion of the DC Preservation League, the fall 2005 studio project focused in Southwest Washington, DC, in an area that we called the “Old Southwest Study Area.” This area is bounded by South Capitol Street to the east, Canal, First, and 2nd streets to the west, M Street to the north, and the Anacostia River to the south. While this section of the District of Columbia is also known as Buzzard-Point SW, the name Buzzard Point has also been used to refer only to the industrial/waterfront portion of the area outside the residential neighborhood. Since our Study Area encompasses the residential, industrial, and waterfront sections, we have chosen to use the more inclusive name of Old Southwest.

The Old Southwest is an area of the District of Columbia rich in history but, for various reasons, one which has remained largely overlooked. In the past five years, however, the area has attracted a great deal of attention. As one of the few neighborhoods in the District with large, underdeveloped tracts of land, the Old Southwest is viewed as a prime location for new housing, businesses, and recreation. A proposed Major League Baseball stadium, sited opposite the area of study on the east side of South Capitol Street, could also affect the area’s residents and neighborhoods, as will planned enhancements to the South Capitol Street transportation corridor. Taken together, these various public and private initiatives represent both opportunities and challenges for the Old Southwest.

Study Issues

This report focuses on two specific elements of community – historic resources and neighborhood character – and explores how the preservation of these assets could provide benefits to residents of the Old Southwest Study Area and to the District of Columbia.

The team’s investigation focused on three questions:
1. Does the Study Area possess significant historic resources?
2. What are the elements that comprise neighborhood character?
3. How can preservation play a major role in future community development to preserve historic resources and maintain neighborhood character?

The Studio Team

The Old Southwest Study Area studio team is comprised of six students who have completed first-year courses in the graduate historic preservation program at the University of Maryland. These courses include research and documentation methods; preservation policy, planning, and management; preservation
law; historic preservation seminar; and building conservation. Concurrently with the studio course, team members are enrolled in such courses as preservation economics and heritage tourism. They also bring a variety of undergraduate backgrounds and professional expertise to the current study, including degrees in architecture, American studies, historic preservation, history, communications, and architectural history; and work experience in architecture, construction management, historic preservation, planning, and marketing/public relations.

Methodology
The team utilized a number of investigative techniques to answer the three research questions. An initial visit to the site in early September 2005 was followed by subsequent visits by team members to create a photographic inventory of the area and to record existing conditions. In addition, the team conducted on-site surveys of Old Southwest residents and interviewed individuals involved in past and present historic preservation initiatives.

Supporting this firsthand data collection was the team’s research in the Washingtoniana Division of the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library, which included building permits, census reports, plat books, maps, and vertical files. The team also found rich information resources in the collections of the Kiplinger Research Library of the Historical Society of Washington, DC, and in the National Archives and Records Administration, in the archives of the DC Housing Authority, and online at the DC Department of Planning and the DC Office of the Chief Financial Officer (real property records). The team also identified published articles, reports, and books exploring relevant issues in urban historic preservation and community development. Throughout the study, team members drew on their knowledge and experience to formulate questions, to identify important sources of information, and to develop a list of recommendations for the preservation of the area’s historic resources and neighborhood character.

Organization of the Report
This report continues with a glossary of terms used in the document followed by Chapter Two, Overview of Existing Conditions. Contained in the overview are demographics, brief summaries of plans affecting the Old Southwest Study Area (hereafter the Study Area or Old Southwest), a description of neighborhood character, an overview of the community history from its earliest settlement, and a detailed inventory of existing historic resources. Chapter Three identifies factors affecting historic resources and neighborhood character and concludes with a series of recommendations, which form the preservation plan that, if implemented, can help to preserve heritage and community in the Old Southwest. The bibliography and appendices at the end of this report list information sources and provide more detailed information on specific topics.
Glossary

Adaptive Use: The process of converting a building to a use other than that for which it was designed, e.g., changing a factory into housing.¹

Affordable Housing: Housing that is within the means of households with incomes that equal a certain percentage, or less, of the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) median family income. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) determines the MSA median family income periodically.²

District of Columbia Inventory of Historic Sites: The inventory of officially designated historic properties in Washington, DC, subject to the Historic Protection Act.³

Historic District: An area within specific boundaries with a concentration of related sites, buildings, structures, and/or objects related by past events or aesthetically by plan, architecture or physical development.⁴

Historic Landmark: A designated district, site, building, structure or object of exceptional historic, architectural, or archaeological significance to the community.

Historic Preservation: A discipline that encompasses a broad range of activities related to the preservation and conservation of the built environment by physical and environmental methods.⁵

Historic Resource: “Any building, structure, object, or collection or grouping thereof and their associated sites and any historic landscapes, which have been designated as important to history, architecture, archaeology or culture of an area by a local, state or federal governmental jurisdiction.”⁶

Hope VI: A federally sponsored program that enables demolition of obsolete public housing, revitalization of public housing sites, and distribution of supportive services to the public housing residents affected by these actions.⁷

Inclusionary Zoning: A means by which local governments can encourage/require developers to build affordable housing in low income areas.⁸

Interpretation: “The educational methods by which the history and meaning of historic sites, buildings, objects, districts and structures are explained by use of docents, leaflets, tape recordings, signs, film and other means.”⁹

Low-income Housing: Housing for households whose income is 80 percent or less of the median household income for the Washington Metropolitan Area as established from time to time by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.¹⁰

Market-Rate Housing: Housing sold at the current real estate market price, without government subsidies or incentives.

National Register of Historic Places: The official list of the Nation’s historic places worthy of preservation. Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the Register is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect our historic and archeological resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service under the Secretary of the Interior. Properties listed in the National Register include districts, sites,
buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture.\textsuperscript{11}

\textit{Preservation:} The act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of a historic property.\textsuperscript{12}

\textit{Public Housing:} “Housing owned and operated by a local public housing authority, under the federal low rent public housing program administered by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. These buildings are occupied predominately by low-income households and rents are limited to 30 percent of adjusted household income.”\textsuperscript{13}

\textit{Rehabilitation:} The act of returning an historic property to a functional new use through repair and new construction but maintaining as much of the original historic fabric as possible.

\textit{Restoration:} The act of returning a property to a certain period of its history by accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as they appeared at a particular period of time. This process may involve replicating historic materials, removal of features from other periods in its history, and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.\textsuperscript{14}


4 Murtaugh, 217.


9 Murtaugh, 217.

10 HUD, 101.


12 NPS. \textit{Archaeology and Historic Preservation}. Available on the World Wide Web: \texttt{<http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/arch_stnds_10.htm>}

13 County of Fairfax Department of Planning and Zoning. “Glossary.” Available on the World Wide Web: \texttt{<http://www.co.fairfax.va.us/dpz/comprehensiveplan/glossary/pq.htm>}


\textsuperscript{12} NPS. \textit{Archaeology and Historic Preservation}. Available on the World Wide Web: \texttt{<http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/arch_stnds_10.htm>}

\textsuperscript{13} County of Fairfax Department of Planning and Zoning. “Glossary.” Available on the World Wide Web: \texttt{<http://www.co.fairfax.va.us/dpz/comprehensiveplan/glossary/pq.htm>}

\textsuperscript{14} NPS. \textit{Archaeology and Historic Preservation} [online]. Available on the World Wide Web: \texttt{<http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/arch_stnds_10.htm>}
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Chapter Two
Overview of Existing Conditions

During an extensive information-gathering period that occupied the first six weeks of the semester, the studio team worked to develop an understanding of the existing conditions in the Old Southwest. This chapter presents its findings.

The first section includes demographic data, relevant zoning regulations, existing land use, and a series of plans by federal commissions, the District government, and private developers affecting the Study Area. The second section attempts to characterize the physical and psychological aspects or neighborhood character. The third section presents an overview of the history of the Old Southwest developed by the team. The fourth section of this chapter contains the inventory of historic resources identified by the team during its study. The inventory contains photographs and individual descriptions of 21 historic resources.

Section 1
Demographics and Land Use

The following demographic information is taken from the District of Columbia’s DC Census Tract Profile based on 2002 Ward Boundaries. The Study Area falls entirely within Census Tract 64. The Greenleaf Gardens high-rise apartments are included in the census information, although not within the boundaries of the Study Area. Bounding the census tracts are M Street, SW, to the north, South Capitol Street to the east, Delaware Avenue, SW, and Canal Street, SW, to the west, and the Anacostia River to the south. The information is from Census Year 2000 unless otherwise noted. Significant findings are noted in the following narrative; the District Census Tract 64 Table is included later in this document in an appendix.

Population

The overall population within Tract 64 is declining. A loss of about 20 percent in population during each of the previous two decades resulted in a population of 2,159 residents in 2000. This decline is substantially higher than the citywide average losses of approximately 5 percent per decade, in the same census years. The population of children also declined rapidly in Tract 64, while citywide averages remained relatively unchanged. Six percent of Tract 64 residents are foreign born, up from less than one percent in 1980. This growth trend is consistent with citywide averages.
Race/Ethnicity

The racial/ethnic composition of the population in the Study Area is noticeably different from the citywide average. In Census Year 2000, 92 percent of Tract 64 residents were African American, 3.6 percent were Caucasian, 3.6 percent were Hispanic, and 1.3 percent were listed as Other. The African-American population was significantly higher than the citywide average; all other races/ethnicities are significantly lower.

Poverty Rates/Employment/Education

While steadily improving since 1980, 43 percent of Tract 64 residents fall below the city’s established poverty line; 46 percent of children are considered to be in poverty. These statistics are significantly higher than the citywide average of 20 percent in Census Year 2000. The unemployment rate of 16 percent in Tract 64 is moderately higher than the citywide average of 11 percent. Despite these indicators, statistics show that Study Area households are far less dependent on public assistance compared to 20 years ago. Education indicators show less improvement, with 52 percent of the population 25 years or older without a high school education.

Income/Home Ownership

The average family income in Tract 64 shows no significant improvement in the past 20 years. The inflation-adjusted family income of $21,276 in 1999 is only slightly higher than the adjusted 1979 average of $20,549. The citywide average for the same period has increased from $59,070 in 1979 to $78,192 in 1999. Homeownership rates in Tract 64 are significantly lower at 14 percent than the citywide average of 41 percent in 2000. According to the District Census, in 2000, sales of single-family homes in Tract 64 were significantly lower than the citywide average; the median sales price was significantly lower than the citywide average of $157,200 at $108,400.

Crime Rates

Reported crimes in Tract 64 have declined markedly since 1980, however, violent crimes are nearly twice as frequent as the citywide average. Property crimes are marginally lower than the citywide average.

Summary

Tract 64 District Census data reveals that the Study Area has a declining population consisting of predominately African-American residents. More than 40 percent of the population falls below the District’s established poverty line, and home ownership and sales numbers are far below city averages. The Study Area can be characterized as a low-income tract largely dependant on subsidized housing.

Zoning Regulations

The Old Southwest and the South Capitol Street Corridor are targets for mixed-used development in the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. The recently approved Capital Gateway Overlay District (CG) drastically changed the zoning in the Study Area. The CG designation promotes mixed-use development, particularly residential, as an overlay to a variety of underlying zones. Design guidelines and design review by the zoning commission for M Street and waterfront sites further influence development in the Study Area. The majority of zoning changes adopting the CG overlay affect the industrial area predominately south of Q Street. While deeming existing
industrial uses as conforming, the CG overlay prohibits their expansion.

Squares previously designated as C-M-2, commercial-light manufacturing, and M, general manufacturing, are now zoned CG/CR, mixed-use, with the Capital Gateway overlay. According to city ordinance, the purpose of the CR designation is to encourage a diversity of compatible uses. An approved public policy or plan and the use of planned unit development (PUD), special exception, or other site review should guide development. In addition to guiding density, height, and uses for new construction, the provisions are intended to encourage the preservation and rehabilitation of historic structures.

Several squares adjacent to Fort McNair and the Anacostia waterfront have been changed from M, general manufacturing, to CG/W-2. The Plan reserved W-2 Waterfront zoning designation for sites with special importance, such as historical or geographical merit, and promotes compatible mixed-use.

In addition, and most significant in terms of impact on the Study Area, are lots on the two northernmost blocks facing South Capitol Street below M Street, SW, which have been rezoned from C-M-1 commercial-light manufacturing to C-2-C high density commercial. C-2-C districts are designed to serve commercial and residential interests by allowing high-density residential and mixed-uses in addition to concentrated commercial uses. This new zoning designation opens the sites for commercial development expected to revitalize the South Capitol Street corridor. The remainder of the Study Area north of Q Street, SW is zoned R-4 for row dwellings, conversions, and apartments.

A list of District of Columbia zoning categories is included in the Appendix.

**Current Uses**

Study Area contains a variety of different uses. Residential use is concentrated north of Q Street, SW, and includes rowhouses, detached houses, and apartment complexes. Commercial uses are minimal and are primarily concentrated along the South Capitol Street corridor. Industrial uses are concentrated south of Q Street, SW, to the waterfront. They include warehouses, storage, a gravel yard, and an electrical generating plant among others. The federal government owns small parcels of land on the Anacostia waterfront.

Two Metro stops on the Green Line serve the Study Area. The Navy Yard stop has an exit on the southeast corner of M and Half Streets, SE, one block east of the Study Area’s northeast boundary. The exit for the Waterfront-SEU stop at the Waterside Mall is at the corner of 4th and M streets, SW, two blocks west of the Study Area’s northwest boundary. Metrobus routes #70 and #71 on the Red Line serve the Study Area directly with multiple stops within its boundaries.

**Recent Plans, Studies and Reports Affecting the Area**

The Old Southwest Study Area is currently being considered in numerous studies, reports, and plans produced by the federal and district governments. Many of the current plans address the Study Area in a broad manner as a component of comprehensive planning efforts. Others bring attention to the Study Area directly including studies focusing on the South Capitol Street corridor and the redevelopment of Buzzard Point. Of the 17
plans and studies by government agencies or commissions described in this section, about half of them identify the preservation of historic resources as a goal.

Within the practical framework of these current studies, reports, and plans, the recommendations of this report will use historic preservation tools for the protection of the Study Area’s historic resources and neighborhood character. This section is subdivided into federal documents produced by the National Capital Planning Commission along with District documents created by the District of Columbia Office of Planning.

**National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)**

The National Capital Planning Commission is the central planning agency for the federal government in the District of Columbia region. NCPC provides overall planning guidance for federal land and buildings in the National Capital Region, which includes the District of Columbia; Prince George's and Montgomery counties in Maryland; Arlington and Fairfax counties in Virginia, and towns located within the geographic area bounded by these counties. Through its planning policies and review of development proposals, the Commission seeks “to protect and enhance the extraordinary historical, cultural, and natural resources of the Nation’s Capital.”

The specific plans affecting the Study Area are described below.


The NCPC document describes the Commission's mission and values, and conveys the agency's goals and visions for the coming years. Related to the Study Area, the transformation of South Capitol Street into a great urban boulevard and the revitalization of the city’s waterfront (inclusive) are noted as goals to be met by anticipating development, transportation, environmental and historic preservation needs. Another important interrelated goal is to: “Protect and enhance historic and natural resources, while accommodating change, during federal project planning and development.”


As part of its long-range planning responsibilities, the Commission released this plan as the framework for future development of Washington’s “Monumental Core,” defined as the open space of the National Mall lined with top cultural institutions and the headquarters of the nation’s three branches of government. The plan proposes to redefine the Monumental Core by creating opportunities for growth and development such as new museums, memorials, and federal office buildings in all quadrants of the city, while preserving the historic character and open space of the Mall. Related to the Study Area, the plan addresses the importance of the South Capitol Street corridor as a visually, economically, and historically significant element of the cityscape that needs to be revitalized. Several pages of “Chapter 8: Implementation” are dedicated to the “most ambitious initiative” of redeveloping the South Capitol Street and M Street environs. The South Capitol Street waterfront terminus is envisioned as a possible monument site, or as the location for a new Supreme Court building.
Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements

The comprehensive plan is a broad statement, projecting 20 years forward the principles, goals, and planning policies that address appropriate expansion and development of Washington, DC. The plan is divided into two components: Federal Elements and District of Columbia Elements. The Federal Elements section deals with issues concerning federal properties and interests in the National Capital Region as authorized by Section 4(a) of the National Capital Planning Act of 1952. Prepared by the Mayor and adopted by the Council of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Elements section focuses on the welfare of DC residents.

Related to the Study Area, the plan promotes the preservation and enhancement of the region’s natural resources and environment. The plan also protects historic resources and urban design features that contribute to the quality of life and the character of the District. Although broad in scope, the “Preservation and Historic Features Element” of the federal component promotes preservation planning and resource stewardship and encourages local public involvement as a key step towards gaining trust and support within the Study Area.

Memorials and Museums Master Plan (2001)

The National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Memorial Commission approved new commemorative sites and their locations on federal land. These federal agencies investigate issues affecting future memorials and museums in a collaborative effort. Related to the Study Area, the plan identifies South Capitol Street as an “extraordinary Commemorative Focus Area.” The plan notes that there are attractive development sites as well as outstanding locations for museums and memorials along the corridor. The South Capitol Street terminus at the Anacostia River, SE/SW, is identified as a prime candidate for a major commemorative site.

NCPC’s New Vision for South Capitol Street (2005)

NCPC’s South Capitol Street Task Force was created in 2004 in an effort to coordinate revitalization plans for the corridor. The task force involved numerous federal agencies, including representatives from the National Park Service, General Services Administration, and Department of Defense, in addition to the District of Columbia. The group worked together to create an open-space framework for cultural areas and commemorative zones where South Capitol Street meets the Anacostia River. Related to the Study Area, the report envisions a new South Capitol Waterfront Park on Buzzard Point located between a new traffic rotary and the river. Near the rotary, a new Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge would intersect with South Capitol Street and Potomac Avenue. The task force plan also addresses the need for mixed-use development south of M Street along the South Capitol Street corridor to build on the momentum of the new baseball stadium, and refers in part to the eastern boundary of the Study Area.

South Capitol Street Urban Design Study (2003)

The South Capitol Street Urban Design Study proposes several design schemes for the revitalization of the South Capitol Street Corridor and the Southeast Waterfront. It is a collaborative effort between NCPC and the District of Columbia Office of Planning. Related to the Study Area, the South Capitol Study...
addresses the scale, location, and character of public open spaces, the mixture and distribution of public and private land uses, and the nature of transportation improvements that should be undertaken along the South Capitol Street Corridor.

**South Capitol Street Report by ULI Advisory Panel (2003)**

NCPC and the District of Columbia Office of Planning (DCOP) asked the Urban Land Institute (ULI) Advisory Panel to review and consult on current plans for the South Capitol Street Corridor, and provide recommendations for implementing the changes. To focus, the panel was asked to reflect on questions of market potential, planning and design, development strategies, and organizational structure. Related to the Study Area, the report thoroughly and specifically addresses the quadrant southwest of M Street and South Capitol Street. Buzzard Point and its environs are part of the report’s “SoCap” (South of the Capitol) expanded Study Area, centered on the South Capitol Street corridor. ULI recommends replacing the name “Buzzard Point” with the SoCap acronym in order to shed negative connotations associated with the historic name, and to create a new identity for the area that will “expedite and raise the quality of development” that will “set the tone for the area.”

**Washington’s Waterfronts- Phase I (1999)**

The premise of this document is that Washington’s waterfronts are a resource that belong to all residents of the District of Columbia and citizens of the United States. Accordingly, the first phase of the Waterfront study assessed existing conditions, recommended development and remediation policies, and identified means of implementation for selected waterfront areas. Related to the Study Area, the document refers to the “Old Southwest” only indirectly due to the proximity of Buzzard Point to the Southwest Waterfront and Southeast Waterfront areas.

**District of Columbia Office of Planning**

**Comprehensive Plan (1998)**


Related to the Study Area, the Comprehensive Plan establishes policies in support of economic development within the Central Employment Area. This area would be south of Potomac Avenue, SW, and would have a direct impact in the Old Southwest. These policies specify significant new commercial and mixed-use developments along South Capitol Street and in Buzzard Point. The Study Area site is also referred to individually and collectively in the Ward 6 chapter of the document. Further, site issues concerning cultural resources are reinforced as part of the citywide policy in Chapter 8, “Preservation and Historic Features Element.”

**Vision for Growing an Inclusive City (2004)**

This is an online framework for the impending update of the Washington, DC Comprehensive Plan. It is not the Comprehensive Plan itself and does not have the authority to legally change or amend the existing plan. The general direction of the preliminary framework was approved by the Council of
the District of Columbia in a public hearing in June 2004. The resolution did not formally or statutorily adopt the Vision; however, it will lay the foundation for community discussion and consideration that will result in an adopted, updated Comprehensive Plan in 2006. The document establishes the basic principle that the city must grow more inclusively to reach full potential, and reorganizes the current Comprehensive Plan by focusing on three major challenges instead of more traditional topics like transportation and housing. The three challenges are: 1. Create Successful Neighborhoods, 2. Increase Access to Education and Employment, and 3. Connect the Whole City.


This plan establishes a vision for historic preservation in the District and addresses public policies, goals, and objectives that can create a structure for preservation activity. The plan highlights the historic strengths and preservation needs in each of the city’s eight wards. It calls for public participation and discusses the services and programs that the community can utilize through the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office.

Related to the Study Area, the plan identifies major protected historic landmarks including Syphax School, elements of the L’Enfant Plan (Potomac Avenue and South Capitol Street), and the adjacent Fort McNair site. The plan lists Fort McNair, Syphax School, and the larger Southwest area as “Areas Surveyed.” A list of future survey priorities for potentially significant historic resources includes “Housing Complexes” as a “Building Type,” presumably referring to the James Creek Apartments, and “Archeological Sites” in general, possibly referring to the former path of the James Creek Canal and similar sites that may contain artifacts pertaining to the city’s history.

**Strategic Neighborhood Action Plans- Cluster 9 (2002)**

Since January 2001, city residents have been working with neighborhood planners in Neighborhood Action teams to develop Strategic Neighborhood Action Plans (SNAPs) for each of the 39 District neighborhood clusters. The SNAPs were released on October 26, 2002, and represent noteworthy planning activities undertaken in each District neighborhood. These plans detail priority issues in each neighborhood, which the DC government uses to inform and guide decisions involving the city budget. Related to the Study Area, Cluster 9 community representatives identified the following priority areas through a series of community workshops and task force meetings: Affordable and Diverse Housing, Public Safety, Public Schools, and Community Development.


The Anacostia Waterfront Initiative (AWI) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed in March 2000 by the 20 federal and District agencies that own or control land along the Anacostia River. The MOU created a first-time joint venture between the federal and District governments to transform the Anacostia River “from the city’s forgotten river to a gem that could rival any urban waterfront in the world.” A draft AWI Framework Plan has been created by the DC Office of Planning to guide the revitalization effort. Eight Target Areas within the boundaries of the AWI have been closely examined and used to create plans consistent with AWI themes. The Framework and
Target Area plans have been developed in a public process involving over 5,000 participants.

Related to the Study Area, the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative overlaps the entire site in a general fashion. Specifically, the South Capitol Street Corridor Target Area is highlighted by the vision of a new signature bridge that will improve access and linkage between the east and west banks of the Anacostia River. The plan envisions South Capitol Street as a multi-use transportation corridor that reconnects neighborhoods and creates a lively commercial boulevard, with inspirational public places and civic destinations. Additionally, as a waterfront, the Study Area is part of the AWI’s key river conservation and restoration efforts.

The Anacostia Waterfront Corporation (AWC)
The Anacostia Waterfront Corporation (AWC) is an enterprise established in 2004 and sponsored by the District of Columbia to lead the revitalization of Anacostia River neighborhoods and to coordinate environmental activities that promote river restoration, including clean up, public awareness, and enjoyment of the river. AWC is guided by the principles of the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative (described above), a critical planning initiative affecting the Study Area. The corporation is also charged with overseeing development around the proposed new Ballpark District. AWC holds public meetings and provides information updates in an effort to involve the general public in the impending development.

The proposed new ballpark is viewed as an important opportunity to revitalize Southeast and Southwest Washington. The Ballpark District is defined as the area generally bounded by M Street, South Capitol Street, the Anacostia River, and New Jersey Avenue. The Ballpark District Urban Development Strategy notes that the concentration of underused and publicly controlled land presents an excellent opportunity for the District to play a role in shaping the character of the Ballpark District and its implementation. The document attempts to guide public improvements and private development in and around the ballpark. Ongoing public meetings provide residents with information and an opportunity to comment on development of the document.

Related to the Study Area, the Strategy document supports the promotion of South Capitol Street as the principal north-south boulevard in the District and recognizes the need to provide benefit to, and minimize negative impacts on, existing surrounding residential neighborhoods. In addition, the AWC identifies key development plans within the Ballpark District that will directly and indirectly affect surrounding areas.

The South Capitol Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study (2003)
The District Department of Transportation is planning to reinforce South Capitol Street’s historic role as a major north-south L’Enfant axis. The department’s South Capitol Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study identifies improvements to South Capitol Street and, in particular, to the Frederick Douglass
Memorial Bridge. This will contribute to transforming the Anacostia waterfront. Related to the Study Area, the report tackles issues concerning the entire South Capitol Street corridor and its surroundings. Physical and social characteristics are addressed specifically in Chapter 2: “South Capitol Street Today.” A historical background, summary of land use and zoning, transportation and traffic information, and an analysis of existing conditions, address much of the Study Area site. Cultural resources are included as a sub-section but are not identified individually.

**South Capitol Street Bridge Study and South Capitol Street Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Project (No published reports; website only)**

The District Department of Transportation has conducted a study on the replacement of the 50-year-old Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge. The bridge is structurally deficient and in need of a major rehabilitation effort or replacement. The proposed new bridge will host vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic. The new bridge is described as crucial to the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative's vision of "a grand gateway into the Nation's Capital across a world-class bridge that provides maximum value for all types of transportation users, while unifying and enriching the neighborhoods it connects."19 Related to the Study Area, South Capitol Street from N Street to the river, east of Half Street, SW, is included in the bridge study site.

**Ballpark Addendum to The South Capitol Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study (Draft 2005)**

This addendum addresses the potential of the new ballpark to advance construction on many of the previously identified South Capitol Street Connectivity Improvements. The addendum reports that economic development resulting from the improvements could be realized earlier than expected. Related to the Study Area, the inclusion of the new ballpark in the South Capitol Gateway planning project will affect future transit, the pedestrian environment, and traffic operations within much of the site.

**Development Plans Adjacent to the Study Area**

This section will focus on development plans adjacent to the Study Area that are being planned or already under construction. The summary for each of the developments is from promotional or informational sources produced by those involved, as noted, and is subject to change. There are no major privately approved development plans within the Buzzard Point site as defined by this project. However, Douglas Development Corporation has amassed property just southwest of the Florida Rock property and the baseball site along the Anacostia waterfront, including 1900 Half Street, SW. News reports note that the developer hopes to create a mixed-use entertainment venue and a successful urban waterfront.20

The following list includes brief descriptions of major development plans adjacent to the Study Area:

---

19. Anacostia Waterfront Corporation's draft Ballpark Addendum to The South Capitol Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study, 2005

20. News reports note that the developer hopes to create a mixed-use entertainment venue and a successful urban waterfront.
Baseball Stadium

**Location:** South Capitol Street & N Street, SE

**Description:** Hospitality; 41,000-seat baseball stadium on 21 acres is being planned as home to the Washington Nationals Major League Baseball club.

**Development Team:** Anacostia Waterfront Corporation, DC Sports & Entertainment Commission

**Status:** Proposed

**Source:** Development Activity, DC Marketing Center website

<http://www.dcmarketingcenter.org/dev_record.php?devId=25>

Florida Rock I

**Location:** 100 Potomac Avenue, SE

**Description:** Mixed-use; new construction on 5.5-acre site adjacent to the Southeast Federal Center; Planned Unit Development with preliminary zoning approval for approximately 1.2 million-square feet of residential, office, hotel, retail, and parking.

**Development Team:** FRP Development Corporation

**Status:** Planned

**Source:** Development Activity, DC Marketing Center website

<http://www.dcmarketingcenter.org/dev_record.php?devId=51>

Southeast Federal Center

**Location:** New Jersey Avenue & M Street, SE

**Description:** Mixed-use; new construction on 42 acres redevelopment site along the Anacostia River with 1.8 million square feet of offices, 2,700 residential units (1,100 rental and 1,600 for-sale), 300,000-square feet retail and cultural, and large park and open space.

**Development Team:** Forest City Enterprises, General Services Administration (GSA)

**Status:** Planned

**Source:** Development Activity, DC Marketing Center website

<http://www.dcmarketingcenter.org/dev_record.php?devId=42>

Department of Transportation Headquarters

**Location:** 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE

**Description:** Office; new construction on 11-acre site consisting of two buildings totaling 1.35 million-square feet of rentable space in the Southeast Federal Center.

**Development Team:** JBG Companies

**Status:** Under Construction

**Source:** Development Activity, DC Marketing Center website

<http://www.dcmarketingcenter.org/dev_record.php?devId=22>
**Waterfront (Waterside Mall Redevelopment)**

**Location:** 401 M Street, SW

**Description:** Adaptive use and new construction; multi-phased redevelopment of existing 1,150,000-square-foot Waterside Mall plus additional 900,000 square feet of residential, office, and retail

**Development Team:** Forest City Enterprises, Kaempfer Company

**Status:** Planned

**Source:** Development Activity, DC Marketing Center website
<http://www.dcmarketingcenter.org/dev_record.php?devId=16>

---

**Arthur Capper/Carrollsburg Dwellings**

**Location:** 2nd Street, SE; M Street, SE; 7th Street & Virginia Avenue, SE

**Description:** Mixed use; new construction HOPE VI public housing project revitalization on 20 acres [the Federal Housing and Urban Development agency (HUD) created HOPE VI to fund and assist in the revitalization of the Nation's most severely distressed public housing]. Consists of 1,323 rental and homeownership units, 51,000 square feet of retail space, 18,000 square-foot community center

**Development Team:** Forest City Enterprises, Mid-City Urban LLC, District of Columbia Housing Authority (DCHA)

**Status:** Under construction

**Source:** Development Activity, DC Marketing Center website
<http://www.dcmarketingcenter.org/dev_record.php?devId=109>

---

**Washington Canal Park**

**Location:** 2nd & M Streets, SE

**Description:** Infrastructure; three-block rectilinear park on 1.8 acres in Old Southeast redevelopment area on government land

**Development Team:** Canal Park Development Association, Anacostia Waterfront Corporation

**Status:** Planned

**Source:** Development Activity, DC Marketing Center website
<http://www.dcmarketingcenter.org/dev_record.php?devId=799>

---

**Riverside**

**Location:** 200 R Street, SW

**Description:** Mixed use; new construction on 8.5 acres up to 1.9 million-square feet of office and residential development adjacent to historic Fort McNair

**Development Team:** Akridge Real Estate

**Status:** Preliminary planning
Pepco/Buzzard Point site

Location: Bounded by First, 2nd, S and V Streets, SW

Description: Mixed use; new construction on 9 acres (currently two parking lots) including 1,100,000 square feet of office space and 1,600 residential units

Development Team: Akridge Real Estate

Status: Proposed

Source: Development Activity, DC Marketing Center.
<www.dcmarketingcenter.com/dev_record.php?devId=359>

Syphax Village

Location: 1360 Half Street, SW

Description: Adaptive use; redevelopment of William Syphax School, a designated DC Historic Landmark, into 12 condominiums, and new construction of 29 residential units on adjacent land

Development Team: Manna, Inc.

Status: Completed

Source: Development Activity, DC Marketing Center website
<www.dcmarketingcenter.com/dev_record.php?devId=788>

Approved Development Plans Within the Study Area

There are no approved major private development plans within the Study Area. However, Douglas Development Group has amassed property just southwest of the Florida Rock property and the baseball site along the Anacostia waterfront, including 1900 Half Street, SW. News reports note that the developer hopes to create a mixed-use entertainment venue and a successful urban waterfront. A small parcel of Florida Rock’s PUD site at the southwest foot of the Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge has been discussed as part of the development planned for adjacent areas relating to the proposed bridge realignment.


17 Ibid., 11.


Section 2

Elements of Neighborhood Character

An observer can understand the essence of neighborhood character from both the physical and the psychological elements of the place. The distinguishing features include: resident interactions, population transition, household income, streetscapes, landscaping, and buildings.22

To understand the neighborhood character of the Study Area as thoroughly as possible, the team reviewed the Strategic Neighborhood Action Plan (SNAP) Cluster 9 and pertinent portions of the South Capitol Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study for a character basis. During the SNAP process, Cluster 9 stakeholders identified the following four priority areas to address in the future of the neighborhood: 1. Add to the affordable housing stock and maintain neighborhood diversity; 2. Increase public safety; 3. Increase the quality of public schools; 4. Integrate community development.23 The Gateway and Improvement Study noted only low-income housing as a defining character feature.24 For a deeper understanding of community qualities and self-perception, the team also developed a survey as a basis for individual and group interviews. Nineteen community residents were interviewed. (Survey questions are included in the Appendix.)

Sense of Community

The defining characteristic in Old Southwest neighborhood is its complexity. While it is a mixed-income community, a high percentage of low-income residents live in the neighborhood. The neighborhood is predominately African American, with a growing percentage of foreign-born residents. The population comprises a full range of ages, from infants to the elderly.

The SNAP report, South Capitol Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study, and some surveys by public housing residents note that the neighborhood within the Study Area is marked by low-income housing.25 While most of the private housing in the area is affordable, many residents also live in public or subsidized housing. Only 14 percent of neighborhood residents own their own homes.26 Mixed-in with blocks of affordable and public housing are rows of market-rate townhouses for middle-income residents. This wide variety of socio-economic strata is one layer of the complexity within the Study Area.

General academic research suggests that homeowners feel more invested in their communities and are more able to change neighborhood circumstances.27 With a low rate of homeownership, Study Area residents might be expected to display disengagement with the neighborhood. Yet, observations made on visits to the neighborhood both during the week and on weekends suggest otherwise. People interact with their neighbors and are aware of outsiders entering the boundaries of their neighborhood. This “small town” atmosphere springs from people recognizing one another within the neighborhood and publicly greeting one another. One-quarter of the surveys...
indicate that neighborhood residents feel they benefit from recognizing neighbors and fellow residents. Furthermore, the introduction to the 2002 Cluster 9 SNAP document acknowledges dedicated and committed residents for actively working around complicated schedules and participating in community activities and meetings to the highest level possible.  

A third layer contributing to the complex nature of the Study Area is the impending development and other major changes over the next few years. Many of the residents surveyed express an uncertainty for the future. One homeowner, who resides in a townhouse along South Capitol Street, stated that he was unsure if he should improve or sell his home because of its location near the Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge renovation site and its proximity to the proposed Ballpark District. Renters worry about increased monthly rates with new attractions in the vicinity such as the planned Major League Baseball stadium and nearby waterfront redevelopment. Additionally, a number of public housing residents expressed the opinion that their presence in the neighborhood will be short-lived as development pressures increase and the government takes action. A real-estate agent who works with properties within the Study Area mentioned that the neighborhood is “prime property” for investment. She stated that the neighborhood is in transition and professionals (singles and couples) “who know a good investment” are moving in.  

Two Neighborhoods  

The Old Southwest Study Area is clearly divided into two distinct sections, adding to its multifaceted nature. The first area is the residential neighborhood between M and Q Streets. The character is marked by the homes and residents that make up the community as discussed in the previous section. The second region encompasses all land south of Q Street, known as Buzzard Point. This section of the Study Area is marked both by the offices and industries operating there today and by its long period of relative underdevelopment.  

The main impression of Buzzard Point is one of open space, with isolated and widely separated warehouses and other small buildings. Fencing tends to be the dominant landscape feature, conspicuously marking property lines. Three large official buildings at the southern-most point – an office building owned by the Douglas Development Corporation, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, and the Potomac Electric Power Company station – dominate lower Buzzard Point, and draw the eye beyond the low open land to the waterfront.  

Presently, the industrial area below Q Street is not pedestrian-friendly. Large trucks rumble through the streets to the various industrial properties on the Point, causing an element of danger to pedestrians. There are no residences south of Q Street, and a survey of the employees of Buzzard Point industries was not attempted in this report.
**Urban Fabric**

Old Southwest is the last remnant of the original Southwest DC. Most of the historic fabric of the original Southwest was eliminated during the mid-20th century Urban Renewal movement. However, within the boundaries of the Study Area exists a rich history spanning the 19th and 20th centuries. Contributing to the distinctive urban fabric in this historic area are townhouses, large apartment complexes, an adaptively-reused elementary school, historic Carron Baptist Church, and a pedestrian-friendly streetscape. Old Southwest’s residential section is primarily made up of two-story rowhouses dating from various time periods. Dwellings include early twentieth-century brick rowhouses and a 1940s complex of public apartment buildings. A majority of the residential buildings have small setbacks, if any. Parking is on the street or in alleys behind the townhouses. The majority of buildings have exposed front steps; a few houses have small porticos and several homes have full-sized front porches. Trees and landscaping are centered in the communal courtyards and along the sidewalks of the James Creek Housing Complex, located in the northwest corner of the Study Area.

**Neighborhood Landmarks**

William Syphax School is a designated historic landmark located within the boundaries of Old Southwest. Located at 1360 Half Street in the center of the surrounding residential segment, the school’s striking and distinctive Colonial Revival architecture combine with its location to make it the dominant element in the streetscape. Syphax is also a powerful community symbol. Some of the residents surveyed expressed sadness when discussing the closing of Syphax School in the late 1980s. As such, in 2003 many residents signed a petition protesting the conversion of the vacant school into adaptively reused building housing affordable-condominiums. A well-known neighborhood element is the James Creek Housing Complex. “James Creek” covers the section between Canal Street and First Street to M Street and O Street of the residential area. The two-toned brick apartment buildings with gable roofs enclose open courtyards. The James Creek apartments on the distinctive tree-lined streets are an unmistakable feature within the Old Southwest.

An important neighborhood landmark is the King-Greenleaf Recreation Center. Built just outside the Study Area and dedicated in 2005, the structure is the recreational center of the Old Southwest community. Eleven of the nineteen people surveyed identified the King Greenleaf Center as their favorite place in the neighborhood. The center is easily accessible both to elderly residents who live one block west in the Greenleaf public housing complex and to children living in the James Creek complex across Canal Street. Computer classes, Bingo, after-school tutoring, Pee-Wee football, and many other activities are offered at the center. The one-story building has a modern appearance, with many large glass windows, a contemporary streamlined exterior, and a geometric roof.

Another neighborhood landmark is the Southwest Community House at 156 Q Street, SW. Southwest Community House (SWCH) is a non-profit community service agency that was founded in Southwest in 1901. The organization moved into 156 Q Street, SW, in 1978. Active in community affairs, SWCH...
serves the low-income residents of the Southwest through a variety of programs.

Accessibility

While some neighborhood residents do own cars, the predominant mode of transportation within the residential section is by foot. The neighborhood is walkable, with interior streets having little vehicular traffic and sidewalks connecting the residences to M Street bus stops, two nearby Metro stations, and nearby shopping. On the fringes of the residential area are two major streets, South Capitol Street and M Street. South Capitol acts as a physical boundary for the neighborhood, deterring pedestrian travel with eight lanes of traffic and an elevated ramp blocking east-west access. Although, one local resident who owns a car commented that South Capitol Street is definitely a neighborhood benefit. He noted that he can easily travel through the city and into Maryland or Virginia for business or pleasure via the road. A more fluid boundary is M Street. The road serves as a psychological border for people entering and exiting the community. One area resident commented that there is only “one way in [south from M Street] and one way out [north to M Street] of the neighborhood.”

Observations

That the character of the Study Area is wholly complex is suggested by both the variation in community land use and the mix of incomes. While the studio team was unable to interview a large, age-diverse group of residents, the majority of residents surveyed expressed similar opinions on every issue. These opinions supported the team’s observations and research findings, leading the team to feel confident in using these interviews as a guide to the neighborhood character of Old Southwest. However, the team believes that additional surveys in the future are warranted, since they could contribute to a more precise description of neighborhood character.

25 DC Office of Planning, 41.
28 Washington, District of Columbia, 8.
29 Bea Paget. Telephone Interview, 15 November 2005.
32 Vanessa Ruffin-Colbert. Personal Interview, 10 November 2005.
Section 3

An Overview of the History of Old Southwest

There are two significant challenges to documenting the history of the Old Southwest. First, throughout much of its existence, the area (also known as Buzzard Point-SW) has been geographically and socially set apart from other Southwest neighborhoods. Second, the Old Southwest has been historically divided into two distinct parts by use: one residential and the other largely industrial. As a result of these factors, the history of the Old Southwest has failed to draw the attention of scholars until recently and, as a result, has remained largely unrecorded. Drawing from various primary and secondary sources, the studio team has assembled the beginnings of a first history of the Old Southwest.

This section of the report will sketch the story of the Old Southwest through 1958, the end date of the period of significance for existing historic structures in the area. The next section contains a detailed inventory of the area’s existing historic resources.

Early History

Long before Europeans settled the land situated at the mouth of the Eastern Branch (now the Anacostia River) and the Potomac River, Native Americans made their home in the area. Most prominent of all the tribes were the Piscataway. The Piscataway spoke Algonquian and established a village in what is now the peninsula containing Buzzard Point. Among the first Europeans to settle along the banks of the Eastern Branch were Maryland colonists in the early-17th Century, seeking refuge from religious persecution in England. Hostile encounters ensued between the colonists and the Piscataway and other tribes along the Chesapeake Bay, resulting in the Piscataway permanently abandoning their homesteads along the Eastern Branch.

Entrepreneurs and real estate speculators slowly established homes in the area of Buzzard Point during the early years of European settlement. In the mid-to late-eighteenth century, wealthy landowners such as Charles Carroll, Jr., and Joseph Johnson, who owned a home between T and Half streets, SW, purchased property not far from Greenleaf’s Point (present-day Fort McNair). Early Baist plat maps identify the southernmost point on the peninsula east of James Creek as "Buzzard Point," while Greenleaf Point is shown to the west of James Creek. An early 1673 map also refers to the area as Turkey Buzzard Point.

In 1781, Daniel Carroll, son of Charles Carroll, Jr., founded the area known as "Carrollsburg," a proposed town near present-day South Capitol Street. (See map.) According to a 1930 Sunday Star article, "The subdivision extended from N street south to the Eastern Branch, and from James Creek Canal on the west to First..."
A 1923 account of early development in the area states that the town of Carrollsburg became “a center for river trade…in a small way.”

After the establishment of the Nation’s Capital in 1796, subsequent development in the Old Southwest was sparse, apparently due to real estate speculation and geography. Daniel Carroll attempted to sell off the Carrollsburg lots; however, the price of his property was too high, causing investors to bypass the area for cheaper lands to the northwest. Another speculator, James Greenleaf, bought land around Carrollsburg and constructed a number of substantial brick rowhouses. These homes, known as Greenleaf’s “Twenty Buildings,” never caught on and contributed to Greenleaf’s eventual bankruptcy.

A shifting, uncertain shoreline was another possible deterrent to further development in the Buzzard Point area. By the 1830s, Carrollsburg was dotted with only shacks and simple wharves. While there was heavy settlement in and around the Navy Yard nearby in the Southeast, much of the lowlands directly south of the Capitol were inhospitable to habitation. The adoption of Pierre L’Enfant’s canal system (described in the following section), which split the southern peninsula between Fort McNair and the Old Southwest, created a barrier between the peninsula and the rest of the city rather than making it the mercantile establishment and focal point he had envisioned.

The L’Enfant Plan and the Washington Canal

In 1790, Congress authorized George Washington to select the site for America’s new capital along a stretch of the Potomac. This new federal district was to be called “Columbia,” and the federal city to be known as “Washington.” The site selected for the capital was at the confluence of the Eastern Branch (now the Anacostia River) and the Potomac River. The natural features of the site – the rivers’ deep channels, connection to the Chesapeake Bay, projecting land masses, and rising terrain – were deemed to be advantageous for both commercial and military reasons. This strategic location was recognized early, and the Washington Arsenal was established on Greenleaf’s Point in 1791.

George Washington hired French engineer Pierre L’Enfant to survey the site and design a plan for the city. Federal surveyors noted that the fall line of the Potomac west of the site was a potential source of hydropower; the deep waters of the Eastern Branch, at the time, were ideal for docks and commerce. Trade and transport were also possible in the expanding western lands. L’Enfant planned a Grand Canal system to accommodate commerce while solving the drainage issues of the low-lying areas of the city.

In 1795, plans to build a canal between James Creek on the Anacostia River and Tiber Creek, which emptied into the Potomac near Georgetown, were put into motion. It was thought that by digging the canal, barges could transport goods such as grain and flour from settlements on the Potomac through the city, thus avoiding transport through a hazardous stretch of the river, and then upstream to the ocean bound ships berthed along the Anacostia. Daniel Carroll, Jr., and Notley Young held two lotteries to raise money for the building of the canal, however they failed to raise the necessary capital and construction was delayed. In 1802, the Washington Canal Company began the construction of the City Canal, which was completed in 1815. This canal cut across the city east to west with branches running
south through Buzzard Point (the James Creek Canal) and the Navy Yard.³⁶

The canal initiated commerce, but it was not long before problems started to arise. During operation, the Washington Canal isolated Buzzard Point and the rest of the Southwest with very few bridges crossing the canal to reach the federal downtown. As a result, the entire Southwest region came to be known as “the island.” This can be seen on early maps of the area.

Another negative impact of the canal was the problem of silting, which resulted from erosion caused by the construction of the city and deforestation, as well as regular run-off from rainstorms and snow melt and a lack of funds for proper dredging. This limited the flow of water through James Creek into the Anacostia, which might then back up depending on the tidal flow and weather conditions. The navigability of the Anacostia was impaired to such an extent that its value as a commercial thoroughfare was dramatically reduced by the 19th century. The canal also became a place to discharge human waste and dispose of dead animals. As a result, the ever-present threat of disease posed by the open canal became a deterrent to settlement in the Buzzard Point area.³⁷ Silting, lack of maintenance, and raw sewage rendered the canal useless by the mid-19th century.³⁸

The presence of the Washington Canal was one of the factors affecting the development of the federal city. Because of the canal and other influences, the city’s development was uneven in terms of density and quality. Many civic undertakings were initiated due to pressure by speculative landholders within and around the new District boundaries.³⁹ While waterfront sites were particularly sought after for their commercial potential,⁴⁰ much of the waterfront development occurred on the western shores of the peninsula, in areas of the Southwest bordering the Potomac and in Georgetown.⁴¹ Fresh water supply reached Georgetown and the Northwest first, further segregating economic classes and shaping building patterns.⁴² The less desirable lands comprising the lowlands, ports, and industrial areas were left to the poor to settle.⁴³

Early Transportation and Industry

Transportation and politics played equally important roles in the city’s physical development. As previously mentioned, the Buzzard Point/Greenleaf Point areas provided a natural harbor for shipbuilding and dry docks and an extensive coastline for transporting goods around the city with the canal connecting farmlands to commercial sites. In the late 18th century, major industries in the Nation’s Capital were shipping, farming, and the construction of buildings and ships. These industries were represented in Buzzard Point.

In the early 19th century, some new business ventures were established in the Buzzard Point area of Old Southwest. In 1789, the first newspaper plant in the District of Columbia was founded in the area of Buzzard Point.⁴⁴ Between 1800 and 1812, Thomas Law built one of the first factories in the District, a sugarhouse, on Buzzard Point with the building later put to use as a brewery.⁴⁵ Despite such ventures, very little industry seems to have occurred in the Old Southwest in the early years of the capital. This might have been from the lack of sanitary conditions arising from the canals, or the impact of the Washington Arsenal at Greenleaf’s Point.

Figure 17 Map of 1820 Washington; dark line illustrates the Washington Canal system with two branches emptying into the Anacostia River via James Creek and the Navy Yard.
The Washington Arsenal served as a location for manufacturing and storing volatile gun powder and other munitions, and its potential for disaster was a constant threat in the area. Besides an explosion that occurred during the 1814 burning of the capital, in 1864, 21 women died in an explosion while filling cartridges for Union troops. A third accident, in 1868, occurred when a laborer dropped a crate of powder. Fear of explosions and related fires caused by arsenal accidents may have served to keep commercial ventures away from the area.

In the spring of 1873, enclosed sewers were installed along the Washington Canal and the canal was filled in as far as James Creek. However, James Creek remained uncovered and polluted; it was not completely covered until almost fifty years later. The James Creek/ Buzzard Point area south of R Street, SW, became chiefly an industrial/warehouse district. Some structures that existed in the 19th century were a dairy on Square 603, food, liquor, and tobacco warehouses on Square 657, and a furniture warehouse along M Street on Square 651. However, industrial development in the Old Southwest was limited. Accessibility was an issue because of the canals and poor road conditions. Maps of the era indicate that most of the land was subdivided, but lay empty. An 1892 drawing of the city does not show any industry on Buzzard Point other than Fort McNair.

The introduction of the railroad and the impact of the Civil War caused significant population growth and development in the Nation’s Capital, previously a relatively unsettled area. In the Old Southwest, insurance maps at the end of the 19th century show a brickyard, coal yard, wagon works, a school, and churches located among relatively scattered residential structures made of wood frame, brick, and stone. The Board of Public Works headed by Alexander “Boss” Shepherd was largely responsible for late-19th century development, favoring sites north and northwest of The Mall. The introduction of the electric streetcar in 1888 and the automobile in 1897 encouraged expansion of the city. Urban planning and zoning, limitations on building heights, and improved municipal engineering related to landscaping, sanitation and flood management ushered in the early stages of the city’s Modern era, which “officially” began with the 1902 McMillan Report and plan.

In the 1920s, business and government leaders renewed efforts to attract industry to Washington, DC. Repeating the experience of 50 years earlier, however, no significant industrial development seems to have occurred in the Old Southwest at Buzzard Point. According to newspaper articles from the early 1930s, the area below the northern working-class residential area was a “no man’s land” and “sparsely settled.” While an increase in population of the Southwest areas after the Civil War precipitated increased housing construction, it appears that most of the residential development occurred north of Q Street. Photographs of Buzzard Point taken between 1916 and 1935 indicate that the houses were mostly frame dwellings and widely separated from neighbors. As late as 1930, one observer noted,
“Much of the place is covered with growing crops and vegetables for the market.”

In 1932, the Potomac & Pennsylvania Railroad extended tracks through the undeveloped southern end of Buzzard Point to bring coal to the new Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) installation. The rails were laid along First Street, SW, and Potomac Avenue, formerly Georgia Avenue. The National Capital Park & Planning Commission had pushed for the new PEPCO plant, hoping it would spur more building interest in this “desolate area.”

The Buzzard Point PEPCO plant was completed in 1933. According to a report in the magazine, *Power*, the plant was the most efficient and environmentally friendly electric plant of its time. Following the PEPCO plant, additional industries did move into the area. In the 1930s, the Standard and Gulf Oil companies had large storage tanks (which remain) and docking facilities on the Anacostia to accommodate barges. There were warehouses for groceries on P Street, SW, between 1900 and 1950, an ice cream plant in the 1950s, a few junk yards, a gas station that became a taxi company by 1967, and various concrete supplies and building material production plants along the Anacostia River.

At the time the PEPCO plant was developed, the federal government owned property in Buzzard Point in addition to Fort McNair. On June 25, 1912, the Army Corps of Engineers had acquired the land at the southernmost tip of Buzzard Point through the condemnation process for “construction, repair or preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors.” The condemned property was transferred to the National Park Service in 1956, which has continued leasing the land to two marinas: the James Creek Marina, which is on the site of the former Corinthian Yacht Club (1913) and located just east of Fort McNair in the western portion of Buzzard Point, and the Buzzard Point Marina, constructed prior to 1930 and located on the eastern tip of Buzzard Point.

**Population Development**

Although often overlooked, Old Southwest possesses a vibrant social history. Within this isolated borough, social conflicts and struggles for land ownership and civil rights have been a part of the area’s history since development first came to Buzzard Point more than two centuries ago. The most significant event in the history of Southwest that forever changed outsiders’ attitudes toward the area was the construction of the Washington City Canal in the early 1800s, described in an earlier section. Residential as well as commercial development in Old Southwest was sparse. With the growth of the federal city in the mid-19th century and the need for workers to build and service it, however, the Old Southwest grew more diverse.

The outbreak of the Civil War had an impact on the racial composition of the District of Columbia’s population, including Old Southwest. In the spring of 1862, it was estimated that 400 freed blacks or runaway slaves had settled in the DC area. By October 1862, their numbers had grown to 4,200 and, by 1865, it is estimated that 40,000 new black residents had settled in Washington. Between 1860 and 1870, the black population of Southwest nearly quadrupled from 1,805 to 6,697, and African Americans comprised nearly 40 percent of the Southwest.

---

*Figure 19* Hopkins map showing speculative development on Buzzard Point in the Southwest, 1892

*Figure 20* Wooden frame dwelling (demolished) formerly located on U Street, SW, early-20th Century
The area was one of the few places in the District to offer African Americans shelter and a chance for a new start. By the end of the Civil War, racial segregation was rampant in Washington DC, and African Americans settling in the District had to create support systems in their surrounding environments. These networks of support included schools, churches, and social clubs in the Old Southwest. Among these institutions was Rehoboth Baptist Church, founded in Old Southwest area in the 1870s, and which grew in membership between 1870 and 1900. Rehoboth Baptist became a leader in Southwest community outreach programs, monitoring social services, and providing social assistance for underprivileged mothers and foster children.

Fervent racism and crowded city lots combined with a belief that "much of the land in Southwest…was low-lying, and hence considered unhealthy, making it unlikely to be developed for middle- or high-income housing" led to the creation of alley dwellings that were inhabited largely by African Americans. According to 1880 census data for the Old Southwest, the customary occupation of an African-American male was working in a brickyard. In the same census year, the typical African-American female was either employed as a servant or as keeping house. This "segregated racial pattern" was the most common experience for working-class blacks, and alley dwellings soon became small towns unto themselves. The alley dwellings of the District are discussed further in the following section.

African Americans were not the only ethnic group to settle in the Old Southwest. By the end of the Civil War, European immigrants had begun settling in the area. The local population doubled between 1870 and 1900 because of the influx of German, Jewish, Eastern European and Irish immigrants, as well as African Americans moving in to the District from nearby states. The 1880 census data for Old Southwest identifies white immigrants who worked as bakers, butchers, laborers, stablemen, blacksmiths, and whitewashers. The census reveals two scenarios for how blacks and non-blacks coexisted in Buzzard Point. Data for "First Street and Half Street, SW" reveals a mixture of both black and white residents. Some black residents did live as servants in white households; however, the data also show a number of black families living on equal terms with white families, with the males working in area brickyards or ironworks and females employed at their respective local schools.

Between 1880 and 1930, Buzzard Point contained an eclectic mix of ethnicities, religions, and traditional institutions isolated within a broader social construct, and all struggling for social equality and civic justice. The Jewish population soared with the establishment of a small Russian enclave, and several African-American community centers, places of worship, and schools flourished in the area. The first community service organization for blacks established in the District, the Colored Settlement House, was founded in the Southwest in 1901 by a group of black residents and black community leaders seeking to improve the lot of the poor. (The successor to this organization is the Southwest Community House, which is located at 156 Q Street, SW).
In 1909, the city named a new elementary school after William Syphax, who helped create a public school system for African Americans in the District. The next section of this document includes an account of the school’s important role in the lives of Old Southwest residents.

When the city’s population boomed again after World War I, stringent zoning and land use regulation were introduced by the District Zoning Commission in 1920. Population continued to increase, and at the conclusion of World War II, major policy shifts in city planning were beginning to shape the city.

During the 1930s, the growing presence of industrial, commercial, and governmental enterprises in areas of the Old Southwest began to spill over into residential neighborhoods, causing increases in noise, pollution, and traffic. Residents from all ethnic backgrounds who could afford to move away did so, while those who could not were forced to remain. By the 1930s and 1940s, Southwest DC had lost significant population and was considered by many to be a run-down, blighted area. Urban Renewal of the 1950s and 1960s caused a massive wave of demolition and new construction in some areas of Southwest DC, with limited impact on structures in Old Southwest. However, Urban Renewal was the reason for a massive displacement of white and black residents in the Southwest, east of Canal Street: 23,500 residents, most of them African Americans, were displaced and relocated to other areas in Washington. The displacement from Urban Renewal has had lasting effects on the neighborhood, as some African-American residents still harbor feelings of mistrust and broken social ties.

Alley Dwellings and Public Housing Projects

As previously noted, the African-American population of Washington, DC, nearly doubled in the decade between 1860 and 1870. During the Civil War's severe housing shortages, alley dwellings were one of the few options available to poor and working-class residents. Alley dwellings were small houses situated in alleys behind larger residences on main thoroughfares. These houses often shared the alleys with workshops, stables, and other accessory buildings. Of inferior construction and lacking private sanitary facilities, alley dwellings offered deplorable living conditions characterized by the spread of infectious diseases, high rates of mortality, and criminal activities.

Washington, DC, was not the only city in the United States with an inadequate housing problem. By the 1890s, most American cities experienced a phenomenal industrial expansion that created a comparable increase in the population classified as “working class.” Despite the significant role this group had played in building the new America, their work and living conditions were among the country’s worst. This soon began to change. Influenced by the social and environmental ideals of a group of social scientists, the Progressive campaign to reform urban and industrial life materialized. The Progressives’ programs reflected the concerns of the urban middle class. The reformers regarded the slums as “potential volcanoes,” and responded by organizing philanthropic and systematic social programs, including housing initiatives.

In 1897, a group of prominent Washingtonians influenced by the Progressive movement, in conjunction with the Board of Trade...
of Washington, the Central Relief Committee, and the Woman’s Anthropological Society, held a public meeting at the Foundry Methodist Episcopal Church to address the issue of providing adequate housing for the wage earners. This meeting was followed by two other meetings addressing the same issues and gathering support for the idea of forming a housing company. Later that year, having secured sufficient subscriptions, the Washington Sanitary Improvement Company was formed. The company was incorporated under the laws of the state of Virginia, as the general incorporation law of the District of Columbia did not allow for the creation of a company for such a purpose.

The Washington Sanitary Improvement Company’s objectives were “to supply to wage earners improved, wholesome homes at reasonable rents...And to provide the very best accommodations from the standpoint of hygiene, and, as to comfort, the utmost which a given cost will permit.” The history of Sanitary Housing in the Old Southwest is explored more thoroughly in the individual resource inventory later in this report.

The dilemma of how to clear alley dwellings and provide adequate housing for former alley residents persisted in Washington, DC. Diverse in population at the outset, by the turn of the 20th century, alley dwellings were predominantly housing for African Americans.

As early as 1914 the Congress passed laws to outlaw alley housing in the District after 1918. Later, the Alley Dwelling Act of 1934 declared that alley dwellings were illegal and provided that the worst areas be razed and the inhabitants relocated. To achieve this goal, the Congress established the Alley Dwelling Authority (ADA) in 1938. The ADA immediately started with plans to reclaim the city’s slums, convert the alleys into streets, and replace existing shacks with model low-cost dwellings. ADA marked the beginning of public housing programs in Washington, DC. To achieve its objectives, the ADA was also involved in constructing garages and commercial buildings. John Idhler, ADA executive director, explained that this approach was taken in order to raise money, and it was located in areas where “proximity to business areas makes residential development inadvisable.”

The ADA faced many challenges. The first was securing adequate funding to undertake all the ambitious plans it was expected to execute. In the later stages of ADA operation, World War II added a second challenge as it shifted the country’s priorities to defense and warfare activities. The third challenge to ADA was humanitarian: despite the apparent relief that many Washingtonians felt toward the decision to clear slums, some were concerned about its social and human consequences. Their fears appear well founded. A survey conducted in 1938 revealed that 6,000 persons inhabited 1,881 alleys in Washington, DC. Within a short time, most of them were forced to move, and all of them had to vacate the alleys in accordance with the Alley Act. However, there was no assurance that new dwellings would be available to former alley residents. Any increase in rent, no matter how minimal, without increased income meant that a large number of the displaced families would not be able to afford new low-income units. Added to that, a considerable part of the alley properties were diverted to commercial use. Many of the displaced families never returned to their original neighborhoods.
In the Old Southwest area, the ADA constructed James Creek Housing as part of its slum clearance program. The project was in its final planning stage as the United States entered World War II. James Creek was designed by Albert Cassell, a prominent African-American architect in the city who also served on the architecture faculty at Howard University. Additional information on James Creek Housing and Cassell is contained in the individual resource inventory later in this report.

Urban Renewal

The 1950 Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital and its Environs recommended redevelopment of “obsolete” neighborhoods, under the authority of the 1945 District of Columbia Redevelopment Act.117 Neighborhoods with overcrowding and poor sanitation caused by lack of indoor plumbing, among other things, were cited during inventories of District dwellings.118 The Redevelopment Land Agency (RLA) implemented the plans, resulting in the clearance of entire city blocks in Southwest and elsewhere.119

Old Southwest was outside the Urban Renewal area, and therefore, was spared the most destructive impacts of renewal efforts. One possible reason for this beneficial oversight may have been the large number of public housing units already located in the area that met the sanitary requirements of the neighborhood evaluators. Ironically, while left off the list of Urban Renewal areas and spared large-scale population displacement and building demolition, the Old Southwest has nevertheless declined, suffering from continuous disinvestments over the past 50 years.
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Section 4
Inventory of Historic Resources

The studio team identified 21 historic resources in the Study Area. This section of the report contains an inventory with individual descriptions of all 21 resources. This inventory represents the studio team’s best effort at identifying and documenting the Old Southwest’s historic resources during the study period, September through November 2005.

The process began with a tour of the Old Southwest led by a member of the DC Preservation League. Following the initial visit, team members returned to the neighborhood several times in order to photograph buildings and streetscapes and record existing conditions. Each team member individually researched one or more of the identified resources in primary sources such as deeds, building permits, plans, maps, and photographs, and secondary sources such as books and newspaper and journal articles. If the property or resource was older than, or approaching, fifty years old, the team deemed the property historic. For properties’ location see map on page 32. If the community decides to pursue designation as a DC historic district or landmark status for individual or multiple buildings, this inventory could provide the basis for more in-depth research.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Sanitary Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area between M, Half, N, and South Capitol streets, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>James Creek Public Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area between M, First, Canal, O, and Half streets, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Syphax School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1360 Half Street, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Carron Baptist Church</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jas. T. Warren Building</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wenig Rowhouses</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Simmons Rowhouses</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Apartment House</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Frame House</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Frame House</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1542 First Street, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>James C. Dent</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence/ Southwest Community House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156 Q Street, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19th Century Rowhouses</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1307, 1309, 1311, 1313, 1315, 1317 South Capitol Street, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Syphax Gardens Public Housing</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple lots in squares 601, 599, 656, 654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tel-Court Cooperative</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple addresses on Half, O, and P streets, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marshal Rowhouses</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple addresses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Walker Rowhouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Henson Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>James Creek Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Buzzard Point Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><img src="image21.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Washington City Canal/James Creek Canal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sanitary Housing

Resource Address: Area between M Street, Half Street, N Street, and South Capitol Street, SW

Architect/Builder: Appleton P. Clark/Washington Sanitary Improvement Company

Building Type/Use: Multi-family dwelling/residential

Date of Construction: 1909/1914

Location: Square 651, all lots

Architectural Description

Four rows of two-story houses comprise Sanitary Housing. Each row contains 29 identical units. Each unit encompasses two independent apartments, one on each floor. The facades are dominated by Flemish-bond brick. The front facade of each unit has two entrances and one window on the first floor level. The entrances contain rectangular door openings topped with blind semi-circle arches whereas the window opening is topped with a blind segmental arch. The second floor level has two rectangular windows. A band of raised brick placed at the bottom of the second floor windows, and two bands of raised brick placed at the top of the second floor windows, wrap around the four facades. The end units have bay windows.

At either end of each unit, a brick pilaster highlights unit separation. The pilaster begins at the end of the second floor windows and ends with the edge of the roof, meeting with a projected brick cornice. The rear facades have one rectangular door opening and a square window opening for every unit. All the doors on the second floor open to a covered wooden porch.

Inside, the historic building plans show that each first floor apartment has a living room that contains an alcove as an optional bedroom, a kitchen, and a bathroom that can be accessed through the living room. Another bedroom is at the back and can be accessed through the kitchen. The entrance to the second floor apartment is by an interior staircase that leads to a hall. There is a kitchen, living room, bedroom, and bathroom that can be accessed through this hall. Another bedroom is at the back and can be accessed through the kitchen.
Integrity

The rowhouses on Half Street and Carrollsburg Place have maintained their original historic fabric in terms of the units’ exterior with the exception of door openings. Due to the fact that the first and second floor apartments in many units have been joined together as one unit, the front facades have experienced many alterations in the opening configurations. Some of the entrances were completely filled in and covered with brick. Some owners have converted them to windows. In some instances, the widths of these door-into-window openings remain unchanged while in others they are made narrower. Many of the window frames were replaced with newer ones. Four of the units have converted the back porches into sunrooms using siding painted in different colors. The rowhouses on South Capitol built in 1914 have been demolished with the exception of one unit on the corner facing N Street.

Factors of Significance

A number of factors of significance relate to Sanitary Housing. One factor relates to the architect, Appleton P. Clark (1865-1955). Clark was one of the most prominent and prolific Washington architects of the early 20th century. He designed many important buildings in Washington, DC, such as the Strand Theatre (1888), Langston School, and the Homer Building, which is a Category II Landmark on the District of Columbia Inventory of Historic Places. Clark was also known for his design of many banks in Washington, including Riggs National Bank, 14th Street and Park Road, NW.

Innovative design and quality of construction is another factor of significance. Each unit had two independent apartments, one on each floor. Although the units were simple in their exterior and economical in construction, they provided good space, light, and air. Each unit had a bathroom, hot and cold water, and a hot water boiler, unlike many of the surrounding homes of the period. The kitchens were equipped with stoves. The concept of having two complete and independent flats in one house was an original idea at the time and was later copied in many projects in the city.

These distinctive houses were constructed by the Washington Sanitary Improvement Company. The company built many sanitary housing projects in Washington. Sanitary Housing on square 651 was intended for African Americans. The company’s operations included purchasing land, constructing houses, and managing these housing projects.

Sanitary Housing had a significant impact on improving the living conditions of the working class, both whites and blacks. By the end of 1906, the company announced that their finished apartments were occupied by 778 adults and 380 children. During that period there were 39 births and only eight deaths, which represented a remarkably low mortality rate when compared with the general death rate among the city population. Within the Sanitary Houses, the mortality rate dropped to one half of non-sanitary housing areas.

To manage these projects, the company required an agent to live in one of the flats in each complex. The agent’s proximity enabled tenants to pay their rents without any delay and without losing some of their limited free time. Moreover, the agents kept
close contact with the tenants and gave advice on caring for the units. To encourage tenants to maintain their homes, the company allowed a rebate of one month’s rent per year for interior repairs. If no repairs were needed, the tenants received the benefit of this allowance or, in the case of making repairs, what remained of it after required maintenance.

Sanitary Housing was intended to remove slums by providing new homes for alley-dwelling residents. Nonetheless, the Washington Sanitary Improvement Company had a different approach in solving this problem. The company considered that it was best to begin the movement by improving dwellings for the better class of wage earners, believing that houses vacated by them would be rented by the next lower class, and so on until the bottom of the ladder was reached.

The company also aimed at securing stock subscriptions not only from philanthropic capitalists, but from wage earners and prospective tenants. At the same time, while the objectives of the company were philanthropic, its management was conducted upon strict business principals. The company declared that their enterprise was in no sense an experiment; it was rather one that offered the security of a first-class investment.

The final factor of significance is that Sanitary Housing soon will be 100 years old.

Sources


James Creek Public Housing

Resource Address: Area between M Street, Canal Street, First Street, O Street and Half Street, SW

Architect/ Builder: Albert Cassell/Alley Dwelling Authority

Building Type/Use: Multi-family dwelling/residential

Date of Construction: 1942

Location: Squares 598, 650, 652. Square 652, lot 6 is not part of the complex.

Architectural Description

James Creek Housing is comprised of 27 two-story rowhouse/townhouse buildings with 239 units. The rowhouses are spread out on the three squares in different configurations in accordance with the squares’ sizes and shapes, creating small alleys and open courts.

All of the units are concrete masonry frame with brick exterior. The front facades of each unit have a window opening and a door opening on the first floor while the second floor has two window openings. The corner units are entered from the sides. A number of brick chimneys are visible. Originally, the buildings have flat roofs for the units on the sides and gable roofs for the units in the middle. There are six types of apartments; each has a different number of rooms. The units’ sizes vary from one-bedroom apartments to four- and five-bedroom townhouses.

Integrity

The entire project received comprehensive modernization in 1982. The alterations included site improvements: fencing, paving, sidewalks, drainage, parking, and landscaping. Electrical and mechanical systems were also upgraded. The exterior alterations included the following: replacing flat roofs with gable roofs, adding arched porches to some units, adding arched brick trims to all door openings, adding concrete bay windows to some units, and adding wood shutters to every window opening.
Factors of Significance

A number of factors of significance relate to James Creek Housing. First, Albert Cassell (1861-1940), a well-known African-American architect, designed the project. A 1919 graduate of Cornell University, Cassell served as an assistant professor in the Architecture Department at Howard University. He was largely responsible for Howard University’s campus design, having produced its Master Plan for expansion in 1930. He designed most of the buildings surrounding the university’s quadrangle, including the Medical School, Frederick Douglass Memorial Hall, and Founders Library. Cassell also designed Mayfair Mansions, a housing project completed in 1946 in northeast Washington. Mayfair Mansions was a first-class complex offering housing for working- and middle-class blacks. It was listed on the DC Inventory of Historic Sites and the National Register for Historic Places in 1989.

James Creek Housing was a slum clearance project of the Alley Dwelling Authority (ADA). The authority financed the complex by loans from the Federal Public Housing Authority and the sale of bonds to private investors. The federal government also subsidized the property with annual contributions, and the District allowed real estate tax-exemption. Through these measures, the tenants’ ability to pay dictated the graded amount of rent.

Some of the first tenants residing in James Creek Housing were associated with the expansion of the Washington Navy Yard which began in 1940. The expansion necessitated use of a slum area adjacent to the Navy Yard’s buildings. The slum clearance resulted in displacing 121 African-American families to an emergency trailer site. Once the units in James Creek Housing were ready, the ADA moved some of the displaced families there beginning in 1942. Other early tenants were migrant African-American war workers employed by federal agencies.

James Creek Housing is included in the Southwest Heritage Trail as an example of early public housing projects in Southwest.

Sources


<http://www.howard.edu/library/Development/Cassell/Founders.htm>


<http://www.archives.gov/research/guide-fed-records/groups/302.html>
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Syphax School (Village)

Resource Address: 1360 Half Street, SW

Architect/Builder: Marsh & Peter/D.F. Mackabee (Original structure) Manna, Inc./Manna, Inc. (Adaptive reuse)

Building Type/Use: School/educational (original) Multi-family dwelling/residential (adaptive re-use) Townhouses/residential

Date of Construction: School - 1901; renovated 2005 Townhouses - beginning in 1999

Location: Square 653; lots 822 and 825

Architectural Description

The historic core of the school is two-and-one-half stories tall with a hipped roof and of the Colonial Revival style. The building has three pavilions, the main pavilion recessed at the front and rear. The building is red brick with wood, metal, terra-cotta, and limestone details. The roof is asphalt and has two brick chimneys.

The main façade has nine bays. Windows on the first story are regular six-over-six double-hung windows, while the second story has arched six-over-six windows. The second story windows have keystones above them. The foundations have patterns of brick that appear rusticated. A terra-cotta stringcourse runs around the building below the first story windows, with a similar treatment below the second story windows. The second story terra-cotta string course has a decorative motif. A cornice surrounds the upper part of the building below wide eaves, and decorative brackets support the roof.

The main entrance has a limestone surround decorated with Doric pilasters on either side of the entrance and a triangular pediment. Above the entrance is a Palladian window with a balcony and iron railing. On the northern and southern sides of the building are secondary entrances that appear less grand, but still have limestone surrounds and a multi-light transom above the doors. The north door is marked “Boys” and the south door marked “Girls.” Above the secondary entrances are large arched windows.

The remaining 1941 addition is on the north elevation. The addition is two stories of red brick with less decorative limestone...
A “water table” consisting of large blocks of limestone surrounds the lower portion of the addition; while a classical cornice caps the second story. Windows are six-over-six double hung windows and have limestone sills. The entrance on the addition is recessed with a limestone lintel inscribed with the school name. Above the entrance is a large window with sidelights.

**Integrity**

During renovation, the exterior of the building was changed. All windows were replaced. The new windows do resemble the original six-over-six double hung windows, on the first story, and the arched multi-pane double-hung windows on the second story. A new gutter system is in place, made of plastic pipes. The basement windows on the rear of the building are bricked in. Also during renovation, part of the 1941 addition and all of the large 1953 addition were removed. Manna, Inc., built 29 townhouses on the school grounds, filling the empty space caused by the demolition.

**Factors of Significance**

The William Syphax School opened in 1901 as a public school for colored children. The school’s factors of historic significance are drawn from both its architecture and its namesake. Although the school has undergone some recent renovations, the school is contemporarily significant for its adaptive use, in a neighborhood where the demand is high for affordable housing. William Syphax School was designated a DC Historic Landmark in 2003.

The architect of the building was the firm of Marsh & Peter, founded by William J. Marsh and Walter G. Peter. The two men were Washington, DC natives who did some of their most noted work in the area. They designed the Evening Star Building (1898), Walter Reed Army Hospital (1908), and the Georgetown Farmer’s & Mechanic’s National Bank.

William Syphax was born a slave in 1829 on Arlington Plantation in Virginia. After Emancipation, Syphax worked as a stenographer and clerk in the office of the Secretary of the Interior. Because of his position, he made many high-ranking friends. In 1868, Syphax became the first African-American trustee of “colored schools” in the District of Columbia and Georgetown. As a trustee and proponent of African-American education, Syphax organized a college preparatory school for black students in 1870. That school eventually became the noted Dunbar High School. Syphax continued to work for African-American education and desegregation of schools in the District until his death in 1891.

The construction of the school’s additions coincided with an increase in housing in the surrounding neighborhood. Five years after the school was dedicated, the Washington Sanitary Improvement Company built four blocks of townhouses, each house split into two apartments. In 1941, the school was expanded with two additions. Not long after these additions were completed, James Creek, a public housing project, opened. The addition in 1953 anticipated the building of another public housing project, Syphax Gardens, in 1958.

After closing in the 1980s, the school sat vacant and became a site for drug-dealing and other crimes. Today, Syphax School no
longer sits empty, but once again serves the community through adaptive-reuse as resident-owned housing.

The Syphax School and surrounding schoolyard form Syphax Village. The Village was a project of Manna, Inc., a nonprofit developer that builds and renovates homes in the District of Columbia specifically for low- to moderate-income families. The corporation was formed in 1982, and has since sold over 850 homes to qualifying families. The company aims to help families achieve homeownership and improve their quality of life.

During a public ceremony, Syphax Village celebrated its redevelopment with the neighboring community in January 2005. The Village consists of 41 townhouses and condominiums for low-income families. The significance of the Syphax Village is that the new townhouses and renovated condominiums continue the century-old tradition of affordable housing in the Old Southwest.

Sources


Carron Baptist Church

Resource Address: 1354 First Street, SW

Architect/Builder: E. Woltz/B. J. Mabre

Building Type/Use: Church/religious

Dates of Construction: 1898; addition of formstone concrete masonry material over original brick exterior sometime after 1950

Location: Square 652, lot 6.

Architectural Description

The architecture of Carron Baptist Church reflects changing times and design styles in Old Southwest. Carron Baptist Church is a vernacular blend of early-20th century Victorian Gothic and Romanesque Revival style architecture, with a few Gothic Revival traits. This harkens back to the late-Romantic period of the 19th century when symbolic virtues of traditional Gothic architecture were inscribed and revived in contemporary church architecture. This Gothic Revival style aesthetic was also tailored to post-Civil War tastes in America.

Carron Baptist Church embodies a modest nave and transept floor plan flanked by aisles on either side of the nave, typical of religious vernacular architecture. Polychromatic exterior walls of the church consist of formstone, a concrete material resembling stone masonry, with pale pink and various shades of gray colors juxtaposed with differing textures. The formstone, applied sometime after 1950, covers the red brick masonry exterior walls of the original structure. Formstone was applied to many brick structures for aesthetics and insulation from the 1940s to 1970s, and is a historically significant element in its own right. (See discussion of formstone, below.) As was common for the Romanesque Revival style, the main block of the church is flanked by two square polygonal towers of the same height and covered with an asphalt material. The front elevation also contains three entrances, one main entrance through the nave and one entrance within each tower.

The west elevation, or front façade, displays Gothic-style windows containing pointed arches with a second-story tracery window. It appears the stained glass windows and transoms...
remain intact and encapsulated by protective outer sashes. All windows are bordered by decorative polychromatic arched mouldings flush with the exterior wall. The front façade of the main block also features a steeply pitched gabled roof, which is flush with the exterior wall and set back from the two square polygonal tower structures. The towers rise from the ends of the gable roof and each contains a pyramidal roof and a square base, with four slopes rising to a peak. The exterior of the towers displays decorative vertical moulding in the quoin areas.

Both north and south elevations of the church continue to illustrate Gothic Revival style with large pointed arched windows on the second story. Modest rectangular-shaped windows decorate the first story. All windows, rectangular and Gothic style, are surrounded by mouldings flush with the exterior. A stringcourse directly above first story windows emphasizes the prominence of the lower level aisle area. Doorways are located on either side of the church and display rectangular transoms. In addition, the north and south elevation walls have decorative, non-structural pilaster buttresses in between every other window bay.

A stone pier and wrought iron fence surround the front façade, creating a front entrance patio area. Wrought iron bars can also be seen on all first floor windows and air conditioning units.

Integrity

The original brick church was constructed in 1898 at a cost of $7,000 for the Rehoboth Baptist Church organization under Reverend H. Lee Coleman and Reverend Richards. It remained a modest brick church until sometime after 1950, when Reverend A. H. Johnson facilitated several updates and major renovations to the building. He was responsible for new interior concrete flooring, updating the men's and women's restrooms, constructing a new choir loft and rostrum, revamping basement office spaces, and installing an impressive new Moeller organ. The formstone was also added to the exterior at this time. In 1969, Rehoboth Baptist Church relocated to Southeast Washington, DC, and the Carron Baptist Church congregation moved from their original Northwest location into the building.

The Carron Baptist Church building possesses integrity in its design, association, materials, and location to the Southwest area. The original brick church remains intact underneath a mid/late-20th century exterior addition of formstone, which in itself is historic. This formstone layer adds character and decorative element to the building and also shows that the church has evolved through several decades and generations of pastorate. The church was the original home of Rehoboth Baptist Church, one of the first recognized African-American churches formed in Washington, DC, directly after the Civil War. This 1898 solid-brick structure is testament to the African-American struggle for equality in religious worship and their determination to establish a permanent community in a highly discriminatory environment. It is exactly this location within the community where the church has remained a stable force for nearly 141 years amidst changing social demographics, population, changing built environment, and race relations.

Factors of Significance

Carron Baptist Church contributes significantly to the heritage, culture, and development of the Old Southwest and to the greater Washington, DC region. It is one of the first African-American
churches in Washington, DC, to achieve recognition as an official religious institution influencing social growth patterns within the Southwest area.

The original occupant of Carron Baptist Church building was Rehoboth Baptist Church. The church was established in mid-1860s, when several congregational members broke from the Second Baptist Church in Southwest to worship at the home of Hanna Johnson along First Street, SW. Years later, General Howard of the US Army (for whom Howard University is named) negotiated for the new group and secured an old frame building on First Street SW, between N and O Streets. The congregation grew in numbers and was soon recognized as the Rehobeth Baptist Church. Several Sunday schools, Bible studies, and community outreach programs were established during this time. As the church grew spiritually, financially, and numerically under the leadership of Reverend Coleman, a more permanent structure was needed to accommodate the expanding congregation. In 1898, members obtained a building permit to erect a two-story brick church in the same lot as the frame building. According to written secondary sources, this frame building was moved back to accommodate the newer brick church.

Rehoboth Baptist: Leader in Providing Social Service Programs for Washington, DC

In February 1936, the Reverend Mr. Johnson was called to the pastorate of Rehoboth Baptist Church. Under his leadership, the church congregation continued to grow, and it soon became a centerpiece of the Southwest community. In the 1940s, Reverend Johnson improved the church’s aesthetic qualities, as well as strengthened its role as a leader in community outreach programs and social assistance for underprivileged mothers and foster children. This focus on improving family life, strengthening community through outreach, providing homes for addicted adults and abandoned children, and participating in citywide charitable events continues today as a major priority of Rehoboth Baptist Church. In 1969, due to a significant loss in its congregation from displacement caused by urban renewal in Southwest, Rehoboth Baptist Church moved to Southeast where most of its members had relocated. There, the church was the first in the city to sponsor group homes for Washington’s homeless and dependent children. In addition, the senior choir of Rehoboth Baptist Church has provided spiritual edification to Washington, DC’s black community for over a century. Rehoboth Baptist Church still keeps ties to its home community of Southwest and is the “mother” of three other churches in the area: Mt. Moriah Baptist Church, The Pilgrim Baptist Church, and The Second Baptist Church.

Since 1970, Carron Baptist Church has occupied the building at 1354 First Street, SW. Carron Baptist is involved with the Southwest community and continues to reach out to residents the same way Rehoboth Baptist Church envisioned nearly 135 years ago. Carron Baptist Church remains a pillar of the Southwest community and is a significant resource in the African-American heritage of Washington, DC.

Description of Formstone

Formstone™ was patented by Albert Knight of Baltimore, Maryland in 1937. Its use was widespread in Baltimore and surrounding areas, and it became popular for covering the
exteriors of rowhouses in that city. The material was applied in a manner similar to stucco, in multiple layers, to wire net or lath attached to existing exterior walls, then scored with simulated mortar joints to suggest individual stones. Many religious institutions chose simulated stone for new buildings, to cover mismatched siding, or to match real stone churches.

The idea that simulated masonry is worthy of preservation has been slowly integrated into historic rehabilitation guidelines. The position of the Hampden Village Main Street Program in Baltimore is that "while Formstone removal may also be included as a façade improvement, applicants are encouraged to keep Formstone that is in good condition [as] it is a distinct part of Baltimore's unique heritage."

Sources


"Organ Installed at Rehoboth Baptist Church," The Washington Tribune. 27 January 1940.


Department of Building Inspection DC Permit #1898, Building Permit for 1354 First Street, SW. Microfilm. National Archives Collection. National Archives and Record Administration (NARA), Washington, DC 2005.
Jas. T. Warring Building

Resource Address: 1319/1321 South Capitol Street, SW

Architect/Builder: Herman S. Ward

Building Type/Use: Warehouse/commercial

Date of Construction: 1944

Location: Square 653, lot 15

Architectural Description

The building consists of a red brick-over-concrete block office and wood frame shed. It is a two-story building with four window openings, two at each floor, and one door opening on the South Capitol Street façade (east). A second door at ground level and two windows on the second floor are visible on the north façade. The south façade is painted (possibly exposed concrete block) with a brick-framed window at ground level. The west elevation at the shed connection is not visible from South Capitol Street. It has a 12-inch thick foundation and exterior walls of eight and 12 inches thick. The structure has a flat roof. A concrete block wall divides the office from the shed beyond. The shed consists of wood posts supporting a frame roof. The entire building according to the building permit measures 27 feet by 132 feet in total length. The shed is approximately 27 feet x 110 feet; the office is approximately 20 feet x 22 feet. A business sign labeled “Jas. T. Warring- Est. 1918” is attached to the South Capitol Street façade.

Integrity

According to the building permit, the original 1944 structure was only one story and 14 feet tall from sidewalk to highest point of roof, as built. The presumed second-floor addition visually differs from the first floor in the appearance of the brick. In addition, large, square industrial windows on the second floor do not align with windows below and do not match the segmental arches found above all window and door openings at the first floor. The lower half of the first floor window openings on the east façade have been bricked-in, as has an entire window opening on the north façade. The integrity of the shed is
unknown due to obstruction of view and distance from public property. The environmental quality of 1321 South Capitol Street is questionable due to past listing on the federal CERCLIS list of “Superfund” sites. It was removed from this list in 2004; its status is now CERCLIS-NFRAP (No Further Remedial Action Planned) reflecting the change.

Factors of Significance

The Jas. T. Warring building is a World War II-era commercial/storage building typical of the scale and use of this section of Buzzard Point. The building and the site remain under Warring family ownership. James T. and Martha Warring were recorded as the owners at the time of its construction. Historic records reveal that the Warring family operated a business involving barrels on and around this site as early as 1919 and the James T. Warring Sons, Inc., website, “Warring Barrels,” states the family business was started in 1918, as does the aforementioned signage noted above. The 1928 Sanborn insurance map notes a “Barrel Storage & Barrel Yard” at 1323 South Capitol Street. There is inconclusive evidence as to what structures existed on this site (or neighboring sites) before 1944.

Sources


Lot 15, Square 653 Deed History (pre-1975).
6  

Wenig Rowhouses

Resource Address: 1400, 1402, 1404 First Street, SW

Architect/Builder: Julius Wenig/S. J. Brinkley

Building Type/Use: Rowhouses/residential

Date of Construction: 1907

Location: Square 654, lot 19

Architectural Description

This group of three rowhouses, each unit three bays wide, is built of brick. The end units retain their original red color while the center unit façade has been painted tan. All of the houses have white, undivided, double-hung windows on the west (front) elevation with two on the first floor and three on the second. Above the windows are heavy rusticated concrete or stone lintels. Two of the windows on the first floor and two on the second have one single continuous lintel. The windows have smooth concrete or stone sills. The front door has a lintel of the same style and composition as the windows. There is a heavy galvanized iron cornice at the top of all of the units; it is not continuous. There is a strip of galvanized iron moulding halfway between the second floor windows and the cornice. The cornice and moulding are painted white. Two brick courses connect the windowsills of the three units on the first and second floors. The roofs are flat.

Differences among the west facades are as follows:

1400: White solid panel front door; white metal bars at first floor windows and door transom; window air conditioners first floor left and second floor center.

1402: Natural wood front door with diamond window; black metal bars at first floor windows and transom; window air conditioners first floor left and second floor center; gate of black metal bars covering front entry.

1404: White front door; black metal bars on first floor windows and transom, window bars inset with decorative element; window

Figure 45 Wenig Rowhouses, northeast elevation, 2005
The Old Southwest
Historic Resource Documentation and Preservation Plan

air conditioner second floor right; gate of black metal bars covering front entry.

All of the houses have small, enclosed front yards. At 1400, a white picket fence extends from the left side of the front walk across the yard, turns back once past the house for about six feet and turns again and extends about 10 feet to the sidewalk at O Street, isolating a patch of front lawn containing a small ornamental shrub. The front yard at 1402 has a low, black iron fence that runs along the right side of the walk at 1400, turns right and extends to the sidewalk where there is a small iron gate. The front yard at 1404 is surrounded by an evergreen hedge, approximately four feet high.

The north elevation of 1400 is visible from O Street. There are four windows on the first and four windows on the second floor. The windows begin about a third of the way from the front corner of the house. Counting from the front corner, windows one and two are larger than three and four. While the size of the window openings are the same for one and two on both floors, there is a panel at the bottoms of one and two on the first floor. Windows one and two are an equal distance apart on both floors, about two feet. From window two to window three on both floors there is a distance of about three feet. From window three to window four on both floors there is a distance of about five-six feet. While the sizes of the window openings are the same for three and four, there is a panel at the bottoms of three and four on the first floor. All of the windows on the north elevation except for one are white, double hung with undivided glass. Window three on the second floor is glass block. All of the window lintels are rusticated concrete or stone; the sills are the same material but smooth. The first floor windows are covered with white metal bars. There appears to be leeching of the mortar, with white stains covering the face of the brick. There is evidence of a patch beneath window four, second floor. There is the “ghost” image of an exterior staircase, beginning above window four on the first floor and descending under windows three and four. A cornice identical to the one on the west elevation runs the length of the north elevation. There is also a strip of moulding above the second floor windows, again identical in style and placement to the one on the front elevation. Connected to the house at the east (rear) elevation is a single story addition covered in yellow horizontal siding. A wooden deck with a simple wood railing extends the length on this elevation of the addition.

The east elevations of 1400 and 1402 are partially visible from O Street. The first floor addition to 1400 appears to extend the width of the house. There is a single window covered with white metal bars. There is a single window on the second floor of 1400, also covered with white metal bars. There is a simple wood cornice. The first floor east elevation of 1402 is not visible, but the second floor has two double-hung windows which may be original. The east and south elevation of 1404 was not observable.

Integrity

The general appearance of this group of rowhouses seems remarkably unchanged since their construction nearly 100 years ago. The galvanized iron cornices and mouldings are intact and, while the windows on the front façade have been replaced in two of the three units, they are the same size and style as shown in the architect’s original drawing. Panel entry doors have replaced the
original half-view doors, but all still have transoms. A small frame addition with a wood porch has been added to the rear of 1400. The brick on the front façade of the center unit has been painted tan and the lintels and sills a lighter color.

Factors of Significance

This group of three brick buildings was built in 1907 by John Schlorb, a first-generation American who was born in the District of Columbia to German immigrants. Schlorb lived with his mother at this location in 1900, however, no house number is given in the census, simply “O between 1st and Half.” Schlorb was a butcher who worked at the Center Market. After construction of the houses, valued at $7,000, Schlorb lived in 1400 and rented the other two properties. Ten years later, a relative, William Schlorb, also a butcher, owned 1400 while John Schlorb lived in 1402 and rented 1404 to Abraham Schlain, a Russian immigrant.

While modest in size, this group of structures is a coherent expression of a classic urban building type, the rowhouse. The occupation and ethnicity of the owner represents the development pattern of this area in the late 19th-early 20th century, as European immigrants settled in the Southwest portion of the Nation’s Capital and formed a multi-ethnic working class neighborhood. Evidence of this development pattern elsewhere in the Southwest was largely destroyed by the urban renewal program of the mid-20th century. This group of houses is one of Southwest’s few remaining examples of this type.

The buildings’ architect, Julius Wenig, practiced in the District for more than 40 years. Born in Frankfurt, Wenig came to this country at the age of 17 and lived a short time in Chicago before moving to Washington. Wenig was a founder of The Washington Savings Bank, and for many years, treasurer of the Washington chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

Sources


Simmons Rowhouses

Resource Address: 4, 4 _, 6, 6 _, 8, 8 _, 10 N Street, SW

Architect/Builder: B. Stanley Simmons/J. F. Mills

Building Type/Use: Rowhouse/residential

Date of Construction: 1916

Location: Square 653, lots 57, 58, 59

Architectural Description

The north (front) facade of each unit in this group of brick rowhouses has a different appearance despite their similarity in form. They are all two bays wide with an entry door and a window to the left of the door on the first floor and two windows on the second floor. The houses have flat roofs. Beyond this similarity, the north facades differ:

Beginning at the first house on the left and moving right, the north façade of 4 has very wide white mortar joints between the brick and shows evidence of repair extending from the right second floor window to the entry door below. The first and second floor windows are double-hung and undivided. The single-bracketed cornice has appears to be of iron or tin and the window frames appear to be of wood. Both the window trim and the cornice are painted gray-blue. The first floor window has a white vinyl frame and is covered with black metal bars. The paneled wooden entry door has fixed-glass windows inset in a fan pattern. There is a glass transom above the door. The door and transom are covered with a frame of black metal bars. There appears to be one concrete step leading to a small concrete landing at the front door.

The front façade of the second house, 4 _, has been painted brick red which has peeled off in places to reveal the brick underneath with wide mortar joints. The cornice, which is a continuation of the cornice of 4, has been painted white and is without brackets. The first and second floor windows are double-hung white vinyl windows with divided lights. The white entry door is solid panel of indeterminate material. There is no transom above. Both the first floor window and the door are covered with a frame of black
metal bars. There is a black light fixture to the left of the door. It appears that one concrete step leads to a concrete landing at the front door.

The front façade of the next house, 6, has been painted brick red and the paint is in good condition. This house is wider than 4 or 4 _. The cornice, which has a single bracket on the left, is painted white, as is the trim on the first and second floor windows. The first and second floor windows are white double-hung windows with undivided glass. The first floor window is covered with a frame of white metal bars embelished with a filigree pattern. It is difficult to see the entry door behind a matching white metal frame. There is a concrete landing reached by a single step at the front door.

The front façade of 6’s neighbor, 6 _, has been painted blue. The first and second floor windows and the entry door have flat panel shutters of a darker blue. The cornice, which is continuous from 6, is painted to match the shutters and has a single bracket between the two houses. The bracket color matches the shutters. The window lintels and sills are painted blue to match the shutters and cornice. The windows are white double hung, undivided windows. There are air conditioners in the left second floor window and the first floor window. This house appears narrower than its neighbors on either side. The front entry door is covered with a frame of white metal bars that matches the one on 6. The front step and landing are of brick.

The front façade of the next house, 8, is painted light green. The cornice is painted dark green and shares a bracket with 8 _. The bracket color is painted one-half dark green (on the 8 portion) and one-half black (on the 8 _ portion). The windows are double-hung, undivided windows. The front door may be of wood or metal and has three rectangular-shaped windows in the top section placed in a descending pattern from left to right. There is a brass mail flap set into the lower third of the door. The door is covered with a frame of black metal bars. There is a concrete step and landing at the front door, flanked on either side by square brick columns.

The front façade of the next house, 8 _, has been painted brick red and the painted surface appears to be peeling under the first and second floor windows. The cornice, windowsills, vents above both of the second floor windows, and the front door and door trim are painted black. The double-hung, undivided windows appear to be of white vinyl with white painted trim. There is an electric meter below and to the left of the first floor window. The top half of the paneled front door has divided lights. There is a concrete landing reached by a single step at the front door.

The final house in the group, 10, is unoccupied. This house appears wider than any of the others in the group. The window and door openings are boarded up from the inside and the boards have been painted red. The front façade has wide mortar joints. The cornice, which continues from 8 _, is peeling and rusted on 10. The left bracket is painted black to match its neighbor’s; the surface of the right bracket is peeling and rusted. There are vents above the two second floor windows similar to 8 _.

All of the houses have small front yards with concrete walks. The yards of 4 through 8 _ are enclosed with three-foot high chain-link fences. The yard at 10 is unenclosed.
The east and west elevations of this group of rowhouses have no openings. There are iron plates that anchor reinforcing rods between the first and second floors and just below the roof line. The walls appear solid on both elevations, with no bulging.

The south elevations of 4, 6, 8, and 10 are partially visible. On each house, there is an external chimney between the windows, which extends approximately three feet above the roof. A white rain leader runs along the angle where the chimney and façade meet on all of the observable elevations except for 10. The houses have simple white painted cornices, except for 10, which has none. The roof of 10 does not appear to join the top of the exterior wall on this elevation. All of the second floor windows are white double-hung, undivided windows. The trim matches the trim of their respective north elevations in material, shape, and color. The second floor windows of 4 are covered with frames of black metal bars. The left window on the second floor of 6 has an air conditioner. The first floor openings at 10 have been filled in with concrete block. The mortar on the left opening is continued onto the wall above. The brick arches above both of the second floor windows on 10 have missing mortar.

The backyards are enclosed with a six-foot-high chain-link fence that is heavily shrouded with vegetation.

**Integrity**

Alterations to these houses over the past 90 years have affected their appearance; however, they retain their original character. The seven houses possess original external walls, the same arrangement of windows and doors (back and front), external chimneys, and their relationship to each other and to the street.

**Factors of Significance**

This group of brick rowhouses was built to meet the demand for working-class housing in the early-20th century. Original house numbers in construction documents were 6-8, 10-12, 14-16-18, although on the Baist Map of 1919 the structures are labeled 2, 4, 6, (three unlabeled), and 10. C.E. Barnes constructed the houses at a cost of $7,000, but the year following their construction, Joseph F. and William S. Mills, the building contractors, are identified in the tax records as the property owners. At the time of the 1920 census, black and “mulatto” working class families occupied six houses. Four of the families rented their homes (4, 6, 8A, and 10); two were owner occupied (6A and 8). The head-of-household occupations were government messenger, butcher, bank clerk, laborer (hotel), laborer (Navy Yard), and laborer (furnace). Of the heads of household, two were born in Washington, DC, and four were born outside the district. Modest in scale, these rowhouses are remnants of typical worker housing of the time and display a cohesive design and solid construction.

Also of note is that, according to the building permit, these houses were the work of B. Stanley Simmons, an architect prominent for his design of apartments and commercial buildings in the District. It is not known whether these houses were designed by Simmons for this site or whether the builder, J. F. Mills, might have used an earlier design by the architect. (By 1916, Simmons would have been in his mid-40s.) At the time of his death in 1931 at the age of 60, Simmons’ work included the Barr Building; the Medical Science Building; the Jewish Community Center; the Metropolitan National Bank; the Mount Vernon; Gloucester; Cumberland; Henrietta; Eastern; Franklin; and Dupont apartments; and the Fairfax and La Fayette hotels.
He was a graduate of the Boston School of Technology (now MIT).

Sources


Architectural Description

This is a two-story brick building which is flanked on either side by two-story brick buildings that differ in appearance and scale from this building. The building’s north (front) façade is three bays wide and has eight windows, grouped in pairs, two pairs on the first and two pairs on the second floor. The windows are double-hung white windows six over sixty. On the first floor, a pair of windows flanks each side of the central entry door. The second floor windows line up with those on the first. The right second floor windows are smaller than the other windows and a large panel fills up the space at the bottom. The first floor windows are covered with a frame of widely spaced black metal bars. Each pair of windows has white vinyl shutters, although only the left second floor window has two shutters; the other windows have one each. There are streaks of white on the surface of the brick extending down the wall from the windows on both floors. There are small vents inset into the brick wall about three feet beneath each pair of first floor windows.

The front entry door, which appears to be of wood, is covered with a white framed steel door of a thick-gauge chain-link material. The door has a bright brass-like doorknob set in a flat white steel plate. Above the entry door is a transom with three divided lights; the chain-link doorframe overlaps the lowest four inches of the transom. There is a wooden porch at the entry with concrete steps.

The top edge of the building façade is embellished simply with intermittent blocks composed of brick that step back over four courses from the top course. The building appears to have a flat metal roof.
A four-foot high metal chain-link fence rings the small yard and runs back to the building on either side. The concrete walk is bordered on either side by chain-link fence approximately six feet high. Entry to the yard is through a six-foot high gate that matches the black metal bars on the windows. Four small black mailboxes hang on the gate. The east and west elevations are crowded on both sides by adjoining buildings and therefore are not observable. The north (rear) elevation was not examined.

Integrity
While the brick building block appears to be original, the windows and entry doors are replacements. It is not known whether the original structure had shutters.

Factors of Significance
The building was constructed for Herminia H. Aiken as an apartment building for four families at an estimated cost of $5,500. The permit states that the building would have 12 rooms heated by stoves. Tax records show that the lots were unimproved until the construction of the building. At the time of the next assessment, 1940, Cline N. Chipman owned the property. The assessed value of the improvements was $6,000. James Creek public housing units flank either side of the building. Further research would reveal more information about the building’s first tenants.

Sources
Department of Building Inspection DC Permit #213895, Herminia H. Aiken, 17 June 1938. Microfilm. National Archives Collection. National Archives and Record Administration, Washington, DC.


Frame House

Resource Address:  69 Q Street, SW

Architect/ Builder:  “Private”/William E. Mooney

Building Type/Use:  Single-family dwelling/residential

Date of Construction:  1906

Location:  Square 656, lot 43 (Original lot 26)

Architectural Description

The two-story frame building at 69 Q Street, SW, was originally constructed as a detached, single-family dwelling. The brick building that adjoins it on the west was constructed in 1941. The exterior appears to be clad in horizontal white aluminum siding and is in good condition. The roof is flat. There are two brick chimneys, one on the west edge of the roof near the front of the house and one along the same side at the rear. The banded and dentiled cornice appears to be from galvanized iron. The cornice’s white paint is flaking, revealing bare metal in a number of areas. There are large simply decorated brackets also with flaking white paint at either end of the cornice.

The south (front) facade is three bays wide. There are two windows and an entry door on the first floor and three windows on the second floor. The windows appear to be aluminum or vinyl storm windows with another window behind them. The storm windows are double-hung, undivided. The entry door is white with a single diamond-shaped window in the top third. An aluminum door covers the entry door. The top half of this door appears screened while the bottom half is glass and covered with an ornamental aluminum grille. A pitched roof covers the front porch, which extends the width of the house and is constructed of concrete and brick. The porch roof is supported by four decorative black iron posts and circled with a railing of the same material. The porch steps appear to be of concrete. A rusted three-foot high metal chain-link fence extends across the front of the yard and then along the left side of the house to the rear separating the house on the left from an alley. There are gates at the front and on the side. The front yard may be six feet deep.
There are about two feet between the house and the fence on the west side of the house.

The west elevation has three windows on the first floor and four windows on the second. All of these windows have storm windows similar to those on the front of the house. The concrete foundation is not covered by the siding.

The north elevation was not observed. There appears to be a small yard at the rear of the house, enclosed by the chain-link fence. Beyond the fenced yard at the rear is another alley, with brick and concrete block commercial buildings.

Integrity

The exterior appearance of this house has been altered over the years with storm windows, vinyl siding, and changes to the front porch structure. However, there are no additions to the building and the arrangement of the windows and doors on the south and west facades appear to be original as does the metal cornice.

Factors of Significance

This structure was built by Samuel Howison at a cost of $1,800 in 1906. The building was constructed by William E. Mooney who also built another surviving house of that era, at 1542 First Street, SW. (Mooney himself lived at 1544 First Street, SW. At the time of the 1910 census, Howison, 68 year old, is employed as a truck farmer. Since his house occupied _ of lot 26 and there were no houses on adjacent lots, he may have farmed here or grown crops at another location on Buzzard Point. [In an earlier (1900) census, Howison is renting a house at 1701 Half Street, SW, and his occupation is “gardener.”] There are two more truck-farmers listed on this page of the 1910 census, on R and on S Streets. By 1916, William E. Mooney is owner of the 69 Q Street, SW property and is granted a permit for construction of a one-horse stable at the rear of the house.

Farming was one of the few industries to take hold in Buzzard Point. Small farms operated here as late as the early 1930s, according to newspaper reports. Howison’s house appears to be the last remaining structure connected to the practice of agriculture in the area.

Sources


Twelfth Census of the United States, Section 1—Population. District of Columbia, 1900.


10

Frame House

Resource Address: 1542 First Street, SW

Architect/Builder: William T. Davis/William E. Mooney

Building Type/Use: Single-family dwelling/Residential

Date of Construction: 1905

Location: Square 656, lot 23

Architectural Description

This is a two-story frame house, 18 feet wide at the front and 37 feet deep, according to the original building permit. The west (front) façade is three bays wide, with a door and two windows on the first floor and three windows on the second. The first floor windows are covered with horizontal white metal bars; the entry door by a black metal security door. The asphalt shingles on the first floor are purple. The window and door trim are white. The front porch is concrete with white posts and railings. The porch is enclosed left of the entry door with asphalt shingles matching the rest of the house. The porch’s pitched roof is covered with dark gray-black shingles.

On this façade, second floor asphalt siding is blue and the second floor window trim is green. There is a row of narrow moulding halfway between the tops of the second floor windows and the cornice. This moulding and the cornice, which appear to be of tin or galvanized iron, are both painted green. The cornice has large “box” brackets at each end with a simple design. The cornice paint is flaking. All of the windows on the west elevation are double hung, with undivided glass. There is an air conditioner in the center window. The south elevation of the house is only partially observable. Visible are three windows on the first and three windows on the second floor. The windows line up three above three. The window frames are green. The first floor windows are covered with black metal bars. The shingles are painted blue just to the sills of the second floor windows. The north elevation of the house has no openings; on this façade, the shingles closest to the front of the house appear to be light blue and the rest of the shingles are white.
The front yard is enclosed with a metal chain-link fence approximately three feet high. There is a gate at the walk. There is patchy grass in the front yard, a low brick wall that encloses a flowerbed in front of the porch, and the concrete walk is partially covered with brick. On the south, the house is a few feet from an adjacent structure. On the north, the house appears to have been built even closer to the property line. On this side, the neighbor’s six-foot high fence of black metal bars sits within four inches of the house and extends from the northwest corner to the back of the property. There appears to be a shed constructed of wood at the rear of the house. The west façade was not observable.

**Integrity**

While the major architectural elements are intact -- porch, window and door frames, and tin or iron cornice -- there have been alterations to the exterior. The current white asphalt shingled siding does not appear original and is painted blue and purple in different sections. Only one round porch column that appears to be original remains; the other supports are square posts. Further inspection is necessary to determine if the porch, porch railings, entry door, and windows are original.

**Factors of Significance**

Joseph Newton, a member of the city fire department, built this two-story frame dwelling at a cost of $2,000 in 1905. Newton was born in Virginia and came to the District between 1900 and 1905. The actual construction was done by William E. Mooney, who lived at 1544 First Street, SW, and also constructed the home of Samuel Howison at 69 Q Street, SW in 1906. The 1542 First Street house illustrates the development of this area of the Southwest as a working-class district in the late 19th–early 20th centuries. Similar to the houses at 1400, 1402, and 1404 First Street, SW, this is one of the few remaining residences in the Southwest from this period.

**Sources**


*Boyd’s 1906 Directory of the District of Columbia.*


Twelfth Census of the United States, Section 1—Population, District of Columbia, 1900.


---

Figure 54 Detached, single family, northwest elevation, 2005
James C. Dent Residence/ Southwest Community House

Resource Address: 156 Q Street, SW

Architect/Builder: William J. Palmer

Building Type/Use: Single-family dwelling/residential (original); institutional offices (current)

Date of Construction: 1906

Location: Square 603, lot 15

Architectural Description

This is a two-story brick building with an English basement. It sits on a slight rise. The entire structure is painted a cream white, which is chalky in appearance. There is a prominent projecting cornice at the roof. The roof is flat. On the right side of the north (front) façade, there is a four-foot projecting bay approximately 12 feet wide that extends from the ground to the roof. In this bay, windows are paired on the basement, first and second floors. The basement windows appear to be fixed and have a brown frame. The matching pairs of first and second floor windows appear to be double-hung, with undivided glass. The windows on each floor are covered with black metal bars. There are arches formed by raised courses of brick over all of the windows and raised courses of three bricks each extending around the house under the first and second floor windows and above the second floor windows. To the left of the projecting bay on the first floor is the entry door. On the second floor above the entry door is a single double-hung window. A porch extends from the projecting bay to the left across the front of the house and around to the east elevation. The space under the porch is open on the basement level below the entry. The entry door is a double door constructed of wood with inset glass panels that are nearly full length. There is a transom above the door with the door and transom set into a wooden frame. The second floor window has the same brick arch set above it as the windows in the bay. There are black metal bars on the entry door and the second floor window. The porch appears to be made of concrete, with black iron railings and roof supports. The steps to the porch also appear to be concrete. There are black iron railings along...
On the south façade, the basement level was not observed. On the first floor, there is a single double-hung, undivided window. On the second floor, there are two windows; the one on the left is identical to the floor below. The one on the right is the same style, but smaller in size. The windows on this elevation have thick, block-like sills. The decorative raised brick courses do not continue onto this façade; neither do the arches over the windows. There is no cornice. From this vantage point, it is apparent that the walls of the west and east elevations extend about 1½ to 2 feet above the flat roof.

There was limited opportunity to view the interior. However, just inside the entry, there is a small tiled foyer that appears to have original tile. The foyer opens into a small hall and then into two large rooms, the one on the right may have been the front parlor. It retains its fireplace.

**Integrity**

This building displays the stateliness that it possessed when it was constructed nearly 100 years ago. There have been no significant changes to the façade. The porch, although now of concrete with “modern” railings and trim, still has a standing-seam metal roof. With the exception of the porch, all of the modifications, the bars on the windows, are easily reversible.

**Factors of Significance**

This house is notable for its owners’ contributions through history to District of Columbia society. The first owner of this property was Reverend James C. Dent, an African-American minister born in Maryland, who was one of the founders of Mt. Moriah Baptist Church. This building replaced a frame residence...
owned by Dent that was constructed in 1889. Mt. Moriah Baptist Church was founded on July 13, 1885 by a group of men and women from Rehobeth (now Rehoboth) Baptist Church. Dent became the church’s second pastor on May 7, 1886. The church was first located at 1220 2nd Street, SW, in the home of a member, Sampson Thomas. Dent moved the church to 3rd and Van streets, SW in 1891. He later oversaw construction of the church’s third home at 2nd and N streets, SW. Dent served as pastor of Mt. Moriah for 22 years until his death in 1908. His widow, Mary, continued to live at 156 Q Street for a number of years. Mt. Moriah recently celebrated its 120th anniversary in the congregation’s fifth home, at 17th and East Capitol streets.

A recent interview with a Southwest resident suggests that this house was later occupied by the Brown family, who took in abandoned children from the neighborhood. This information needs to be substantiated by further research.

The current owner of the building is Southwest Community House, Inc. (SWCH). The history of SWCH spans more than 100 years and dates to its founding as the “Colored Social Settlement,” the first social service organization for African Americans in the District. In 1978, the agency purchased 156 Q Street and moved its operations into the building. Through the years, SWCH has been a vital part of the community, providing services and support to low-income Southwest residents and playing an important role in the affairs of the community.

Sources


Eleventh Census of the United States, 1890, Washington, District of Columbia.

Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900, Washington, District of Columbia.


19th Century Rowhouses

Resource Address: 1307, 1309, 1311, 1313, 1315, 1317 South Capitol Street, SW

Architect/Builder: Coleman & Richards

Building Type/Use: Rowhouse/residential (original); mixed use (current)

Date of Construction: 1892

Location: Square 653, lots 827, 52, 53, 54, 68, 69, 70 (Original lots 12 and 13)

Architectural Description

These two-story rowhouses are constructed of red brick. The east (front) elevation of each is two bays wide, with a window and door on the first floor and two windows on the second. There are subtle changes in the application of the brick. Specifically, two raised courses of brick visually connect all of the units just below the first and second floor windows. The windowsills and door openings interrupt the first floor course. The second floor course also continues after each windowsill. There are decorative double arches over all of the windows and doors formed by an arrangement of projecting and receding stretchers interspersed with headers and capped by an “eyebrow” of brick stretchers. The cornice is formed by projecting and receding courses of brick arranged in “stacks.” Brackets break the cornice line between each unit. The units are identical in these aspects.

There are marked differences among the units’ facades related to wall surfaces, windows, and doors. Beginning with 1317: This building is painted light blue. The double-hung white vinyl windows are undivided. The first floor window is covered with vertical black iron bars. The window trim and sills are painted white. There are small rectangular vents above both of the second floor windows. A loss of mortar in several sections gives the appearance of “cracks” in several areas of the façade. The gaps are most apparent above the left windows on the first and second floor. The entry door is of wood with a diamond-shaped pane of glass. There is a black mailbox hanging on the door, and a black iron barred security door covers door and mailbox. A concrete porch in front of the first floor windows is separated...
from the public sidewalk by a barrier composed of white painted concrete piers linked by two black iron bars laid horizontally.

Continuing to the north, 1315: The façade of this building appears not to have been painted since construction. The brick has a fine, smooth surface. The windows may be original to the date of construction: they are wooden, double-hung windows with the glass in each sash divided in half vertically. The sashes and the trim are in need of paint and fastening. The window and door lintels appear to be of a pierced tin or other material. There is an air conditioner on the second floor right window. The brick is stained, especially along the raised brick courses. Although stained, the façade does not have significant areas of cracking or missing mortar. The entry door and its screen door appear to be made of wood. There is a panel inset into the transom over the screen door resembling a landscape painting. There is a gas meter to the right of the door, and two deep concrete risers connect the sidewalk to the entry.

Continuing to the north, 1313: Painted a creamy white, this building has smaller first and second floor windows than the first two buildings described. The windows appear to be white vinyl, and panels fill the rest of the window openings. Window trims are painted white. There is a red and white awning over the white entry door; the door appears to be of metal or fiberglass. The top half of the door has an inset of divided lights. There is a transom over the door covered with white bar. There is an electric meter on the left of the house, next to 1315. There are two concrete risers leading to the entry. A yellow banner with red letters announces that a nail salon is coming soon to this location.

Continuing to the north, 1311 and 1309: These buildings are nearly identical in appearance. The facades are painted a cream color. All of the windows are white vinyl double-hung windows, undivided. The window frames, trim, and sills are painted white. There are black iron bars on the first floor windows and the entry doors and transoms. There is an electric meter to the right of the door at 1311 and a gas meter to the right of the door at 1309. A single concrete riser leads to each entry.

Continuing to the north, 1307: This building is vacant. The surface of the front façade appears to have been painted or covered with a second façade, which has been removed, leaving areas of brick covered with tan patches that may be concrete. All of the windows have been removed and the openings covered from the inside. The front entry is a flush white steel door. The transom window has been removed and the opening covered from the inside. The arch above the right window on the second floor is missing two bricks. Part of the sill is missing under the first floor window and the raised course of brick is gone on the left side of the entry door although it remains on the right side of the door. There is an electric meter at the left side of the façade near the first floor window. There is a single concrete riser at the entry. On the right side of this façade is the edge of a six-inch concrete wall which extends from the ground to just below the bracket cap.

The north façade of 1307 is covered in concrete. To its north near the sidewalk, there is a 15-foot-long sign on a tall pole announcing free parking. The area in front of the north elevation is covered in macadam. There is a concrete riser connected to the building on the left side, indicating that there may have been
an entry door here at some time. The south façade of 1317 and the west elevation of this group of rowhouses were unobservable.

Integrity

This group of rowhouses is intact with no significant alterations. The original late 19th century brickwork, which gives the group its distinctive appearance, is relatively unaltered although the façade has been painted on most units.

Factors of Significance

This group of substantial rowhouses was built by the firm of Coleman & Richards in 1892 at an estimated cost of $5,000. They were built as rental units to house the growing numbers of workers moving into this area of the District in the late 19th century. According to 1908-09 tax records, Francis R. Richards owned these parcels and the improvements had an assessed value of $1,800. The 1900 census reveals the birthplaces and occupations of the tenants:

1307 George E. Suit, Virginia, day laborer. His wife, Lottie, District of Columbia, dressmaker.

1309 James Watson, Maryland, ship carpenter.

1311 Robert Nally, Maryland, conductor.

1313 Ephriham Phillipp, Virginia, cab driver. His daughter, Gertrude, District of Columbia, Bureau of Engraving.

1315 Haughley Connolly, Ireland, lithographer. His wife, Annie, Missouri, bookfolder.

“William Bright, District of Columbia, railroad brakeman.

The variety of occupations listed for the residents of this small block of dwellings reveals how the workers housed in this area of the Southwest contributed in numerous ways to the development of the Nation’s Capital at the turn of the century. These buildings are the oldest known structures in the Old Southwest. Further research on the builder and developer, Coleman & Richards, could reveal other development activity in the District by the company.

Sources

Hopkins Real Estate Atlas: 1892.
Twelfth Census of the United States, Section 1—Population. District of Columbia, 1900.
Syphax Gardens Public Housing

Resource Address: 1501 Half Street, SW

Architect/Builder: Chatelain, Gauger & Nolan/National Capital Housing Authority

Building type/use: Apartment building/residential

Date of Construction: 1958

Location: Some lots of squares 601, 599, 656, 654.

Architectural Description

Syphax Gardens is comprised of nine separate three-story brick buildings. In plan, the buildings have three shapes: U, L and I. Dominating the facades is Flemish-bond brick. The facades have a typical design, in which the front facades contain a centrally positioned entrance. Two double-hung windows, one on each floor, top this entrance. On either sides of the entrance there are two double-hung windows for each floor. The windows right next to the entrance on both sides have double panes, while the ones farther away have single panes. All the windows have black aluminum frames. White air-conditioning units are visible on most of the windows. All Syphax Housing buildings are distinguished by having a green canopy on the front entrance. The rear facades follow the same symmetrical design feature. With the chimneys placed in the centerline, three single-pane, double-hung windows on each floor are located on either side. White down spouts are visible on the front and rear facades. The side facades have an identical design with two window openings on each floor. The buildings have gable roofs covered with asphalt shingles.

Integrity

No significant alterations have been made to Syphax Gardens exterior, thus it retains its original design. However, most of the window and doorframes have been replaced several times.

Factors of Significance

Syphax Gardens Public Housing is one example of the National Capital Housing Authority projects, which was the successor of the Alley Dwelling Authority. The National Capital Housing Authority was responsible for the development and management of public housing in the District of Columbia.
Authority provided low-rent housing in the District and constructed temporary housing for defense workers and military personnel during World War II. Syphax Gardens public housing was built by Chatelain, Gauger & Nolan, a well-known architectural firm in Washington. The firm designed several notable buildings in Washington, DC, including the Woodridge Neighborhood Library, the Westmoreland Congregational Church, the Washington Gas Light Company headquarters, and the Kiplinger Building (1948-1964). The firm was also known for its design of the Chancery of South Africa in Washington, DC, in 1964.

Syphax Gardens is included in the Southwest Heritage Trail as an example of early public housing in Southwest. In was also mentioned in the Trail database that Marvin Gaye, the Soul music superstar (1939–1984), spent part of his early childhood in Syphax Gardens.

Sources


Tel-Court Cooperative Apartments

Resource Address: 1401, 1405, 1409, 1413, 1417, 1421 Half Street, SW; 35, 39 P Street, SW; 34, 38 O Street, SW


Building Type/Use: Apartment buildings/residential

Dates of Construction: 1939

Location: Square 654; lots 25 and 30-38

Architectural Description

The architecture of Tel-Court apartments is a blend of Art Deco and Art Moderne styles. The apartments along O and P streets were constructed in 1939, near the end of Art Deco style (1925-1940) and at the height of the Art Moderne period (1930-1945). Tel-Court apartments reflect the changing architecture of our Nation’s Capital during World War II years of the 20th century and are unique to Old Southwest because they embody a sense of time and place as emphasized by their architectural detail. Art Deco is characterized by linear, hard edge and angular composition and highlighted with stylized decoration. Art Moderne typifies flat roofs, smooth wall finishes, and horizontal bands of windows creating a streamlined effect. These characteristics can be seen in the Tel-Court buildings.

The apartment buildings along O and P streets near the alley are three-story, brick and concrete block buildings with six bays. The complexes contain two separate but conjoined apartment blocks, each with nine units and an English basement. Apartment complexes on both O and P streets display many decorative elements of Art Deco and Art Moderne styles: such as the main entranceways, the bays of the façade that are arranged in setbacks emphasizing geometric form, and in decorative materials used in the upper levels. The first story contains a soldier course band of bricks around the entire complex and two ornamental doorways. Each doorway contains terra-cotta quoins around the doorjamb and terra-cotta lintels with a stepped, frontispiece leading up to an octagonal window. Each bay in the unit has three sets of two, double-hung windows, which appear to
have been replaced, and concrete sills. The third story of the complex is partitioned off by concrete stringcourse and displays decorative brickwork alternating between uniquely designed stucco patterns. This ornamental stucco can be seen in the center bays of the complex and fluidly connects both apartment blocks. Design patterns in the brickwork can also be seen above third story windows juxtaposing with the concrete and stucco.

The apartment buildings on the corners of Half Street and O and P streets are two-story, brick and block with three bays. They resemble the style and texture of the O and P street units; however, they contain fewer apartments. Influenced by Art Deco, the ornamentation around doors and windows is similar to the other complexes, with slight variations in detail. The doorways are comprised of terra-cotta quoins in the jamb flush with each other and display a center keystone. Also on this façade, a concrete stringcourse rests above second story windows and separates more decorative stucco pattern and brickwork from the rest of the building. The intricately carved stucco squares echo patterns seen in the facades of complexes on O and P streets and serve to connect these corner buildings with the larger context.

The apartments along Half Street are three-story brick with four connected blocks, each containing nine individual apartments. These buildings exhibit several design elements found in the units on O and P streets, such as fluctuations in setbacks of bays in the façade, a flat roof, ornamental decoration around entranceways, and unique materials and design patterns ascribed to the third floor. However, this set of apartments is unique because it contains alternating styles of terra-cotta pattern around the doorways as evidenced in both corner buildings and those along O and P streets. In addition, an unadorned octagonal window is detached from the entranceway and is in the middle of the bay, surrounded by squares of soldier course bricks. The third story demonstrates similar features with a soldier course row of bricks highlighting windows and a stucco pattern with concrete stringcourse horizontally unifying individual apartment blocks.

All apartment buildings include screened-in brick porches in the rear facades. These porches are original to the structures and help to form a series of courtyards in the rear of the complexes. The rear courtyard areas are separated from Syphax Gardens housing complexes on the other side of the square by an alley. Generously proportioned front yards and chain-link fences define the character of the Tel-Court apartments within a larger neighborhood context.

**Integrity**

According to the original building permit from 1939, the apartments along O and P streets consisted of four buildings with 130 rooms, were designed to house 36 families, and were constructed at a cost of $72,000. Currently under the ownership of Arco Management, Tel-Court Cooperative apartments possess integrity in their design, association, materials, workmanship, and location to the Southwest area. They have remained solidly intact and largely unaltered since their construction, with the exception of new windows and systems updating. The facades are original materials and composed of brick, concrete, stucco and terra-cotta. They exemplify authentic workmanship of materials and reflect changing design preferences of one of Washington’s most influential architects. They are also the only...
remaining examples in residential architecture of the Art Deco and Art Moderne styles within Southwest Washington, DC.

Factors of Significance

Appleton P. Clark, a master architect for his time, designed the apartments for the Washington Sanitary Improvement Company. Clark was one of the most prominent and prolific District architects of the early twentieth century and was responsible for designing many important buildings in the district. The Washington Sanitary Improvement Company, which built the architecturally significant Sanitary Housing on Half Street in 1909, managed its projects through special incentives for homeowners. Originally, Sanitary Housing in the District was intended to provide homes for alley dwelling residents, thereby alleviating slums. However, the Washington Sanitary Improvement Company had a different approach to solving this problem. They contended that it was best to begin the movement by providing improved dwellings for a slightly higher class of wage earners, in the belief that houses vacated by them would be rented by the next lower class of wage earners and that this system would continue until slums were deserted. This unique method of improving working-class living conditions was very progressive for its time and the remaining residential architecture is testament to its success. In addition, the Sanitary Housing on square 651 was also one of the first housing projects in Washington, DC, aimed at providing housing for African Americans.

Sources


Department of Building Inspection DC, 1939, Building Permit for square 654 lots 35-38 O and P Streets, SW. National Archives Collection. National Archives and Record Administration, Washington, DC, 2005.
Marshall Rowhouses

Resource Address: Multiple addresses on P, First, 2nd, and Q streets, SW


Building Type/Use: Rowhouse/residential

Date of Construction: 1941

Location: Some lots of squares 599, 601, 656, 658

Architectural Description

There are five groups of this type of rowhouses at five different locations. Square 599 contains eleven units that face P Street, square 601 contains 23 units that face First Street and ten units that face 2nd Street, square 656 contains eleven units that face Q Street, and square 658 contains 10 units that also face Q Street. All the groups have identical unit design and the same architectural features. Flemish-bond brick exterior dominates all the facades. The front façade of each unit has one square window opening and one door opening on the first floor. The second floor has two rectangular window openings. All the window openings have a projected concrete sill. A number of projected concrete lintels that extend on the top of each two adjacent front doors characterize this type of rowhouse. Two bands of projected brick placed above the second floor window openings wrap around all the facades. One group of rowhouses facing Half Street is placed above the street curb grade level and can be entered by seven steps. The rest of the groups are entered directly from the street curb level. The side facades have three rectangular window openings on each floor. The rear facades have one rectangular door opening and a square window opening for every unit. All the doors on the second floor open to an uncovered wooden deck. All the units have flat roofs.

Integrity

All the units have maintained their original designs with slight visible changes to their exterior. Air conditioner units have been added to most of the houses, which are visible in the windows of

Figure 64 Marshall Rowhouses on First Street, 2005
the front facades. Different types of newly installed wires can also be seen on the front facades. Wrought iron security bars have been added to the first floor windows of some units. Most of the window and doorframes have been replaced with newer ones. The flat roof of one unit on P Street has been replaced with a gable roof. Most of the units look well maintained. Thirteen units on First Street are painted in different colors, while all the rest remain unpainted.

Factors of Significance

Both the Marshall Rowhouses and Walker Rowhouses were designed by George T. Santmyers. Santmyers was one of Washington’s most prolific apartment house architects. Santmyers also designed The Building at 3901 Connecticut Avenue, NW in 1927, which was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1997 for its historic significance in architecture and engineering. Santmyers was also known for designing Meridian Manor at 1424 Chapin Street, NW, which was mentioned in the recent exhibition, “Affordable Housing: Designing an American Asset,” presented at the National Building Museum. By the same token, C. H. Marshall, the developer and builder for this type of rowhouses, was the same builder for Sanitary Housing on square 651.

The construction of both the Marshall and Walker rowhouses is consistent with the patterns of development identified in the Study Area, which are marked by constructing dwellings for the working class.

Sources


Walker Rowhouses

Resource Address: Multiple addresses on O and P streets, SW
Architect/Builder: George T. Santmyers/G. T Walker
Building Type/Use: Rowhouse/residential
Date of Construction: 1941
Location: Square 599, 601; multiple lots

Architectural Description

There are two groups of this type of rowhouse at two different locations. Square 599 contains 17 units that face O Street, SW, and square 601 contains five units that face P Street, SW.

All the groups have identical unit design and the same architectural features. Flemish-bond brick exterior dominates all the facades. The front façade of each unit has one square window opening and one door opening on the first floor. The second floor has two rectangular window openings. All the window openings have a projected brick sill. The front facades display a decorative brick band. A number of gable-roof front porches characterize this type of rowhouses. The side facades have three rectangular window openings on each floor. The back facades have one rectangular door opening and a square window opening for every unit. All the doors on the second floor open to an uncovered wooden deck. Each porch extends on every two adjacent front doors. All the windows are double hung. Some of these windows still retain the white wooden frames while others have aluminum window frames. All the groups of this type of rowhouse have a front yard of approximately 12 feet. All the units have flat roofs.

Integrity

All the units have maintained their original designs with slight visible changes to their exterior. Most of the window and doorframes are replacements. Different types of newly installed wires are visible on the front facades. The conditions of these units vary: Some show signs of aging, while others look well maintained.
Factors of Significance

George T. Santmyers designed both the Marshall Rowhouses and Walker Rowhouses. Santmyers was one of Washington’s most prolific apartment house architects. Santmyers also designed a building at 3901 Connecticut Avenue, NW, in 1927, which was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1997 for its historic significance in architecture and engineering. Santmyers was also known for designing Meridian Manor at 1424 Chapin Street, NW, which was mentioned in the recent exhibition, “Affordable Housing: Designing an American Asset,” presented at the National Building Museum.

The construction of both Marshall and Walker rowhouses is consistent with the same patterns of development identified in the Study Area, which are marked by constructing dwellings for the working class.

Sources


Potomac Electric Power Company-Buzzard Point Station

Resource Address: 2000 Block of Half Street, SW

Architect/Builder: Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation designed and constructed station in conjunction with PEPCO engineers.

Building Type/Use: Power plan/industrial

Date of Construction: 1933

Location: Square 667, lot 814

Architectural Description

The architecture of the Buzzard Point plant was designed to complement the District of Columbia’s downtown buildings as a light-colored, plain, and monumental building. However, the building differs from the District’s architectural styles: It is Art Deco in style, constructed of buff brick and large buff blocks rather than white limestone or marble. The flat roof is accentuated by a geometric cornice, typical of Art Deco. The cornice continues all around the rectangular building.

The south (front) elevation is set back from V Street. It has three bays. The four windows are vertical, accentuating the height of the electric station. Along the top of the windows runs a decorative band of wide vertical bricks. Stone lintels rest beneath the five-over-five windows, and Plexiglas storm windows protect the opaque glass from the elements. Beneath the windows extends a “water table” where the brick changes to large blocks and continues to the foundation. Between the windows are slightly raised brick pilasters. Across the center of the south elevation protrudes an extension and entrance.

Similarly with a flat roof, the extension is smaller and more human scale. The extension is only made of large stone blocks. Steps lead up to a recessed entrance. The door is industrial with a plain, clear transom overhead; and the entrance is plain. But, the light fixtures on either side of the entrance are Art Deco in design and may be of copper because of their green patina. Three small windows are on either side of the door. On each side of the southern extension are two small windows matching those near the entrance.

Figure 68 PEPCO plant, southwest view from Anacostia River, 1932
The western wing is approximately half the height of the main building, and has a similar cornice but with a different geometric pattern. The southern elevation of the western wing does not have the imposing presence of the main elevation, with only two vertical windows, much narrower and shorter than the other southern windows. Across the west elevation of the west wing are six narrow windows. Accompanying the windows are six loading docks, closed tightly.

The three octagonal stacks are most visible from the western elevation, since they extend into the sky from the west wing. The three stacks are identical to one another, have eight sides, and are made from buff brick. Each stack has many ladders and other necessary climbing apparatus extending up one side.

The north elevation of the Buzzard Point PEPCO plant is hardly visible from the public right-of-way, due to yards containing transformers and other electrical equipment. The section that is visible reveals a small concrete block extension. The extension appears on the original footprint, so, although it does not match the other building material, it seems to be from the same era.

The east elevation has four sections defined by the four long windows and alternating pilasters. The cornices and water table from the south elevation also extend around to the east. Stone lintels support the windows that are covered in Plexiglas.

A chain-link fence surrounds the building. Surrounding the electrical equipment is a solid brick wall, which blocks views of the area from the public right-of-way.

Integrity

The PEPCO plant at Buzzard Point remains much the same as it did at the time of completion in 1933. The plant can now generate more power, due to six increases in productivity. Along with the increasing productivity, the building’s size increased as well. Additions were made to the back of the building between 1933 and 1945. By the end of World War II, the plant was operating at peak capacity. The building and later additions appear seamless.

Factors of Significance

The Buzzard Point PEPCO plant is significant for its architecture and contribution to the area’s industrial advancement. It is also a visual landmark at the southern tip of Buzzard Point clearly visible from the western bank of the Anacostia River. Since Washington, DC’s inception, city leaders talked of bringing industry to the city. One area that city leaders and planners focused on was Buzzard Point, in Washington’s Southwest. Despite some industrial operations in the 19th and early 20th centuries, the southern tip of Buzzard Point remained largely an industrial “no man’s land” until the Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) opened a generating plant in 1933. In 1931, the railway entered Buzzard Point along Potomac Avenue increasing transportation access to a remote part of the city. Linked by the railway to the rest of Washington, the Buzzard Point PEPCO plant was the first in a number of large industrial buildings constructed on the underdeveloped peninsula.

To protect the white marble and limestone buildings and monuments of Washington, the Buzzard Point plant was built to be one of the cleanest and most environmentally-progressive
plants of its day. Fly-ash discharge and smoke, so common in early 20th century industry, were reduced by Cottrell electrostatic precipitators. In an era when two precipitators were standard, the Buzzard Point plant had three. Running at full capacity, 96 percent of polluting ash was removed from the stacks by electrostatic filters. Ash then was collected into a steel storage bin and discarded.

Other improvements in the building’s design aided oil fire reduction and efficiency. Oil pumping equipment was held in a fire-proof room with a fire-extinguishing system. High pressure oil lines were contained in low pressure lines to reduce the possibility of oil leakage. Further, the Buzzard Point plant burned 0.888 lbs of coal to produce one kilowatt hours, versus the 2.05 lbs of coal that the Benning Road PEPCO plant required.

Today, the PEPCO plant at Buzzard Point remains an anchor of industry in the immediate area. It is one of three buildings that are visible on Buzzard Point, and of the three visual landmarks, it is the only historic building. Although operating since 1891 under another name, the present Potomac Electric Power Company has provided power to Washington, DC residents since 1896. As the first industrial building on Buzzard Point, and one connected to the century-old company, the PEPCO generation plant stands as a symbol for longevity in today’s “newer is better” technological and industrial societies. Today, the plant still provides one-third of DC residents with electric power.

Until recently, PEPCO owned three undeveloped lots used for parking and held for future expansion. These spaces helped to maintain the deserted appearance that has marked Buzzard Point’s history, even after its industrial development. In March 2005, PEPCO sold two of the parking lots (which have development potential of up to 2.7 million square feet) to Ackridge Management Company.
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Mathew Henson Earth Environmental Center

Resource Address: Corner of Half and V streets, SW

Architect/Builder: Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation

Building Type/ Use: Pumping station/industrial (original use); environmental education center (current use)

Date of Construction: 1933

Location: Square E 667

Architectural Description
The Mathew Henson Earth Environmental Center is a rectangular, one-story brick structure, approximately 100 feet long by 35 feet wide. The buff brick matches the Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) plant, which is located immediately across Half Street, SW. The roof is flat. There is a centrally located door with windows symmetrically placed on either side. A wide stone belt course at the roofline relates this small building to the Art Deco styling of the main PEPCO building. Formerly used as a water pumping station for PEPCO, this building is now an environmental education center. The pumps have been removed. Visible on top of the roof are cages of birds that are part of the center’s raptor research program. There is a wooden dock located in the rear of the building on the river with several utility boats moored there. The interior of the building is an open room which contains empty aquariums.

Integrity
The Mathew Henson Earth Environmental Center, formerly the PEPCO Pumping station has retained much of its architectural integrity. The brick walls are intact and appear to be original. With the exception of the new “Green Roof” (described below) and the removal of the pumps, the building appears to be unchanged since first constructed in 1933.

Factors of Significance
The pumping station was constructed in 1933, as part of the PEPCO electricity generating plant, to provide water for the operation of the plant. The turbines that generated electricity needed water turned into steam in order to function. As
technology progressed, steam became obsolete and PEPCO allowed the pumping station to fall into disrepair. The pumping station was the first site in Washington, DC, to be designated a Brownfield site. In 1999, PEPCO gave the property to the Earth Conservation Corps, a nonprofit environmental education organization. The Earth Conservation Corps was founded in 1989 to “restore and reclaim two of the nation’s most threatened resources: the environment and disadvantaged youth.”

The Corps, with the assistance of the United States Navy Mobile Construction Battalion 23 (Seabees), transformed the former Brownfield site into an environmental education center. The roof of the building became the first in Washington, DC, to utilize the concept of a “Green Roof.” The roof has vegetation growing upon it, which filters storm water before it enters the Anacostia. When PEPCO gave the building to the Earth Environmental Corps, the organization changed the name of the building to the Mathew Henson Earth Environmental Center. Mathew Henson was an African-American explorer who accompanied Robert Peary in the 1909 American expedition to the North Pole. In 1906, Peary had been the first recipient of the Hubbard Award from the National Geographic Society for his contributions to Arctic exploration. At the dedication of the Henson Environmental Center in November 2000, Mathew Henson received the Hubbard Award posthumously for his contributions to exploration, discovery, and research. The award included a $50,000 grant to the Earth Conservation Corps for classroom and field equipment. Besides the grant, the National Geographic Society established a Mathew Henson College Scholarship. Currently, the Henson Environmental Center is open to the public. The Center offers programs that combine community-service, education, and job training including the Raptor Rehabilitation Center, which provides Corps members with experience in wildlife management and rehabilitation.

Sources


James Creek Marina

Resource Address: 200 V Street, SW

Architect/Builder: Unknown

Building Type/Use: Marina/recreational

Dates of Construction: Unknown. The Corinthian Yacht Club was founded in 1913

Location: Confluence of the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers.

Architectural Description

The main building upon the property is a contemporary vernacular cement block building that houses a small office. The marina has 297 wet slips made from floating docks. The slips accommodate boats from 16 feet long to over 160 feet long. There is deep-water fuel dock for the use of 89 octane gasoline and diesel engines. A pump-out station is also available to offload waste from boats that have their own sanitary facilities. The marina is landscaped and has a volleyball pit, a picnic area, and a parking lot.

Integrity

Marinas located at this site have included the Corinthian Yacht Club, the Fort McNair Marina, and James Creek Marina. Since the mouth of James Creek is located on the marina site, archaeological excavation may reveal artifacts from the 19th and 20th century. Due to the constant upgrading and maintenance of recreational marinas and the upkeep of modern floating docks, however, there appears to be no historical docks or buildings on the site.

Factors of Significance

A marina has been located on the same site for over ninety years, with different vendors operating the marina. First known as the Corinthian Yacht Club founded in 1913, the Army Corps of Engineers acquired the property along the waterfront June 25, 1912 through the condemnation process for “construction, repair, or preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors.” (Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, case #1009) Jurisdiction was transferred to the National Park Service in 1957.
No further historic information was available from the National Park Service.

The marina offers dockage for small and large sailboats as well as motorboats. In 1987, the National Park Service completed a study proposing six alternatives to the marina area of Buzzard Point. There were plans within the study, including a fishing pier, which would have made the waterfront more assessable to non-boaters.

- **Alternative 1**: 430 slips, operated by one or two marinas.

- **Alternative 2**: called for total of 370 boat slips and an increased parking area, operated by either one or two marinas, stabilization of the shoreline, with a restaurant located at the James Creek Marina site.

- **Alternative 3**: proposed 370 boat slips operated by one marina, with a fishing pier located where the Buzzard Point Marina is now located, and stabilization of the shoreline.

- **Alternative 4**: included a total of 384 boat slips operated by two marinas with a fishing pier in the center. The shoreline would be stabilized.

- **Alternative 5**: is similar to alternative 4, except that the fishing pier would be closer to First Street.

- **Alternative 6**: was a proposition for no action.

After reviewing the six alternatives it appears that Alternative 1 is the plan that has been most closely adhered to. Presently a total 387 boat slips, within the James Creek and Buzzard Point marinas, increased the number of boat slips by 143 since 1987.

---
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Figure 72 James Creek Marina, aerial view
Buzzard Point Marina

Resource Address: East of the Coast Guard Headquarters at 2100 Second Street, SW

Architect/Builder: Unknown

Building Type/Use: Marina/recreational

Dates of Construction: Unknown. The Buzzard Point Yacht Club was founded prior to 1930

Location: Located at the Confluence of the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers, east of the Coast Guard Headquarters

Architectural Description
A small vernacular wooden building houses an office. The marina consists of 90 floating docks and a pump-out station for off-loading human waste from boats that have their own sanitary facilities. There is a public boat-launching ramp available to launch and pull out boats. Installation and repair of modern floating docks is an ongoing process.

Integrity
Buzzard Point Marina has been located in the same location for over 75 years, and was the first Sailboat Center in Washington DC-Capitol Hill area. Archaeological evidence of the recent past may be found on the site.

Factors of Significance
As with the James Creek Marina, the Army Corps of Engineers acquired the property June 25, 1912 through the condemnation process for "construction, repair, or preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors." (Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, case # 1009) Jurisdiction was transferred to the National Park Service in 1957. No further historical information was available from the National Park Service.

When the Buzzard Point Yacht Club opened prior to 1930, it was the first Sailboat Center in Washington, DC-Capitol Hill area. Presently, sailboats and motorboats utilize the James Creek Marina, with the marina offering dockage. In 1987, the National Park Service completed a study proposing six alternatives to the marina area of Buzzard Point. See the previous inventory item, James Creek Marina, for a description of the study recommendations and outcome.
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Washington City Canal/James Creek Canal

Resource Address: N/A

Architect/Builder: Benjamin Latrobe/Unknown

Building Type/Use: Infra structure/canal

Dates of Construction: 1802-1815

Location: Washington City Canal. From Tiber Creek on the west to the Navy Yard on the east; James Creek Canal: Near 2nd Street, SW

Architectural Description

The Washington City Canal varied in width from 50 feet, on the eastern section, to 150 feet near the White House. The original depth is unknown, but silting due to runoff from poor agricultural methods and a lack of funds for dredging caused the canal to fill in. When the canal was functional, it may have had only enough water in it to accommodate barges that drew approximately three feet of water. The canal’s sides were made of wood, brick, and stone.

The James Creek Canal was 55 feet wide and had stone sides, however, its depth is unknown.

Integrity

It is possible that the now-covered James Creek Canal may contain archaeological evidence.

Factors of Significance

The Washington Canal system was part of the L’Enfant Plan for the development of the city in 1791. In 1795, there were plans to build the Washington City Canal between the Navy Yard on the Anacostia and Tiber Creek that emptied into the Potomac near Georgetown, and the James Creek Canal that joined the Washington City Canal near Second Street, SW. Daniel Carroll and Notley Young held two lotteries to raise money for the building of the canal. This plan failed to raise the capital needed, and the construction of the Washington City Canal was delayed until 1802 and completed in 1815. The hope was that by digging the canal, barges could transport goods such as grain and flour from backcountry settlements. Goods would travel downriver on the Potomac from Western Maryland and what is now West
The canals acted as a barrier to the development of Buzzard Point in the 19th century. The Washington Canal/James Creek Canal formed an area that could only be reached by bridges or water. This is one of the reasons the Southwest area was often referred to as “The Island.” The silting in of the canal further limited commercial activity, and the pollution caused by sewage and dead animals also made the area near the canals an unhealthy area to live in. Unimagined by their 19th century proponents, the canals established a pattern of isolation that have affected development of Buzzard Point and the Old Southwest for nearly two centuries.
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Analysis and Recommendations

Section 1

Factors Affecting Historic Resources and Neighborhood Character

The Study Area has a long, full history and a complex neighborhood character. Some preservationists may argue that these two issues are reason enough to intervene in an historic neighborhood facing change. To appraise the Study Area’s need for intervention fairly, the factors affecting neighborhood historic resources and character require closer examination. These factors fall into the three broad categories discussed below.

1. The Study Area is a Low-Income Neighborhood

According to the 2000 Census, over 40 percent of residents in the Old Southwest have incomes that fall below the District of Columbia’s certified poverty line. The average family income is approximately one-quarter of the citywide average. The Study Area may be described as a low-income neighborhood. One result of the neighborhood’s economic condition is that there has been little change in the historic fabric. While the majority of Southwest DC underwent drastic redevelopment in the mid-20th century, this pocket of the original Southwest remains.

Although beneficial to the preservation of historic building fabric, obvious challenges accompany the low-income category. For instance, the 2000 Census stated that only 14 percent of Old Southwest residents own their homes. This low rate of homeownership implies a high rate of rental tenancy. In most neighborhoods, owners of rental units have little incentive to maintain and improve their dwellings, including historic buildings, because of the low expectation of economic return.

If the Study Area were to become an historic district, the low-income condition in the neighborhood could have another impact. Property owners may find it financially difficult to comply with design guidelines recommended by the city. The costs of necessary repairs and routine maintenance may cause an adverse economic impact on property owners. Maintaining the physical integrity of the neighborhood could become perceived as a constraint on finances rather than beneficial to the quality of neighborhood character.

Due to limited quantities of affordable housing in the area, the younger generation of residents must leave the neighborhood and either settle elsewhere in the District or go to neighboring states to find affordable housing. As residents leave the neighborhood, neighborhood values and character will certainly be affected. This transition is already at hand, as Old Southwest homes are being bought by “outsiders” attracted by impending development such as the Major League Baseball stadium on the opposite side of South Capitol Street.
2. Development Plans for the Study Area

Many of the neighborhood residents equate new development with displacement. If new housing sales and rents are set at market-rate prices, many Study Area residents are afraid that they will not be able to afford to continue living in the area. The possibility of development leads to uncertainty about the future for current long-time residents of the Study Area. Since the District of Columbia has a limited supply of public and affordable housing, the Study Area residents fear being displaced not only outside their neighborhood but also outside their city. However, exploring the changes new development may create within the neighborhood also brings to light many opportunities. For example, most new development sites on Buzzard Point are currently zoned for mixed-use buildings.\textsuperscript{124} The National Capital Planning Commission’s (NCPC) \textit{New Vision for South Capitol Street} suggests developing Buzzard Point-Southwest as an area of mixed-use buildings to help support the new Major League Baseball stadium.\textsuperscript{125} The \textit{Riverside} plan is within the Study Area at 200 R Street, SW.\textsuperscript{126} This plan calls for 1.9 million square feet of mixed-use construction. If the new housing is created for a range of income levels, there could be an increase in affordable housing. The Old Southwest already has affordable housing and a mix of income levels, so the new residential development could support the current neighborhood character.

An increase in the number of property owners resulting from the new development could also spur creation of new amenities that would be available to existing neighborhood residents, promote greater infrastructure maintenance, and give the area more political clout.\textsuperscript{127} With appropriate measures to prevent displacement of current residents, new residents with a mix of incomes can help to revitalize a community.\textsuperscript{128}

With new development comes an inevitable visual change to the landscape and cityscape. NCPC’s \textit{Extending the Legacy} plan proposes to extend the Monumental Core, which is presently focused on the National Mall, to all quadrants of the city.\textsuperscript{129} The plan connects Buzzard Point with the rest of the city, even to the siting of a new monument in the community. \textit{The Memorials and Museums Master Plan} also mentions Buzzard Point as a focus for a new monument, specifying the land owned by Florida Rock.\textsuperscript{130} These potential changes to the landscape could cause a loss of the familiar neighborhood landscape for Study Area residents. But, the landscape changes could also create a more aesthetically pleasing and functional area south of Q Street and promote more free and inviting access for residents to the Anacostia Waterfront at Buzzard Point.

Similar to the landscape changes are possible changes in traffic patterns and transportation. The NCPC \textit{Strategic Plan 2004-2009} considers redesigning South Capitol Street into an attractive boulevard,\textsuperscript{131} while the \textit{New Vision for South Capitol Street} plans a new Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge.\textsuperscript{132} The new bridge will extend farther south than the present bridge and include a new traffic rotary at the Potomac Avenue/South Capitol Street intersection. The \textit{South Capitol Street Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study}\textsuperscript{133} suggests redesigning South Capitol Street for use by cars, bicycles, and pedestrians. Finally, the \textit{Ballpark Addendum to the South Capitol Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study} discusses the traffic difficulties the ballpark construction will cause around the development area, and mentions that future transit will be affected by the finished
ballpark. All of these plans will affect movement within and surrounding the Study Area. The changing movement could again cause a loss of familiarity for current residents. Bus routes may change, streets such as Potomac Avenue that are currently quiet may soon become busier, and common pedestrian routes may change. The plans do show that South Capitol Street will be affected positively by becoming easier to cross. Thus, pedestrians should eventually benefit from a safer South Capitol Street.

Lastly, new development may improve economic opportunities for area residents. Mixed-use buildings could bring offices, retail, restaurants, and hotels into the newly developed site. Each new business will require employees. Residents will likely gain new job opportunities within walking distance from their residences. New businesses also could provide new places for Old Southwest residents to buy necessities and find entertainment. However, if development is concentrated in Buzzard Point, more people will be traveling through the current neighborhood on their way to work, homes, and the riverfront parks. An introduction of new people and a steady flow of strangers could disrupt the small-town character of the Study Area.

Construction projects like the new Washington Nationals baseball stadium, scheduled to begin in March 2006, and plans to modify the Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge could “pollute” the local area with construction noise for years. The stadium is scheduled to be finished in 2008, but the bridge construction will extend into the next decade. Thus, construction will have an extended affect on the quality of life for neighborhood residents. On the other hand, the new construction and development may clean up some potential toxic industrial sites making the local environment cleaner and safer for Old Southwest residents.

3. A Current Lack of Protection for Study Area Historic Resources

This study documents 21 existing resources in the Old Southwest. Currently, the William Syphax School is the only designated DC Historic Landmark within the Study Area. Without protection for local historic resources, any kind of changes that adhere to basic zoning regulations may occur in the neighborhood unimpeded.

Contributing to the lack of current protection is the fact that only a few community residents are engaged in preservation activities. It is likely that many people, of both moderate and low income, are unfamiliar with the historic preservation process. There are generally held impressions regarding the effects of the process that can discourage the uninformed from taking advantage of its benefits. Further, the experience of Old Southwest residents with preservationists has not been wholly positive. One community leader noted that the community is distrustful of outsiders interested in the area’s historic resources because of a past experience with an academic who used residents’ research without compensation or acknowledgement. This wariness may cause Old Southwest residents to reject neighborhood preservation initiatives generated outside the community.

Despite the few people involved in historic preservation activities, there is interest in community history by some residents. A number of locally-based historians are avidly researching sites that exemplify the social history of the area. A local community group nominated and achieved the designation
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of Friendship Baptist Church as a landmark. There is also a passion to protect community historic resources: Hundreds of Old Southwest residents signed a petition in 2003 to preserve the historic William Syphax School from alteration.136

Conclusion

Old Southwest historic resources and neighborhood character are affected by the neighborhoods’ low-income level, proposed new development adjacent to and within the Study Area, and the current lack of protection for historic resources. After consideration of these factors, the study team has identified a number of tools for protecting the community’s unique historic resources and neighborhood character. These tools, which together comprise the Preservation Plan for Old Southwest, are discussed in the following section.
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Section 2

Preserving Heritage and Community: The Preservation Plan

After compiling an inventory of the area’s historic structures, recording elements of neighborhood character, and assessing opportunities and challenges related to current economic and social conditions and development plans, the Old Southwest studio team has identified the following goals for a community preservation plan:

- To protect and preserve the identified historic resources
- To sustain neighborhood character
- To maintain the stock of affordable housing
- To revitalize the community
- To educate community residents and the general public on the history of Old Southwest.

To achieve these goals, we recommend use of the following tools:

1. Create awareness of community history and existing historic resources
2. Focus planning efforts and utilize economic incentives
3. Designate a historic district and historic landmarks.

Exploration of the Preservation Tools

I. Create an awareness of community history and historic resources among residents

During the semester, the study team discovered that the Old Southwest has a rich history that reflects the patterns of development that have taken place in the Nation’s Capital since its founding. The team also learned that the area’s history has gone largely unrecorded and, as a result, unknown. Therefore, as an initial step in preserving the Study Area’s historic resources and neighborhood character, the team recommends implementing a program to create awareness in the community of the history of Old Southwest.

A number of Old Southwest residents are or have been engaged in historic research in the area. For example, Vanessa Ruffin-Colbert, a resident of Carrollsburg Place, is documenting the history of Sanitary Housing. Her research is supported in part through a $5,000 grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation. In addition, the History Task Force of the Southwest Neighborhood Assembly developed an exhibit, “Southwest: Then and Now,” for the Smithsonian Folk Life Festival in 2001. The Task Force also contributed information to Cultural Tourism DC as this organization developed the Southwest Heritage Trail and the related publication, “River Farms to Urban Towers.” Further, as mentioned earlier in this report, a group of residents successfully nominated Friendship Baptist Church for designation as a DC Landmark. Undertaking a focused, comprehensive awareness program will now be easier because of these earlier efforts.
The proposed program to create awareness among community residents will have four components: 1) a public presentation by the study team on its findings; 2) the formation of a community historical society or preservation organization; 3) presentation of local history activities; and 4) continued publicity about the community’s history and historic resources.

**Presentation by the Study Team**

The Old Southwest studio team expects to present its findings to residents at a site in the community in December 2005. The team will present a brief overview of the history of the Old Southwest and an illustrated inventory of community historic resources. An Executive Summary of the team’s report and an Inventory of Historic Resources will be distributed to participants. This information will also be supplied to the community newspaper, *The Southwester*, for publication in a future issue.

**Formation of a Community Organization**

The second component of the awareness program is the identification of a community organization that would engage local residents in neighborhood history activities on an ongoing basis. This has been an important step in local preservation efforts throughout the District. The History Task Force of the Southwest Neighborhood Assembly might take the lead, since it has assumed an active role in promoting community history in the past. If this is not acceptable to the community, an alternative would be the formation of a new history organization based in Old Southwest. The leadership could come from individuals whose interest in community history was apparent during the team’s study. This group may be able to acquire financial support for its activities, either through contributions from private individuals or from established funds such as the NTHP program already mentioned. This group could also identify partners, both inside and outside of the community, as resources for further efforts.

**Case Study**

**The Tenleytown Historical Society**

One of the communities in the District that has established a local historical society is Tenleytown. The mission of the Tenleytown Historical Society “is to encourage the architectural, cultural and historic preservation of Washington, DC, particularly Tenleytown and its environs, through education, research, public programs, and tours.” Members of the Tenleytown Historical Society pay annual membership dues, and as a 501 (c) (3) organization, dues and contributions to the organization are tax deductible. Incorporated in 1988, the organization is run entirely by volunteers.

In addition to presenting meetings and lectures on Tenleytown history, the Society publicly advocates for the protection of historic sites in Tenleytown, in surrounding neighborhoods, and throughout Washington, DC. Members participate in meetings held by District agencies concerning plans that could impact the community’s historic resources. With assistance from the DC Historic Preservation Grant Program, the society completed a Historic Resources Survey of its community in 2003. The society was also successful in its application for designation of the Grant Road Historic District and of two buildings as Historic Landmarks.
Local History Activities

With a cadre of volunteers in place, the awareness program can proceed. The third component in the awareness program consists of history activities presented in the neighborhood. These activities would seek to engage young and old residents in learning about Old Southwest history. The activities could be presented at the Greenleaf Recreation Center, the main community meeting place identified by residents. Perhaps with the assistance of the study team, the community history organization could install a photo exhibit of the area’s documented historic resources in the Center’s main hallway.

Following this exhibit, the organization could sponsor a “family history day,” where residents would be invited to come to Greenleaf Center and bring their old photographs of family, church, school, and local events for scanning. These photographs would be the main attraction at a second community event, a “town meeting,” which would feature a presentation using many of these images to tell the story of Old Southwest. The audience would be invited to speak up with their recollection of the events, people, and institutions pictured. By providing residents with an opportunity to share their stories and to learn from each other, the event can generate interest and pride in the history of the Old Southwest. This type of two-phase event has been used successfully to stimulate interest in local history in the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area. The names and addresses of attendees at both community events could form the nucleus of a mailing list for future history activities targeted at children (perhaps curriculum-based), senior citizens, or families. The photos and reminiscences could also form the basis for an electronic “Old Southwest Community History Archives” maintained by the community historic organization.

Publicize Old Southwest History

The fourth component of the awareness program is to continually publicize the history of Old Southwest through all appropriate means. The Southwest Branch of the Library of the District of Columbia would be an ideal location for a photo exhibit combining historic and contemporary images of Old Southwest families and of historic resources illustrated with a timeline of local history. This exhibit could later be installed for a period of time at the Washingtoniana Division of the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library. A regular history column in The Southwester could relate the history of the Study Area to residents throughout the Southwest. The community history organization could also develop a website containing information on Old Southwest history and events and activities planned by the organization, as well as links to online resources.

The success of the awareness program can be measured by two standards. The first is that of residents’ new knowledge of their community history stimulates a “grassroots” effort to preserve Old Southwest historic resources through zoning amendments or historic designation. The second, and perhaps the most important measure, is if residents’ increased pride in their community heritage empowers them to seek greater and more equitable economic and social benefits in future development within their community.
2. Focus Planning Efforts and Utilize Economic Incentives

Many policies established within the District of Columbia’s Comprehensive Plan address a variety of preservation-related issues and are applicable to the Study Area. These policies reflect the District's approach to dealing with complex issues such as creating and sustaining very-low- to moderate-income housing, protecting and preserving a neighborhood's unique architectural or social fabric, and re-incorporating retail and small business investment back into economically-distressed areas. Utilizing these specific policies also affords threatened neighborhoods, as well as parts of their contiguous areas, the potential for protection in terms of their character and integrity. The conservation of an area's historic built environment due to zoning and special treatment planning enables a community to revitalize and to protect its neighborhood character.

Specialized Planning Area/ Special Treatment Area

The best use of current District of Columbia planning policies applicable to Old Southwest is the establishment of a Specialized Planning Area (SPA). The first step involves reaching consensus on the community’s unique neighborhood character. In addition, the community should consider uses and locations for desired new development. Existing uses and potential adaptive re-use options for historic and non-historic buildings should be identified. Residents can work through a local community organization, in conjunction with the local Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC), to create a Specialized Planning Area. If there is no existing local community organization willing and able to address these issues, than one should be created.

Specialized Planning Areas are a mixed-use land use category classified into four sub-areas. Of the four classifications, the Special Treatment Area (STA) is the most appropriate for the Old Southwest community. According to the Comprehensive Plan, an STA should “exhibit unique physical, social, or functional characteristics and features” such as “cultural design or architectural and ethnic characteristics.” A local community organization that represents Old Southwest residents could create objectives for neighborhood preservation and revitalization to be targeted within the STA. Possible objectives include protecting neighborhood scale and historic character, maintaining low-income and affordable housing in the neighborhood, and creating new commercial development that serves local residents.

Case Study
Reed-Cooke Special Treatment Area and Overlay District

The Reed-Cooke neighborhood is named for two elementary schools, Marie Reed and H.D. Cooke. It is part of the greater Adams Morgan neighborhood in Washington, DC. Policy objectives for the designated STA include: (1) Protect current housing in the area and provide for the development of new housing; (2) Maintain heights and densities at appropriate levels; and (3) Encourage small-scale business development that will not adversely affect the residential community.

The Reed-Cooke Neighborhood Association worked with Kalorama Citizens Association to create the Reed-Cooke Overlay District (RC Overlay District) in 1989 to preserve residential...
character and moderate density. The purpose of this district, which applies to portions of non-residentially zoned squares in the Reed-Cooke STA, is to implement the aforementioned Reed-Cooke Special Treatment Area objectives in addition to ensuring that new non-residential uses serve the local community. The RC Overlay District regulates building heights, with a bonus height available for any project that provides on-site construction or substantial rehabilitation of low-and-moderate-income household units meeting specified requirements.

In Old Southwest, a Special Treatment Area could encompass the residential and commercial blocks generally between M and Potomac Avenue, SW, and Canal, 2nd, and South Capitol streets, SW. The STA could create awareness among residents and city planning staff by its inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan. This official recognition would be a justifiable way to monitor changes and guide new development in Old Southwest. In this way, it could also help provide a foundation for the support of Historic District designation. At a minimum, individual Historic Landmarks could be designated within the Special Treatment Area.

Overlay District and Buffer Zone

The next step for the community related to this recommendation would involve working with the DC Office of Planning to create an overlay district as part of the Old Southwest Special Treatment Area. This overlay district could provide additional regulation for building heights and uses and for adherence to aforementioned Special Treatment Area objectives. It would create a transition area for the residential portion of the STA excluded from the overlay by promoting sensitive development, at an appropriate scale and density, between the existing neighborhood and the projected intense development south of the overlay. An Old Southwest Overlay District could include the mixed-use blocks generally between Q Street and Potomac Avenue, SW, and 2nd and South Capitol streets, SW (which would remain included in the Special Treatment Area). An overlay district would essentially create a “buffer zone” to aid in the regulation of building heights and uses, and could provide alternatives with effects similar to inclusionary zoning. The Reed-Cooke Overlay District and the Uptown Arts Overlay District currently achieve inclusionary zoning objectives with incentive-based tools.

Economic Incentives

There are several economic tools available through the DC Department of Housing and Community Development’s (DHCD) “Notice of Funding Availability,” published as of October 2005, applicable to the Study Area. These funds allow DHCD to solicit applications for projects striving to fulfill the following goals: (1) increase the supply of decent, affordable rental and ownership housing through preservation, rehabilitation, and assistance for new construction; and (2) support neighborhood revitalization and economic opportunities.

The four major funds available are the Housing Production Trust Fund (HPTF), HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME), Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), and Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). HOME, CDBG, and LIHTC funds must benefit low-income individuals and households with incomes of up to 80 percent of the area median income (AMI), as defined by the US Department of Housing and
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Urban Development (HUD). Additionally, a CDBG-funded project must ultimately benefit a low-income community, where the activity will primarily benefit residents of low-income neighborhoods. HOME regulations specify that 90 percent of the total households assisted through the rental program have incomes that do not exceed 60 percent of the AMI. HPTF funds require that 40 percent of the monies disbursed benefit extremely low-income households, those at 0-30 percent of the AMI, as first priority. The remainder of HPTF money is then put toward benefiting very low-income households to low-income households. The DHCD gives priority to eligible projects that deal with preservation of expiring, federally subsidized, affordable rental housing; new construction of affordable rental or for-sale housing; substantial rehabilitation of affordable rental or for-sale housing; special needs housing; elderly housing; and community facilities.

The economic tools mentioned in this section are best utilized by community organizations in partnerships with Community Development Corporations (CDC) or their equivalent. Experience with economic development strategies and a working knowledge of DHCD procedures are essential prerequisites to successful implementation of the tools. Residents of Old Southwest could participate by identifying and prioritizing the challenging issues in their neighborhood, such as low-income housing, that require special attention when working with partner organizations. Many economic tools, such as Community Development Block Grants and Low Income Housing Credits, complement historic preservation opportunities by combining with traditional preservation grants and tax credits to make projects more economically feasible. Moreover, the use of economic tools in Old Southwest could advance support from District agencies through focusing planning and revitalization efforts in a recognized Special Treatment Area. Building upon this success, Historic District designation could be an important next step in the preservation of neighborhood character and the built environment in the Old Southwest.

3. Historic District Designation

At this point, we conclude our recommendations by answering the third question: How can historic preservation play a major role in future community development to preserve historic resources and maintain neighborhood character? After conducting many discussions and investigations, and analyzing many preservation tools that would be most appropriate to the Study Area and have the capability to achieve the identified preservation goals, the studio team recommends designating the residential part of Old Southwest as an historic district.

Throughout the report, we have demonstrated the rich history and the distinct character that the Study Area possesses. At the same time, we have also presented many indicators of inevitable change and growth that the area will witness in the near future. The Old Southwest community should welcome the coming developments but should, at the same time, be prepared to manage and direct progress in a desired direction in order to preserve the historic resources and maintain the neighborhood’s character. We believe that the suggested historic designation would, largely, accomplish that.
The suggested historic district is based on a theme revealed in our research: we found that Old Southwest represents the development of an urban residential community providing affordable housing for working class and low-income families in the period from 1892 to 1958. Such a theme is quite common in many historic districts especially in urban areas, such as Foggy Bottom Historic District\(^{151}\) and Anacostia Historic District\(^{152}\) in Washington, DC, and South Clifton Park Historic District in east Baltimore.\(^{153}\) The historic significance of these three historic districts relies in part on the fact that each is “a working-class neighborhood.”

Based on the theme identified, we recommend delineating the boundaries of the suggested historic district as follows: establish M Street as the northern boundary of the district, and Delaware Avenue, Canal Street, and 2nd Street as the western boundary. Q Street forms the southern boundary and South Capitol Street is the eastern boundary. It should be noted here that some lots within this area are excluded (see opposite map) because they are not consistent with the suggested theme.

We also recommend designation of the PEPCO plant and the former PEPCO pumping station (now the Mathew Henson Earth Environmental Center), as DC Historic Landmarks for their significance as examples of early 20th century industrial development in the District.

If historic districting is not approved, then individual properties such as Sanitary Housing, James Creek Housing, the James C. Dent Residence/Southwest Community House, PEPCO, the Henson Center, and any other property that the community deems historic could be proposed for designation as individual landmarks or part of a multiple building listing.

Within the suggested historic district boundaries, there are 15 historic resources that this report has identified earlier. They vary from housing projects to single family homes, small groups of rowhouses, a factory, and an already designated historic landmark, which is the Syphax School. Included in the historic resources are two public housing projects (James Creek and Syphax Gardens) owned by the DC Housing Authority. There is precedence for the historic designation of public housing, both nationally and locally. The District of Columbia designated Langston Terrace Dwellings on 21st Street, NE, as an historic landmark in 1982 for its significance as the first public housing in DC.\(^{154}\) The team has noted significant similarities between this landmarked property and James Creek Public Housing. Both projects were constructed by the same housing authority, the Alley Dwelling Authority; both were designed by well-known African-American architects (Albert Cassell for James Creek and Hilyard Robinson for Langston Terrace Dwellings), and both were intended for African-American residents.

**The Benefits of Historic Designation**

During our interviews with area residents, it became clear that many residents are unaware of the role that historic district designation could play in community preservation and of the economic benefits it could yield. One of the economic benefits, for example, is that properties become eligible for a variety of financial incentives at the local, state, and federal levels, such as the Historic Preservation Tax Credit, grants from the Historic
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Preservation Fund and the approved but unfunded DC Historic Housing Tax Credit.

The combined use of the historic rehabilitation tax credit with the low-income housing tax credit also offers an exceptional opportunity to maintain the available housing stock in the Study Area while rehabilitating historic structures. This strategy has been used in the rehabilitation of Butchers Hill, an historic neighborhood in Baltimore. One rehabilitation project within the Butchers Hill neighborhood was St. Elizabeth’s Senior Housing. The project included converting a convent into 20 housing units. Together, the low-income housing tax credit and the state and federal historic rehabilitation tax credits totaled 60 percent of the project’s $1.7 million cost.155

Locally, homeowners in designated historic districts become eligible for the DC Targeted Historic Housing Tax Credit to renovate their homes. The provisions for this tax credit are the same as the federal historic tax credit; meaning that the renovation work (both interior and exterior) must conform to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, must exceed $5,000, and at least 10 percent of the expenditures must be spent on the exterior of the residence. A substantial advantage for this tax credit is that the property doesn’t need to be income producing, thus it is targeted to homeowners. However, because funding has not been approved, to date no credit has been made available. The DC Preservation League is advocating full funding for the credit.156 At the same time, the Council of the District of Columbia is currently considering a bill to “simplify the income tax credit available to low-and moderate-income homeowners for qualified rehabilitation expenditures of a historic home; (and) to provide loans to enable low-income homeowners to undertake work eligible for tax credit.”157 As of December 1, 2005, there has been a public hearing of this measure but no vote has been taken.

Another source of funding may be available from the National Trust for Historic Preservation through its Community Partners Program (CPP). CPP provides below-market-rate loans from its Inner-City Ventures Fund, which is supported by the Ford Foundation, the Metropolitan Life Foundation, NationsBank, and Fannie Mae. The program also provides access to tax credit equity through a Heritage Partners Housing Fund.158

Local historic designation can also provide properties within the historic district protection from private development. Protection includes a review process by the local Historic Preservation Review Board, and some security from public actions under regulations such as Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and Section 4f of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. Above all, historic designation represents the District of Columbia’s acknowledgement of Old Southwest’s unique characteristics and essential part in the development of the Nation’s Capital: this can create a sense of pride and appreciation among community members of their heritage and historic resources.

**Historic District Design Guidelines**

The historic designation usually requires properties within the historic district to comply with certain design guidelines. The purpose of these guidelines is to preserve the neighborhood character and maintain a building’s historic fabric. Such regulations may present a financial burden to property owners especially in an historic area characterized by affordable housing.
Preserving the integrity of the neighborhood could be perceived as a constraint on finances rather than beneficial to the quality of neighborhood character.

Although tax credits may help alleviate these added costs, it is useful to mention that the issue of economic hardship related to rehabilitation/maintenance of historic properties has received attention at the federal and local government levels. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has issued the “ACHP Policy Statement on Affordable Housing and Historic Preservation.” Among other considerations, the policy statement urges federal and state agencies, local governments, housing providers, and the preservation community in general to “actively seek ways to reconcile national historic preservation goals with the special economic and social needs associated with affordable housing.”

Many communities have addressed this issue by reconsidering local historic district design guidelines. To this end, a number of pilot programs have been administered with the assistance of the Community Partners Program of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Dwight Historic District Design Guidelines was one of the pilot efforts developed in 1999.

**Case Study**

**Dwight Historic District Design Guidelines**

The purpose of the Dwight Historic Design Guidelines is to encourage preservation rehabilitation strategies that are economical yet focus on preserving the most important historic features of each house and those most important to defining the character of the neighborhood. The guidelines are used for homeowners undertaking privately financed rehabs. They include recommendations for numerous historic features such as windows, porches, trims and ornaments, and so on. For each feature, the guidelines provide three options. Option 1 calls for always repairing rather than replacing the historic feature or material. Option 2 calls for replacing the feature or material to match. Option 3 calls for replacing the feature with comparable substitute material in case options 1 and 2 are too costly.

**Community-Based Organization**

We believe that the key to achieving preservation goals is community participation in the historic preservation process. The importance of this concept is demonstrated by the fact that we have included the development of a community organization in all three of our preservation goals.

We encourage residents of Old Southwest to take the lead in nominating historic properties for designation. This could be achieved by identifying existing community organizations and empowering them to actively involve their members and take a leadership role. However, if such entities cannot be identified, we recommend forming a community-based organization to act in this role.

The first task of the community-based organization would be to work with Old Southwest residents to promote the area’s history and heritage. At the same time, the organization would pursue local, state, and federal funding that could contribute to preserving and protecting the historic resources and the built environment. The organization’s nomination of historic properties for designation would take place when it is assured that the majority of residents support the effort.
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In 2005, the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) awarded 11 grants totaling over $100,000 “to promote the architectural and historical significance of Southwest Washington, DC.” These grants were made through the Monument Mitigation Grant Fund, a joint project of Monument Realty, DC Preservation League, and the DC Historic Preservation Office. The fund was created by these organizations “to help educate DC residents about the history of Southwest and mid-20th century architecture, and to improve or expand public open space in the quadrant.” (Source: NTHP press release, 20 April 2005.)


Doris Dyen, Director of Cultural Conservation, Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area. Telephone interview, 5 December 2005.

The Web site of the Tenleytown Historical Society, http://www.tenleytownhistoricalsociety.org/index.htm, is a highly developed example.


In 2005 the District Office of Planning and conducted a study on the possibility of introducing inclusionary zoning overlays (IZ) into the Comprehensive Plan. Options for both voluntary and mandatory IZ programs were addressed. The Zoning Commission Case 04-33 Inclusionary Zoning Preliminary Report contained a proposed coverage area map for IZ within the city, including a large portion of the Old Southwest Study Area north of R Street, SW. Voluntary inclusionary zoning would allow developers to use incentives such as bonus density increases for including low- and moderate-income housing as part of new construction or rehabilitation projects. A common incentive is to allow additional height or FAR (floor-to-area ratio) in projects within the IZ overlay.
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Preservation League, District of Columbia Targeted Historic Housing Tax Credit available on World Wide Web: http://www.dcpreservation.org/DCTaxCredit_FS.doc


The ACHP Policy Statement on Affordable Housing and Historic Preservation at http://www.achp.gov/afford.html

Section 3

Conclusions

The census data reveal that Old Southwest is a mixed-income neighborhood, but one with a high percentage of residents living at the poverty level. Over the past 20 years, the neighborhood education level has increased, the poverty level and crime rate have decreased, and population has declined. The complexities do not end with demographic information. The neighborhood’s history and character are also complex and are reflected by the various building types found in the Study Area. Market-rate townhouses, affordable housing, public housing, industrial, and recreational properties exist side-by-side. A diverse group of individuals constructed these buildings in the late 19th through the mid-20th centuries.

The Fall 2005 Historic Preservation Studio team found that Old Southwest has many historic buildings and a vibrant neighborhood character. The distinctive atmosphere of the neighborhood is threatened by potential development. To begin to preserve the unique historic qualities of the area, the team recommends a three-step approach:

1. Create awareness of Old Southwest history among community residents;
2. Focus planning efforts by implementing specialized zoning and utilizing economic incentives;
3. Designate the residential portion of Old Southwest as an historic district, or individual properties as landmarks, to afford these historic structures and their settings the highest level of protection.

Recommendations for Further Study

All of the interviews with community members took place on weekdays; therefore, the residents surveyed were mainly female and usually older residents. While there was consensus among these individuals on neighborhood qualities, the team recommends that a larger and more inclusive survey be conducted so that the complexities of neighborhood character can be examined more thoroughly. The survey sample should include:

- Greater diversity in ages.
- Households with young children.
- Representation of a broader mix of income levels.
- Individuals employed by companies and federal agencies located at Buzzard Point.

The team also recommends a more intensive survey of historic fabric within Old Southwest. The inventory included in this report records descriptions and research on 21 resources, but additional historic properties may be discovered. While additional resources may be identified by the community in the future, the team believes that any nomination for historic designation would be facilitated by use of the information contained in this report. Each inventory description represents a portion of the necessary information to nominate a historic property, and lists available archival and published sources.
Conclusion

The tools necessary to begin the preservation of Old Southwest are contained in this document. The plan outlines a series of actions as a potential route toward preservation. Residents of Old Southwest may choose to use these ideas and tools to shape the future of their neighborhood.

The overarching concept presented in this report is that the most important attribute for influencing the future of a place is its community. The rewards can be great. As an early proponent of urban historic preservation noted, "Historic preservation can be the underlying basis of community renewal, human renewal, and economic renewal. Preservation is not some isolated cultural benefit. I see it as a means to create an operating community of concerned and reasonably happy people."1

---
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## Appendices

### Appendix 1

### Census Data, Tract 64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract 64.00 Prepared by NeighborhoodsInz DC (revised February 7, 2005).</th>
<th>All Tracts in D.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>All Tracts in D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1990</td>
<td>2,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1990</td>
<td>2,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1990</td>
<td>2,317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Isolation Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Tracts in D.C.</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% close to school, 1990</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% have a phone, 2000</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% close to rail, 1995</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% have a tv, 2000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Child Well-being Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Tracts in D.C.</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% children in poverty, 1990</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% children in poverty, 1990</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% low birth births, 1991</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low birth births, 1991</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Tracts in D.C.</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. family income (all ages, 1990-92)</td>
<td>20,740</td>
<td>20,010</td>
<td>20,340</td>
<td>105,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. family income (ages 65+, 1990-92)</td>
<td>20,740</td>
<td>15,082</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>220,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. family income (all ages, 1989-91)</td>
<td>21,275</td>
<td>15,192</td>
<td>17,967</td>
<td>354,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change in avg. family income, 1979-1989</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change in avg. family income, 1991-1999</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Conditions
### Tract 64

#### Median Home Value (2005 $), 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>119,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Median Home Value (2005 $) by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Median Home Value (2005 $) by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Median Home Value (2005 $) by Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than HS</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Median Home Value (2005 $) by Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$30,000</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001-$40,000</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001-$50,000</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$60,000</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001-$70,000</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001-$80,000</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-$90,000</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,001-$100,000</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Median Home Value (2005 $) by Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mortgage Lending (Home Purchase Loans)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 1996</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 2001</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 2002</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Median Home Value (2005 $) by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Median Home Value (2005 $) by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Median Home Value (2005 $) by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>This Tract</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>117,179</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mortgage Lending (Home Purchase Loans) (2005 $) by Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 1996</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 2001</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 2002</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$30,000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001-$40,000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001-$50,000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$60,000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001-$70,000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001-$80,000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-$90,000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,001-$100,000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mortgage Lending (Home Purchase Loans) (2005 $) by Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 1996</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 2001</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 2002</th>
<th>Loans per 1,000 housing units, 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Zonign the Nation's Capital

Summary of Zoning Districts

Districts

Summary

CR
National Multi-family residential, commercial, and certain light industrial development to a maximum lot occupancy of 75%, for residential use; a maximum FAR of 1.5 for residential use and a maximum height of ninety (90) feet. Residential setback requirements as proposed.

C-1
Permitted multi-family medium density development and low-rise commercial development to a maximum lot occupancy of 60% for residential use, a maximum FAR of 1.0, and a maximum height of thirty (30) feet.

C-2A
Permitted multi-family medium density development, including office, retail, housing, and mixed uses to a maximum lot occupancy of 80% for residential use, a maximum FAR of 1.5 for residential use and 1.1 FAR for other permitted uses, and a maximum height of sixty (60) feet.

C-3A
Permitted multi-family medium density development for major retail and office uses to a maximum lot occupancy of 75%, for residential use, a maximum FAR of 0.8 for residential and 2.0 FAR for all other permitted uses, and a maximum height of ninety (90) feet.

C-3B
Permitted multi-family medium density development for major business and employment centers of medium density development, including office, retail, housing, and mixed uses to a maximum lot occupancy of 100%, a maximum FAR of 1.5 for residential use and 1.5 FAR for all other permitted uses, and a maximum height of six (6) stories/seventy-five (75) feet.

C-4
The downtown core comprising the retail and office centers for the District of Columbia, Multi-family medium density commercial and light residential uses to a maximum lot occupancy of 100%, a maximum FAR of 1.5 to 10.0, a maximum height of 120 feet and 170 feet for high rise buildings. (Maximum height and FAR dependent on width of adjoining streets.)

C-5
Pennsylvania Avenue Development (PAD) permits retail and office, housing and mixed development in the area of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, NW between 14th and 16th Streets, NW to a maximum lot occupancy of 100%, a maximum FAR of 4.0 for residential and 1.5 FAR for all other permitted uses and a maximum height of ninety (90) feet.

C-6
Permitted multi-family medium density development for major retail and office uses to a maximum lot occupancy of 80%, a maximum FAR of 1.5, and a maximum height of thirty (30) floors for all other uses.

C-7
Permitted multi-family medium density development for major retail and office uses to a maximum lot occupancy of 100%, a maximum FAR of 4.0, and a maximum height of ninety (90) feet.

M
General commercial and light industrial uses to a maximum FAR of 0.6, and a maximum height of thirty (30) feet with standards of exterior effects and new residential prohibited.

C-8
Permitted multi-family medium density development of high bulk commercial and light manufacturing uses to a maximum FAR of 0.0, and a maximum height of sixty (60) feet with standards of exterior effects and new residential prohibited.

R-1A
Permitted multi-family medium density development of single family residential uses for detached dwellings, a minimum lot area of 7,500 square feet, a maximum lot occupancy of 40%, for residential use and 60% for church and public schools, a maximum height of 75 feet, and 130 feet for all other structures, and a maximum height of thirty (30) stories/forty (40) feet.

R-1B
Permitted multi-family medium density development of single family residential uses for detached dwellings, a minimum lot area of 7,500 square feet, a maximum lot occupancy of 40% for residential use and 60% for church and public schools, a maximum height of 75 feet, and 150 feet for all other structures, and a maximum height of thirty (30) stories/forty (40) feet.

R-2
Permitted multi-family medium density development of single family residential uses for detached dwellings and semi-detached structures, a minimum lot area of 40 feet and lot area of 6,000 square feet for detached structures, and 30 feet and 3,000 square feet for semi-detached structures, a maximum lot occupancy of 60% for church and public school use and 40% for all other structures, and a maximum height of thirty (30) stories/forty (40) feet.

R-3
Permitted multi-family medium density development of single family residential uses including detached, semi-detached, and row dwellings, church and public schools with a minimum lot width of 20 feet, a minimum lot area of 2,000 square feet, a maximum lot occupancy of 60% for new dwellings, a minimum lot area of 3,000 square feet and 60% lot occupancy for semi-detached dwellings, a minimum lot width of 40 feet and a minimum lot area of 4,000 square feet for detached structures, and a maximum height of thirty (30) stories/forty (40) feet.

R-4
Permitted multi-family medium density development of single family residential uses including detached, semi-detached, and row dwellings, church and public schools, a minimum lot width of 18 feet, a minimum lot area of 1,500 square feet and a maximum lot occupancy of 60% for row dwellings, churches and schools, a minimum lot width of 30 feet and a maximum lot area of 3,000 square feet and 60% lot occupancy for semi-detached structures, a minimum lot width of 40 feet and a minimum lot area of 4,000 square feet for detached structures, and a maximum height of thirty (30) stories/forty (40) feet.

R-5
Permitted multi-family medium density development of single family residential uses including detached, semi-detached, and row dwellings, and the approval of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, new residential development of low density residential lots of 15 feet and 170 foot adjoining streets, including row houses, townhouses, and apartments to a maximum lot occupancy of 65%, 90% for churches and public schools, a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.9, and a maximum height of fifteen (15) stories/forty (40) feet.

R-6
Permitted multi-family medium density development of single family residential uses including detached, semi-detached, and row dwellings, and the approval of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, new residential development of low density residential lots of 15 feet and 170 foot adjoining streets, including row houses, townhouses, and apartments to a maximum lot occupancy of 40%, 60% for churches and public schools, a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.9, and a maximum height of fifteen (15) stories/forty (40) feet.

R-7
Permitted multi-family medium density development of single family residential uses, including detached, semi-detached, and row dwellings, a minimum lot occupancy of 75%, a maximum FAR of 1.5 and a maximum height of sixty (60) feet.
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## Appendix 4

### Neighborhood Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What do you see as the boundaries of your neighborhood?</td>
<td>(These could be streets or buildings.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is your favorite place in the neighborhood?</td>
<td>(This could be a street, a building, or an area.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you like living in this neighborhood? Why or why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many of your neighbors do you know by name?</td>
<td>How many of your neighbors do you think of as your friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you participate in community meetings or community-sponsored events?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What do you do in your free time in the neighborhood?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What do children do around here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. As children grow up and start their own families, do they stay in the neighborhood? Why or why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What makes this neighborhood a good place to live?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is there anything you would like to change about the neighborhood?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>