MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 10201 Menlo Ave.  
Meeting Date: 10/25/17

Resource: Contributing Resource  
Capitol View Historic District
Report Date: 10/18/17

Review: HAWP  
Public Notice: 10/11/17

Case Number: 31/07-17G  
Tax Credit: None

Applicant: Minter Farnsworth  
Staff: Dan Bruechert

Proposal: New Construction

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC approve with two (2) conditions the HAWP application.
1. The windows must be either wood or clad, not vinyl, and have fixed interior and exterior grids. Details need to be submitted to Staff for review and approval with final approval authority delegated to staff.
2. Due to the site’s environmentally sensitive location an erosion plan must be submitted for review and approval with final authority delegated to staff.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource within the Capitol View Park Historic District
STYLE: N/A
DATE: N/A

The parcel is currently undeveloped and is located at the corner of Menlo Ave. and Loma St. in the Capitol View Historic District. The lot slopes steeply down a ravine and into a conservation easement that covers the rear third of the lot. When the district was surveyed and established in 1982, this area of the Capitol View HD was identified as associated with the period 1870-1916.

BACKGROUND
This lot was established as part of a preliminary plan that was approved by the Planning Board on August 6, 1985. Prior to this HAWP, the subject property had been identified as associated with the original period of development of Capitol View, despite its undeveloped appearance.

PROPOSAL
The applicant proposes to construct a two-story house with an attached garage, install a retaining wall, fencing and a rear deck.
APPLICABLE GUIDELINES
When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Capitol View Park Historic District, several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the Approved & Adopted Sector Plan for Capitol View & Vicinity (Sector Plan), Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A), and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). The pertinent information in these documents is outlined below.

Approved & Adopted Sector Plan for Capitol View & Vicinity (Sector Plan)
1. 1870-1916: Characterized by large lots and variety of setbacks, and architecturally encompassing the "Victorian" residential and revival styles and the early bungalow style popular during this period, these twenty-two houses are of a higher degree of architectural and historical significance than the other structures within the district.
3. Nominal: These house of themselves are of no architectural of [sic] historical significance, but through their contiguity to the significant resources have some interest to the district.
4. Spatial: Spatial resources are unimproved parcels of land which visually and aesthetically contribute to the setting of the historic district, and which can be regarded as extensions of the environmental settings of the significant historic resources.

Montgomery County Code, Chapter 24A Historic Resources Preservation
(b) The commission shall instruct the director to issue a permit, or issue a permit subject to such conditions as are found to be necessary to insure conformity with the purposes and requirements of this chapter, if it finds that:
(1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or
(2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or
(3) The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or
(4) The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

STAFF DISCUSSION
The applicant proposes to construct a house on the undeveloped lot at the corner of Menlo Ave. and Loma St. in the Capitol View Historic District. Additionally, the applicant proposes to make site improvements including a driveway, retaining wall, and privacy fence. This lot is unique in that less than 25% of the lot will be visible from the public-right-of-way; the remainder of the lot is set behind the neighboring property at 2900 Loma St. There are several utility easements on the property that limit the placement of the house and the driveway. Additionally, the rear third of the lot is subject to a conservation easement and may not be developed. The view of any house built on this lot will only be visible from a limited angle from the public right-of-way and staff supports approval.

New Construction
The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story, side gable house, three bays wide, with Hardi siding on the lot. The house has two smaller front facing gables and a small covered front porch. To the right there is a single bay attached garage covered in a gable roof.

The style of the house is best described as "Traditional" as it draws from several different periods of construction. The two-over-one windows are more in keeping with a Craftsman house as are the battered columns covering the front porch. The board and batten shutters and board and batten decoration under the two front facing gables are more vernacular elements. At the rear there are some two-over-one windows that have a two-lit transom above. The applicant proposes an uncovered deck to the rear.

The applicant did not provide windows specifications with the application materials. Staff thinks that the proposed two-over-one configuration is acceptable, and recommends the HPC condition approval on the applicant using a wood or clad window using either true divided lites or simulated divided lites with fixed interior and exterior grids.

The applicant proposes to construct a 12’ × 20’ (twelve feet by ten feet) deck to the rear (the deck details are on included on the elevation drawings and were provided as a supplement to the application). The applicant proposes to construct the structure of the deck out of wood, with a composite decking material, azek trim, and "Wolf" metal rails. Staff feels that the composite decking and azek trim are acceptable substitute materials in this location due to the fact that their characteristics are similar to wood. Staff also feels that the metal balusters are acceptable in this location because the deck is at the rear on new construction. As this will not be visible from the public right-of-way, Staff believes this decorative element should be approved.

When the district was established in 1982, Staff believes that this site was part of the larger parcel and environmental setting of the Hahn House (c.1895), at 2801 Barker St. Staff has been unable to locate the copies of the preliminary plan that created the subject property’s lot, however, Staff is reasonably sure that this occurred as part of the preliminary plan that was approved by the planning board in 1985. Due to this, Staff does not feel that the applicant should be bound to using a “Victorian” vocabulary in the design of the proposed house. To do so would contravene Standard 9 by not effectively differentiating new construction from the old.

Staff further believes that this resource should be evaluated as a ‘Nominal’ resource for several reasons. First, it is a building that is surrounded by buildings from the latter half of the 20th
century. Directly to the south, the house was constructed in 1993. To the west, the house was constructed in 1953. And to the north the neighboring house was constructed in 1989. Farther to the north, the next houses were constructed in 1929, 1989, and 1926. Second, the properties across Menlo Ave. are outside of the district, so any development here will have less impact on the historic district, as the proposed construction is at the edge of the district. Third, because only an oblique angle of this house will be visible from the public right-of-way, it will have a reduced impact on the surrounding district.

Staff believes that the applicants use of a rectangular house shape with a simple side gable roof form achieves a house that, where visible from the district, creates a house that will successfully blend in to the surrounding district and Staff supports its approval.

**Site Work**
The applicant proposes to construct a privacy fence, retaining wall, and will remove several trees.

The applicant is proposing to construct a driveway and parking area to the front of the house using asphalt. This material is widely used throughout the district and will have a minimal impact on the site and the surrounding district. As the parking area will not be visible from the public right-of-way, it will not impact the district and should be approved.

The applicant is proposing to install a six foot (6’) tall, wood, board on board privacy fence placed at the front boundary of the property. The HPC does not typically approve fences taller than forty-eight inches (48”) in front of the rear wall plan within historic districts. The neighboring property has a fence that is approximately five feet (5’) tall, which would intersect the proposed fence at the middle. The southern half of the proposed fence will be obscured by the neighbors existing fence and will not be visible. The northern portion of the fence will be visible from the public right of way and staff believes that due to the unique siting of the lot, a solid board on board design is acceptable, however, the fence height should be reduced to 48” (forty-eight inches) to the north of the neighbor’s wooden fence.

The applicant additionally is proposing to construct three sections of a retaining wall to be built out of 6” × 6” (six inches by six inches) railroad ties and will range from grade height to 30” (thirty inches) tall. Due to the negative slope of the lot, none of the retaining wall sections will be visible from the public right-of-way. Staff believes that this material is consistent with the retaining walls used throughout the district and is an acceptable material.

The applicant will need to remove several trees in order to develop the lot. The applicant has identified a total of seven trees proposed for removal (see the attached Tree Survey). Four trees are at the edge of the property and are located at the only access point from the property to the public streets. The other three trees are placed where the house is proposed. Due to the unique lot placement and the slope of the lot, the driveway and house could not be placed anywhere else on the site. Staff feels that the loss of these trees is unavoidable and recommends approval for their removal. To deny the tree removal would deprive the owner of reasonable use of the property as zoning currently allows this lot to be developed with a single-family home (24A-8(b)(5)).

Finally, the applicant did not provide an erosion plan with the application materials. Due to the
site’s steep slope and the conservation easement at the rear of the lot, Staff recommends the HPC condition approval on the applicant submitting an erosion/sediment control plan to Staff for review and approval prior to stamping the final plans.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff recommends that the Commission **approve with two (2) conditions** the HAWP application;

3. The windows must be either wood or clad, not vinyl, and have fixed interior and exterior grids. Details need to be submitted to Staff for review and approval with final approval authority delegated to staff.

4. Due to the site’s environmentally sensitive location an erosion plan must be submitted for review and approval with final authority delegated to staff.

and with the general condition applicable to all Historic Area Work Permits that the applicant will **present 3 permit sets of drawings to HPC staff for review and stamping prior to submission for permits** (if applicable). After issuance of the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS) permit, the applicant will arrange for a field inspection by calling the DPS Field Services Office at 240-777-6370 prior to commencement of work and not more than two weeks following completion of work.
MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 10201 Menlo Ave.  
Resource: Contributing Resource  
Capitol View Historic District  
Review: HAWP  
Case Number: 31/07-17G  
Applicant: Minter Farnsworth  
Proposal: New Construction  

Meeting Date: 10/25/17  
Report Date: 10/18/17  
Public Notice: 10/11/17  
Staff: Dan Bruechert  

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC approve with three (3) conditions the HAWP application.
1. The windows must be either wood or clad, not vinyl, and have fixed interior and exterior grids. Details need to be submitted to Staff for review and approval with final approval authority delegated to staff.
2. The proposed fencing must be lowered to no higher than 48” (forty-eight inches) above grade north of the neighbors existing privacy fence.
3. Due to the site’s environmentally sensitive location an erosion plan must be submitted for review and approval with final authority delegated to staff.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource within the Capitol View Park Historic District
STYLE: N/A  
DATE: N/A  

The parcel is currently undeveloped and is located at the corner of Menlo Ave. and Loma St. in the Capitol View Historic District. The lot slopes steeply down a ravine and into a conservation easement that covers the rear third of the lot. When the district was surveyed and established in 1982, this area of the Capitol View HD was identified as associated with the period 1870-1916.

BACKGROUND

This lot was established as part of a preliminary plan that was approved by the Planning Board on August 6, 1985. Prior to this HAWP, the subject property had been identified as associated with the original period of development of Capitol View, despite its undeveloped appearance.

PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to construct a two-story house with an attached garage, install a retaining wall, fencing and a rear deck.
APPLICABLE GUIDELINES
When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Capitol View Park Historic District several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the Approved & Adopted Sector Plan for Capitol View & Vicinity (Sector Plan), Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A), and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). The pertinent information in these documents is outlined below.

Approved & Adopted Sector Plan for Capitol View & Vicinity (Sector Plan)
1. 1870-1916: Characterized by large lots and variety of setbacks, and architecturally encompassing the “Victorian” residential and revival styles and the early bungalow style popular during this period, these twenty-two houses are of a higher degree of architectural and historical significance than the other structures within the district.
2. Nominal: These house of themselves are of no architectural of [sic] historical significance, but through their contiguity to the significant resources have some interest to the district.
3. Spatial: Spatial resources are unimproved parcels of land which visually and aesthetically contribute to the setting of the historic district, and which can be regarded as extensions of the environmental settings of the significant historic resources.

Montgomery County Code, Chapter 24A Historic Resources Preservation
(b) The commission shall instruct the director to issue a permit, or issue a permit subject to such conditions as are found to be necessary to insure conformity with the purposes and requirements of this chapter, if it finds that:

(1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or
(2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or
(3) The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or
(4) The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
STAFF DISCUSSION
The applicant proposes to construct a house on the undeveloped lot at the corner of Menlo Ave. and Loma St. in the Capitol View Historic District. Additionally, the applicant proposes to make site improvements including a driveway, retaining wall, and privacy fence. This lot is unique in that less than 25% of the lot will be visible from the public-right-of-way; the remainder of the lot is set behind the neighboring property at 2900 Loma St. There are several utility easements on the property that limit the placement of the house and the driveway. Additionally, the rear third of the lot is subject to a conservation easement and may not be developed. The view of any house built on this lot will only be visible from a limited angle from the public right-of-way and staff supports approval.

New Construction
The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story, side gable house, three bays wide, with Hardi siding on the lot. The house has two smaller front facing gables and a small covered front porch. To the right there is a single bay attached garage covered in a gable roof.

The style of the house is best described as “Traditional” as it draws from several different periods of construction. The two-over-one windows are more in keeping with a Craftsman house as are the battered columns covering the front porch. The board and batten shutters and board and batten decoration under the two front facing gables are more vernacular elements. At the rear there are some two-over-one windows that have a two-lite transom above. The applicant proposes an uncovered deck to the rear.

The applicant did not provide windows specifications with the application materials. Staff thinks that the proposed two-over-one configuration is acceptable, and recommends the HPC condition approval on the applicant using a wood or clad window using either true divided lites or simulated divided lites with fixed interior and exterior grids.

The applicant proposes to construct a 12’ × 20’ (twelve feet by ten feet) deck to the rear (the deck details are on included on the elevation drawings and were provided as a supplement to the application). The applicant proposes to construct the structure of the deck out of wood, with a composite decking material, azek trim, and ‘Wolf’ metal rails. Staff feels that the composite decking and azek trim are acceptable substitute materials in this location due to the fact that their characteristics are similar to wood. Staff also feels that the metal balusters are acceptable in this location because the deck is at the rear on new construction. As this will not be visible from the public right-of-way, Staff believes this decorative element should be approved.

When the district was established in 1982, Staff believes that this site was part of the larger parcel and environmental setting of the Hahn House (c. 1895), at 2801 Barker St. Staff has been unable to locate the copies of the preliminary plan that created the subject property’s lot, however, Staff is reasonably sure that this occurred as part of the preliminary plan that was approved by the planning board in 1985. Due to this, Staff does not feel that the applicant should be bound to using a “Victorian” vocabulary in the design of the proposed house. To do so would contravene Standard 9 by not effectively differentiating new construction from the old.

Staff further believes that this resource should be evaluated as a ‘Nominal’ resource for several
reasons. First, it is a building that is surrounded by buildings from the latter half of the 20th century. Directly to the south, the house was constructed in 1993. To the west, the house was constructed in 1953. And to the north the neighboring house was constructed in 1989. Farther to the north, the next houses were constructed in 1929, 1989, and 1926. Second, the properties across Menlo Ave. are outside of the district, so any development here will have less impact on the historic district, as the proposed construction is at the edge of the district. Third, because only an oblique angle of this house will be visible from the public right-of-way, it will have a reduced impact on the surrounding district.

Staff believes that the applicants use of a rectangular house shape with a simple side gable roof form achieves a house that, where visible from the district, creates a house that will successfully blend in to the surrounding district and Staff supports its approval.

Site Work
The applicant proposes to construct a privacy fence, retaining wall, and will remove several trees.

The applicant is proposing to construct a driveway and parking area to the front of the house using asphalt. This material is widely used throughout the district and will have a minimal impact on the site and the surrounding district. As the parking area will not be visible from the public right-of-way, it will not impact the district and should be approved.

The applicant is proposing to install a six foot (6)’ tall, wood, board on board privacy fence placed at the front boundary of the property. The HPC does not typically approve fences taller than forty-eight inches (48") in front of the rear wall plan within historic districts. The neighboring property has a fence that is approximately five feet (5)’ tall, which would intersect the proposed fence at the middle. The southern half of the proposed fence will be obscured by the neighbors existing fence and will not be visible. The northern portion of the fence will be will be visible from the public right of way and staff believes that due to the unique siting of the lot, a solid board on board design is acceptable, however, the fence height should be reduced to 48" (forty-eight inches) to the north of the neighbor’s wooden fence.

The applicant additionally is proposing to construct three sections of a retaining wall to be built out of 6” × 6” (six inches by six inches) railroad ties and will range from grade height to 30” (thirty inches) tall. Due to the negative slope of the lot, none of the retaining wall sections will be visible from the public right-of-way. Staff believes that this material is consistent with the retaining walls used throughout the district and is an acceptable material.

The applicant will need to remove several trees in order to develop the lot. The applicant has identified a total of seven trees proposed for removal (see the attached Tree Survey). Four trees are at the edge of the property and are located at the only access point from the property to the public streets. The other three trees are placed where the house is proposed. Due to the unique lot placement and the slope of the lot, the driveway and house could not be placed anywhere else on the site. Staff feels that the loss of these trees is unavoidable and recommends approval for their removal. To deny the tree removal would deprive the owner of reasonable use of the property as zoning currently allows this lot to be developed with a single-family home (24A-8(b)(5)).
Finally, the applicant did not provide an erosion plan with the application materials. Due to the site’s steep slope and the conservation easement at the rear of the lot, Staff recommends the HPC condition approval on the applicant submitting an erosion/sediment control plan to Staff for review and approval prior to stamping the final plans.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**
Staff recommends that the Commission approve with three (3) conditions the HAWP application;
1. The windows must be either wood or clad, not vinyl, and have fixed interior and exterior grids. Details need to be submitted to Staff for review and approval with final approval authority delegated to staff.
2. The proposed fencing must be lowered to no higher than 48” (forty-eight inches) above grade north of the neighbors existing privacy fence.
3. Due to the site’s environmentally sensitive location an erosion plan must be submitted for review and approval with final authority delegated to staff.

and with the general condition applicable to all Historic Area Work Permits that the applicant will present 3 permit sets of drawings to HPC staff for review and stamping prior to submission for permits (if applicable). After issuance of the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS) permit, the applicant will arrange for a field inspection by calling the DPS Field Services Office at 240-777-6370 prior to commencement of work and not more than two weeks following completion of work.
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Person: Minter Farnsworth
Email: farnsworthhomes@verizon.net
Daytime phone #: 301-370-8625

Tax Account #: 02 6104 40

Name of Property Owner: 10201 Menlo LLC
Daytime phone #: 301-370-8625

Address: 25101 Peachtree Rd, Clarksburg, MD 20871

Contractor: Minter P. Farnsworth II
Phone #: 301-370-8625

Contractor Registration #: 126100

Agent for Owner: Same
Daytime phone #: 301-370-8625

LOCATION OF BUILDING PREMISE

House Number: 10201 Menlo Ave
Street: Silver Spring
Nearest Cross Street: Loma St.
Lot #: 13
Block #: 18
Subdivision: Capitol View Park
Parcel #: 54526

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT, ACTION AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:

☐ Construct ☐ Alter/Remodel ☐ A/C ☐ Slab ☐ Room Addition ☐ Porch ☐ Deck ☐ Shed
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Wreck/Rez ☐ Solar ☐ Fireplace ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Single Family
☐ Revisions ☐ Repair ☐ Reversible ☐ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☐ Other:

1B. Construction cost estimate: $350,000

1C. If this is a renewal of a previously approved active permit, see Permit #: N/A

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTENSIONS/ADDITIONS

2A. Type of sewage disposal:
   ○ 01 WSSC
   ○ 02 Septic
   ○ 03 Other:

2B. Type of water supply:
   ○ 01 WSSC
   ○ 02 Well
   ○ 03 Other:

PART THREE: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCES/RETYING WALLS

3A. Height: 4 feet

3B. Indicate whether the fence or retaining wall is to be constructed on one of the following locations:
   ☐ On property line
   ☑ Entirely on land of owner
   ☐ On public right of way/assessment

I hereby certify that I have the authority to make the following application, that the application is correct, and that the construction will comply with plans approved by all agencies listed and I hereby acknowledge and accept this to be a condition for the issuance of this permit.

Signature of owner or authorized agent
Date: 9.25.17

Approved: ___________________________ For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission
Disapproved: __________________________ Signatures
Date:

Application/Permit No.:
Date Filed:
Date Issued:

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS

814607
THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MUST BE COMPLETED AND THE REQUIRED DOCUMENTS MUST ACCOMPANY THIS APPLICATION.

1. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
   a. Description of existing structure(s) and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance:
      
      Construct new house on vacant lot

   b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district:
      
      Construct new house, retaining walls, deck and fence compatible with the neighborhood

2. SITE PLAN
   Site and environmental setting, drawn to scale. You may use your plot. Your site plan must include:
   a. the scale, north arrow, and date;
   b. dimensions of all existing and proposed structures; and
   c. site features such as walkways, driveways, fences, ponds, streams, trash dumpsters, mechanical equipment, and landscaping.

3. PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
   You must submit 2 copies of plans and elevations in a format no larger than 11" x 17". Plans on 8 1/2" x 11" paper are preferred.
   a. Schematic construction plans, with marked dimensions, indicating location, size and general type of walls, window and door openings, and other fixed features of the existing resources and the proposed work.
   b. Elevations (façades), with marked dimensions, clearly indicating proposed work in relation to existing construction and, when appropriate, context. All materials and fixtures proposed for the exterior must be noted on the elevations drawings. An existing and a proposed elevation drawing of each façade affected by the proposed work is required.

4. MATERIALS SPECIFICATIONS
   General description of materials and manufactured items proposed for incorporation in the work of the project. This information may be included on your design drawings.

5. PHOTOGRAPHS
   a. Clearly labeled photographic prints of each façade of existing resource, including details of the affected portions. All labels should be placed on the front of photographs.
   b. Clearly label photographic prints of the resource as viewed from the public right-of-way and of the adjoining properties. All labels should be placed on the front of photographs.

6. TREE SURVEY
   If you are proposing construction adjacent to or within the dripline of any tree 6" or larger in diameter (at approximately 4 feet above the ground), you must file an accurate tree survey identifying the size, location, and species of each tree of at least that dimension.

7. ADDRESSES OF ADJACENT AND CONFRONTING PROPERTY OWNERS
   For ALL projects, provide an accurate list of adjacent and confronting property owners (not tenants), including names, addresses, and zip codes. This list should include the owners of all lots or parcels which adjoin the parcel in question, as well as the owner(s) of lot(s) or parcel(s) which lie directly across the street/highway from the parcel in question.

PLEASE PRINT (IN BLUE OR BLACK INK) OR TYPE THIS INFORMATION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE.
PLEASE STAY WITHIN THE GUIDES OF THE TEMPLATE, AS THIS WILL BE PHOTOCOPIED DIRECTLY ONTO MAILING LABELS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner’s mailing address</th>
<th>Owner’s Agent’s mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10201 MENLO LLC</td>
<td>MINTER, P. FARNSWORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25101 PEACHTREE RD</td>
<td>25101 PEACHTREE RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKSBURG, MD 20871</td>
<td>CLARKSBURG, MD 20871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. STAGUHN AND K. FLORIAN STAGUHN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10203 MENLO AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER SPRING, MD 20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILLIP HAUSSMANN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10200 MENLO AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER SPRING, MD 20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOVI LEHMAN AND NOA LIVNI LEHMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900 LOMA ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER SPRING, MD 20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNN J. BUSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2905 BARKER ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER SPRING, MD 20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY A. AND E.C. VOLZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2801 BARKER ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER SPRING, MD 20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BABEL AND CHLOE PEREZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10202 LESLIE ST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER SPRING, MD 20902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s mailing address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10201 MENLO LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25101 PEACHTREE RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKSBURG, MD 20871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses**

| RICHARD NICHOLLS ET AL  | MICHAEL E. LIVERMORE AND FUMIYO HASHIDA |
| 10200 LESLIE ST.        | 10118 LESLIE ST.                 |
| SILVER SPRING, MD 20902 | SILVER SPRING, MD 20902          |
Existing Property Condition Photographs (duplicate as needed)

Detail: **DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE @ CORNER OF MENLO + LOMA**

Detail: **PROPOSED NEW FENCE LOCATION (ON SITE PLAN)**

Applicant: **10201 MENLO LLC**
10201 MENLO AVENUE

PROPOSED MACADAM DRIVEWAY
LOCATION AS PER SITE PLAN DRAWING
10201 MENLO AVENUE

PROPOSED FENCING:
PRESSURE TREATED 1" X 6" VERTICAL
6' HIGH PRIVACY FENCING WITH NATURAL FINISH
LOCATION AS PER SITE PLAN DRAWING
10201 MENLO AVENUE

PROPOSED RETAINING WALLS:
6" x 6" PRESSURE TREATED RETAINING WALLS
WITH 6" x 6" PRESSURE TREATED TIE BACKS
WITH NATURAL FINISH
LOCATIONS AS PER SITE PLAN DRAWING