MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 5912 Cedar Parkway., Chevy Chase  
Meeting Date: 1/25/2017

Resource: Contributing Resource
Chevy Chase Village Historic District  
Report Date: 1/18/2017

Applicant: Blake and Sydney Bath
(Luke Olson, Architect)  
Public Notice: 1/11/2017

Review: HAWP  
Tax Credit: N/A

Case Number: 35/13-17B  
Staff: Michael Kyne

PROPOSAL: Rear addition and other alterations

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC approve with one (1) condition the HAWP application.

1. Window and door details will be submitted, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource
STYLE: Colonial Revival
DATE: c. 1916-1927

BACKGROUND

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission at the December 21, 2016 HPC meeting for a preliminary consultation. At that time, the Commissions was generally supportive of the applicants’ proposal, but expressed the following concerns:

- The front elevation of the existing left side bump out should not be altered, as it is historic, character-defining, and highly visible from the public right-of-way.
- The proposed new chimney at the rear should be brick and not stone veneer, due to its potential visibility from the public right-of-way.

The applicants have returned with a HAWP application, responding to the Commission’s previous concerns.

PROPOSAL:

- Construct a new covered entry on the left side elevation of an existing bump out at the left side of the historic house
- Remove an existing non-historic enclosed rear porch
• Construct a new two-story addition in place of the existing non-historic enclosed rear porch to be removed
• Construct a new left side rear addition/expansion with a gambrel roof that extends through the roof of the existing left side bump out and to the roof of the main house
• Alter the left side elevation of the existing left side bump out, emphasizing a gambrel roof form
• Construct a dormer on left side elevation of the existing left side bump out
• Construct a single-car garage at the rear/left side of the property

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

In accordance with section 1.5 of the Historic Preservation Commission Rules, Guidelines, and Procedures (Regulation No. 27-97) ("Regulations"), in developing its decision when reviewing a Historic Area Work Permit application for an undertaking at a Master Plan site the Commission uses section 24A-8 of the Montgomery County Code ("Chapter 24A"), the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation ("Standards"), and pertinent guidance in applicable master plans. [Note: where guidance in an applicable master plan is inconsistent with the Standards, the master plan guidance shall take precedence (section 1.5(b) of the Regulations).] The pertinent information in these documents, incorporated in their entirety by reference herein, is outlined below.

Sec. 24A-8. Same-Criteria for issuance.

(a) The commission shall instruct the director to deny a permit if it finds, based on the evidence and information presented to or before the commission that the alteration for which the permit is sought would be inappropriate, inconsistent with or detrimental to the preservation, enhancement or ultimate protection of the historic site or historic resource within an historic district, and to the purposes of this chapter.

(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

(5) The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship; [emphasis added] or

(6) In balancing the interests of the public in preserving the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district, with the interests of the public from the use and benefit of the alternative proposal, the general public welfare is better served by granting the permit.

(c) It is not the intent of this chapter to limit new construction, alteration or repairs to any 1 period or architectural style.

(d) In the case of an application for work on an historic resource located within an historic district, the commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historical or design significance or for plans involving new construction, unless such plans would seriously impair the
historic or architectural value of surrounding historic resources or would impair the character of the historic district. (Ord No. 9-4, § 1; Ord No. 11-59)

Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

The Secretary of the Interior defines rehabilitation as “the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.” Standards 2, 5, and 6 most directly apply to the application before the commission:

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
7. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Chevy Chase Historic District Guidelines

The guidelines break down specific projects into three levels of review – Lenient, Moderate and Strict Scrutiny.

“Lenient Scrutiny” means that the emphasis of the review should be on issues of general massing and scale, and compatibility with the surrounding streetscape, and should allow for a very liberal interpretation of preservation rules. Most changes should be permitted unless there are major problems with massing, scale and compatibility.

“Moderate Scrutiny” involves a higher standard of review than “lenient scrutiny.” Besides issues of massing, scale and compatibility, preserving the integrity of the resource is taken into account. Alterations should be designed so that the altered structure still contributes to the district. Use of compatible new materials, rather than the original building materials, should be permitted. Planned changes should be compatible with the structure’s existing design, but should not be required to replicate its architectural style.

“Strict Scrutiny” means that the planned changes should be reviewed to insure that the integrity of the significant exterior architectural or landscaping features and details is not compromised. However, strict scrutiny should not be “strict in theory but fatal in fact” i.e. it does not mean that there can be no changes but simply that the proposed changes should be reviewed with extra care.
The Guidelines state three basic policies that should be adhered to, including:

Preserving the integrity of the contributing structures in the district. Alterations to contributing structures should be designed in such a way that the altered structure still contributes to the district.

Design review emphasis should be restricted to changes that will be visible from the front or side public right-of-way, or that would be visible in the absence of vegetation or landscaping.

Alterations to the portion of a property that are not visible from the public right-of-way should be subject to very lenient review. Most changes to rear of the properties should be approved as a matter of course.

The Guidelines that pertain to this project are as follows:

**Awnings** should be subject to moderate scrutiny. Addition of plastic or metal awnings should be discouraged.

**Doors** should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not.

**Dormers** should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not.

**Garages and accessory buildings** which are detached from the main house should be subject to lenient scrutiny but should be compatible with the main building.

**Major additions** should, where feasible, be placed to the rear of the existing structure so that they are less visible from the public right-of-way. Major additions which substantially alter or obscure the front of the structure should be discouraged but not automatically prohibited. For example, where lot size does not permit placement to the rear, and the proposed addition is compatible with the street sance, it should be subject to moderate scrutiny for contributing resources, but strict scrutiny for outstanding resources.

**Porches** should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not.

**Second or third story additions or expansions** which do not exceed the footprint of the first story should be subject to moderate scrutiny, in view of the predominance of large scale houses in the Village.

**Windows** (including window replacement) should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not.

**STAFF DISCUSSION**

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission at the December 21, 2016 HPC meeting for a preliminary consultation. At that time, the Commissions was generally supportive of the applicants' proposal, but expressed the following concerns:

- The front elevation of the existing left side bump out should not be altered, as it is historic, character-defining, and highly visible from the public right-of-way.
- The proposed new chimney at the rear should be brick and not stone veneer, due to its potential visibility from the public right-of-way.
The applicants have returned with a HAWP application, responding to the Commission’s previous concerns. Specifically, the applicants have made the following revisions:

- The front elevation of the existing left side bump out will not be altered.
- In direct response to suggestions by the Commission, the proposed covered entry has been relocated to the left side elevation of the existing left side bump out.
- As revised, the proposed new chimney at the rear will have a brick veneer to match the existing chimneys on each end of the historic house.

New aspects of the applicants’ proposal include:

- The rear roof/false-facing gable of the c. 2000 right side addition will be converted to a hipped roof. At the preliminary consultation, the applicants presented two options – Option A, which included the proposed hipped roof alteration, and Option B, which retained the rear-facing gable. The Commission voiced support for both options, as the proposed alteration was at the rear, where it is not at all visible from the public right-of-way.

- The proposed fenestration for the rear addition has been revised, with four ganged double-hung windows with spread mulls replacing the previously proposed three double-hung windows on the second-floor, and with transom windows being proposed across the entire first-floor porch. Two new round window(s) are also proposed on the rear elevation – one that replaces the previously proposed square window in the gable of the proposed new rear-facing gambrel roof, and one on the second-floor above the proposed new rear porch.

The proposed fenestration revisions are on the rear elevation, where they are not at visible from the public right-of-way, and the Commission did not review the previously proposed alterations on the rear elevation with a great deal of scrutiny. Accordingly, staff supports the proposed fenestration revisions, finding that they will not detract from the subject property or surrounding historic district.

- The applicants also propose several new window alterations on the left elevation of the existing left side bump out: two basement-level windows will be infilled; the second-floor window, which was previously proposed to be infilled, will be permanently shuttered; the non-historic leaded glass window (c. 2000 renovations) will be infilled, with new ribbon windows installed above; and the previously proposed double-hung window at the rear corner will instead be paired double-hung windows with a spread mull and Azek surrounds and panelling.

Staff is generally supportive of the proposed alterations. Specifically, staff finds:

- The Commission has generally reviewed proposals to infill basement-level windows on side elevations with lenient scrutiny.
- Shuttering the second-floor window is a more appropriate approach, which will allow the location of the original window to be discerned. This revision was made at staff’s suggestion.
- The applicants have provided the following information, indicating that the leaded glass window is non-historic: the window is not a true leaded glass window, but has an applied grid on the interior; the trim on the exterior of the window matches that on the c. 2000 right-side addition; the window is an integral part of the range, which
dates to c. 2000 interior renovations.

- The Commission was supportive of the previously proposed single double-hung window at the rear corner, which included similar surrounds and panelling, although the materials were not known at that time. Staff suggests that making this a paired window is a relatively minor alteration.

In the past, the Commission has allowed the use of Azek on additions and new construction, and the applicants have argued that, in this instance, the use of Azek will differentiate the proposed alterations from the original construction on the existing left side bump out. Staff suggests that, due to its location at the extreme rear of the side elevation and limited visibility from the public right-of-way, the use of Azek at the rear corner is unlikely to detract from the subject property or surrounding streetscape.

- The applicants propose to use stone veneer for the proposed new rear porch, which was implied in the elevations submitted for the preliminary consultation, although not explicitly stated.

In the past, the Commission has been reluctant to approve stone veneer, especially when visible from the public right-of-way. Due to the location of the proposed stone veneer, its limited visibility, at best, and the Commission’s leniency toward the other proposed rear alterations, the Commission may find that, in this case, the stone veneer is unlikely to detract from the streetscape or surrounding historic district.

On the other hand, the Commission did previously express concerns over the use of stone veneer on the proposed new chimney at the rear and may have similar concerns regarding the use of stone veneer for the proposed new rear porch. Although staff reluctantly recommends approval of the proposed stone veneer, citing the aforementioned mitigating factors, the Commission may find that targeting or brick would be a more appropriate material in this location.

After full and fair consideration of the applicant’s submission staff finds the proposal as being consistent with the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-(b) 1 and 2, having found the proposal is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Chevy Chase Village Historic District Guidelines outlined above.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Commission **approve with the condition specified on Circle 1** the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b), having found that the proposal is consistent with the Chevy Chase Village Historic District Guidelines identified above, and therefore will not substantially alter the exterior features of the historic resource and is compatible in character with the district and the purposes of Chapter 24A;

and with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation;

and with the general condition that the applicant shall present the 3 permit sets of drawings, if applicable to Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) staff for review and stamping prior to submission for the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS) building permits;

and with the general condition that final project design details, not specifically delineated by the Commission, shall be approved by HPC staff or brought back to the Commission as a revised HAWP
application at staff’s discretion;

and with the general condition that the applicant shall notify the Historic Preservation Staff if they propose to make any alterations to the approved plans. Once the work is completed the applicant will contact the staff person assigned to this application at 301-563-3400 or michael.kyne@montgomeryplanning.org to schedule a follow-up site visit.
APPLICATION FOR HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: lolson@gtmarchitects.com  Contact Person: LUKE OLSON  Daytime Phone No.: 240-333-2021

Tax Account No.:  CONTRACT PURCHASERS: BLAKE & SYDNEY BATH  Daytime Phone No.:  
Address: 7 HESSEY ST CHEVY CHASE MD 20815  
Contractor: T.B.D  
Contractor Registration No.:  
Agent for Owner: LUKE OLSON  Daytime Phone No.: 240-333-2021  

LOCATION OF BUILDING PREMISE
House Number: 5912  Street: CEDAR PARKWAY  
Town/City: CHEVY CHASE  Nearest Cross Street: W KIRKE STREET  
Lot:  
Block:  
Subdivision:  
Sub: 17900  Fall: 69  Parcel: P675  

PAST HISTORY: TYPE OF PREVIOUS ACTION AND USE
1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE: CONSTRUCT  □ □ □ CONSTRUCT  
□ □ □ Repair  □ □ □ Remove/Reorient  
□ □ □ Move  □ □ □ Install  
□ □ □ Wreck/Raze  □ □ □ Solar  
□ □ □ Install  □ □ □ Single Family  
□ □ □ Decks  □ □ □ Single Family  
□ □ □ Shed  □ □ □ Single Family  
□ □ □ Other: T.B.D.  

1B. Construction cost estimate: $ T.B.D.  

1C. If this is a revision of a previously approved active permit, see Permit #  

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTRICATIONS
2A. Type of sewer disposal: 01  □ WSSC  02  □ Septic  03  □ Other:  
2B. Type of water supply: 01  □ WSSC  02  □ Well  03  □ Other:  

PART THREE: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCE/RETAINING WALL
3A. Height: ______ feet ______ inches  
3B. Indicate whether the fence or retaining wall is to be constructed on one of the following locations:  
□ On party line/property line  □ Entirely on land of owner  □ On public right of way/assessment  

I hereby certify that I have the authority to make the foregoing 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: 01/03/17  

Approved:  
For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission

Disapproved:  
Signature:  
Date:  

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

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS
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:

   SEE ATTACHED

   b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district:

   SEE ATTACHED

2. SITE PLAN
   Site and environmental setting, drawn to scale. You may use your plat. 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 both the existing resources and the proposed work.
   b. Elevations (facades), 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 facade 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 facade 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.
a.) Description of existing structure(s) and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance.

The existing house is a 1920’s era 2½ story center hall colonial with a two-story historic addition on the left side with a gambrel roof form and a two-story non-historic addition on the right side and the rear with gable roof forms. The main mass has stucco siding on the first floor with ptd. cedar shingle siding above. While the side additions are painted lap siding with ptd. cedar shingle siding above. The majority of the house has a brick veneer base and asphalt shingle roofing. There is a large one-story porch on the rear that was enclosed at some point and has a roof deck above. In 2003 a detached two-car garage was approved by the HPC for the lot but not built (Case No. 35/13-032Z). There is an existing driveway on the left side of the property.

b.) General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district.

The scope of work includes altering the left side elevation of the existing two-story gambrel mass to complete the gambrel roof form on the rear of the mass, which will allow us to convert the second floor of the existing rear two-story wall plane into a gambrel roof form extending from the existing left side bump-out back towards the rear yard. There will be a dormer on the left side of the new gambrel roof. The existing non-historic enclosed rear porch will be removed, and in its place we propose to construct a two-story addition running from the new rear gambrel roof over to the existing gable roof on the right side, which will be converted into a hip roof form. Also included in the proposed addition/renovation are a new rear porch and a new detached one-car garage. Based on feedback provided by the HPC during our Preliminary Review we have relocated a proposed mudroom entry door from the front of the existing left side bump-out to the left side, with a small canopy over the entry for shelter from the weather.

We are proposing a modest addition entirely to the rear of the subject property including modifications to the existing left side elevation with the intent of providing some relief for an existing 42’ long 2-story wall plane. The proposed addition/renovation is minimally visible from the public right-of-way and subordinate to the existing historic resource in scale and massing. We’ve specified materials on the addition that are compatible with the existing historic materials (stone foundation, fiber cement shingle & mitered lap siding, asphalt shingle & standing seam metal roofing, clad-wood divided light windows & doors, ptd. pvc trim & details.)
Date: January 3rd, 2017
(Valid for ONE YEAR)

To Whom It May Concern,

By my signature on this statement, I, Sydney Barth, Contract Purchaser authorize the following employee of GTM Architects to represent and sign building permit applications on my behalf, in Montgomery County, as the applicant, until this authorization is rescinded by me (in writing).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Original Signature

List of Authorized Representatives: LUKE OLSON

Authorized Representative's Original Signature

[Signature]

Print Name

LUKE OLSON
EXISTING SITE PLAN
SCALE 1" = 30'

PROPOSED SITE PLAN
SCALE 1" = 30'

- ZONED R-60
  Lot Size: 20,558 SF
- Existing Lot Coverage = 2,933 SF (14.3%)  
  APPROVED LOT COVERAGE PER HCL CASE NO. 35/13-0522 = 3,635 SF (17.7%)
- Proposed Lot Coverage = 3,720 SF (18.1%)
- Allowable Lot Coverage = 6,417.4 SF (30%)
PROPOSED LEFT ELEVATION

ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOFING TO MATCH EXISTING

PTD. STRAIGHT EDGE PANEL FIBERCEMENT SHINGLE SIDING, MATCH REVEAL OF EXG. SIDING

STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING @ PORCH

PTD. PVC TRIM, AZEK OR EQ.

NEW CLAD-WOOD WINDOWS & DOORS, SIMULATED DIVIDED LIGHTS IN SHADOW BAR

PTD. FIBERGLASS COLUMNS, HMG OR EQ., ITALIAN BASE AND CAP

STONE VENEER BASE @ REAR PORCH / PLANTER

BSMT

EXG. CHIMNEY TO REMAIN

EXG. WINDOWS TO REMAIN PERMANENTLY SHUTTER EXISTING WINDOW AS SHOWN

EXG. SHINGLE SIDING TO REMAIN PERMANENTLY SHUTTER EXISTING WINDOW AS SHOWN

STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING @ CANOPY

NEW CANOPY OVER NEW SIDE ENTRY, 3'-0" MAX PROJECTION

EXG. STUCCO SIDING TO REMAIN

EXG. LAP SIDING TO REMAIN

EXG. BRICK FOUNDATION TO REMAIN

DASHED LINE OF EXISTING WINDOW OPENINGS TO BE INFILLED WITH BRICK TO MATCH EXISTING
HPC APPROVED GARAGE MASSING

PROPOSED GARAGE ELEVATIONS

LEFT SIDE

FRONT

RIGHT SIDE

BATH RESIDENCE
**HAWP APPLICATION: MAILING ADDRESSES FOR NOTIFYING**
[Owner, Owner's Agent, Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contract Purchasers’ mailing address</strong></th>
<th><strong>Owner's Agent’s mailing address</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLAKE &amp; SYDNEY BATH</strong></td>
<td><strong>LUKE OLSON</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 HESKETH STREET</td>
<td>7735 OLD GEORGETOWN RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE MD 20815</td>
<td>STE 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BETHESDA, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARLES HOBBES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 W KIRKE ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THOMAS &amp; MELISSA DANN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 W KIRKE ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHEVY CHASE CLUB INC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 CONNECTICUT AVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

--- X

HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT - Case No. 28/11-003-16A
16923 Norwood Road :

--- :

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION :
5912 Cedar Parkway :

--- X

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
December 21, 2016, commencing at 7:32 p.m., in the MRO
Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland
20910, before:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Kirwan, Chair
Sandra Heiler
Brian Carroll
Marsha Barnes
Kathleen Legg
Richard Arkin
Saralyn Salisbury-Jones
Eliza Voigt

Deposition Services, Inc.
12321 Middlebrook Road, Suite 210
Germantown, MD 20874
Tel: (301) 881-3344 Fax: (301) 881-3338
info@DepositionServices.com www.DepositionServices.com
MR. KIRWAN: Any discussion? All in favor, please raise your right hand.

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: All opposed?

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: If any, abstentions?

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: So the motion passed with how many are we tonight, four, eight. So the motion passes 7 to 1. Thank you. And for next steps, you'll talk to Staff.

The next item on our agenda this evening is a preliminary consultation at 5912 Cedar Parkway in Chevy Chase. Do we have a Staff Report?

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do have a Staff Report. As you noted, this is 5912 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase. A Contributing Resource within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District, Colonial Revival, circa 1916 to 1927. And the proposal, construct a new covered entry on the front elevation of an existing bump-out at the left side of the historic house; remove an existing non-historic enclosed rear porch; construct a new two-story addition in place of the existing non-historic enclosed rear porch to be removed; construct a new left side rear addition/extension with a gambrel roof that extends through the roof of the existing left side bump-out into the roof of the main house; alter
the left side elevation and the existing left side bump-out emphasizing a gambrel roof form; construct a dormer on the left side elevation of the existing left side bump-out; and construct a single car garage at the rear/left side of the property.

And I have quite a few photographs here, and we'll just sort of walk around the property. This is looking directly from the opposite side of Cedar Parkway. Again, I'll just walk around the property a bit. And then walking up the drive, and backing up for a moment, this is just sort of demonstrating the visibility of that left side bump-out from the public right-of-way. This is standing at the sidewalk. So not entirely visible, but partially, obviously.

And this is moving closer to the house. And so, that left side bump-out that I kept referring to is what you're seeing right here, the most prominently displayed feature in front of you. And then looking back, and what I'm trying to demonstrate here is the existing second story expansion at that extreme rear. So, the 1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps indicate that this left side bump-out was there at that time. So, in 1927 it included that one-story section at the extreme rear. And, of course, that would make the second story section at the extreme rear a later addition.
And this is just looking, trying to show you that somewhat gambrel form of that roof on the left side. Again, looking at that second story expansion. This is looking at the house directly at the rear, and the center section there is that existing enclosed porch which will be removed, and that entire middle section in-filled with a two-story rear addition. And looking at what is the left side when viewed from Cedar Parkway. So this is where the two-story addition with the gambrel roof will be at the rear. And then looking at this existing addition, which dates to 2000.

And I have all of the plans here should we need to reference them. And, I will point out that we do have two options here, Option A and Option B, and the only difference that I was able to find was the -- if you look at the left side in this image, we have a hipped roof, and in Option B we have a gable end roof. And it currently does have a gable end roof, but there is no window in the proposal.

And here, I want to point out the embellishment added to sort of emphasize that gambrel roof form of that left side bump-out. And the applicable guidelines are the Chevy Chase Village Historic District Guidelines, and the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. And, on to the discussion.

I'm asking for your guidance on the following, the covered front entry. So, as we noted, the applicant does
propose to construct a new covered entry on the front
elevation of the existing bump-out at the left side. As
proposed, the existing first floor window on the front
elevation of the bump-out will be removed. A new door will
be installed in the same approximate location, not the exact
location, but approximate location. And an awning will be
constructed over the new door. And the proposed awning will
be similar to those on the main house, and on the second
story of the bump-out. So those awnings then will be
mimicking are historic.

And again, Staff consulted the 1927 Sanborn Fire
Insurance Map, which showed that bump-out. As discussed
earlier, it’s two stories in this image, until we get to
that extreme rear where it’s one story. Staff asks for the
Commission’s guidance regarding the appropriateness of the
proposed new covered front entry, particularly given the
fact that the left side bump-out is historic, and that the
proposed alterations will be highly visible from the public
right-of-way. And, in accordance with the Guidelines, the
Commission should review the proposed awning, window and
door alterations with moderate scrutiny.

One thing I do want to point out quickly, so the
Sanborn Fire Insurance Map that we consulted based in 1927,
so we know that that left side bump-out was there at that
time. Though, the tax records indicate that the house was
actually constructed in 1908. So it may not be original to
the house though, while certainly, in my opinion, I think
that it is. But, I would still say that it is historic.

The enclosed rear porch removal and two-story rear
addition. Staff fully supports the removal of the existing
non-historic enclosed porch from the rear elevation, and the
construction of the new addition. The proposed alterations
are at the rear. They will not be visible from the public
right-of-way at all, and they have no potential to impact
the surrounding district. The proposed two-story addition
will remain within the same approximate footprint as the
enclosed porch to be removed.

Something that I didn't discuss in the Staff
Report, there is a new porch at the rear which perhaps you,
have some guidance on. But, my opinion is that it will not
be visible from the public right-of-way. The submitted
elevations indicate that a new chimney is proposed on the
right side, and that's as viewed from Cedar Parkway of the
proposed two-story addition. And I'm asking for your
guidance regarding the appropriateness of the chimney given
its potential visibility from the right-of-way.

The left side rear addition and expansion. The
applicant proposes to construct a new addition expansion at
the rear of the historic left side bump-out, which we spent
quite a bit of time on thus far. That addition expansion
will have a gambrel roof form, taking cues from the somewhat
gambrel roof form of the historic left side bump-out. And
the proposed gambrel roof will be extended through the rear
portion of the left side bump-out with its ridge extending
to the main house. And the ridge of the gambrel roof will
remain below that of the main house.

The roof of the historic left side bump-out will
be embellished, emphasizing its somewhat gambrel form, which
we saw on the plans. A dormer is also proposed on the left
elevation of the bump-out. And, consulting the 1927 Sanborn
Fire Insurance Map, shows a one-story feature at the rear of
the bump-out. We've already discussed this but, I just want
to emphasize this again. A second story expansion has
previously been added here.

The location of the -- again, it's clear from the
photographs and the elevations submitted by the applicant,
and we can clearly see in the 1927 map that it was a one-
story feature at that time. Staff suggests that the gambrel
roof approach could minimize the perceived massing from the
public right-of-way, which is important because, as
proposed, the addition is coplanar with the historic left
side bump-out. However, the proposal would make the
original form of the historic bump-out nearly indiscernible
detracting from the subject property and surrounding
historic district.
And, I also note that the left side bump-out does not have a true gambrel roof form. And, in accordance with the Standards, it is likely inappropriate to embellish this feature which could create a false sense of history. On to the garage, the applicant proposes a one car garage at the rear left side. The proposed garage will be at the end of an existing driveway, and is entirely consistent with other garages in the district. According to the 1927 Sanborn Map, there was originally a detached garage in the same approximate location at the rear left side. And in accordance with the Guidelines, garages and accessory buildings which are detached from the main house should be subject to lenient scrutiny, but should be compatible with the main building. Which, in my opinion, the proposed is.

And other. And this stage, the applicant has not provided materials for the proposed alterations. And, I ask your guidance on the appropriate materials for the various aspects, including the windows, doors, siding, roofing, and rear porch materials. And we discussed earlier Option A and Option B which, at the rear, we see the hipped roof and the gambrel roof. So, any guidance on that would be appreciated. I am in support of both options. However, I do note that there are no existing hipped roofs on the house. And with that, I will take any questions you have for me.
MR. KIRWAN: Any questions for Staff?

MS. HEILER: I think you indicated that there would be a new chimney that would be visible from the public right-of-way. Can you point out where that is?

MR. KYNE: In this elevation. So, this is the proposed rear. So the chimney in question is the one, if you look, focus on the screen here. This is the chimney, and that's Option A and Option B. But we can see that it's not there in --

MS. HEILER: So that's in addition to the two chimneys that already exist on the house?

MR. KYNE: That's my understanding, yes.

MS. HEILER: Okay.

MR. KYNE: We can check with the applicants, but that's my understanding of the proposal.

MS. HEILER: Thank you.

MS. LEGG: And just to confirm, I also have a chimney question. The materials for that have not been decided, that's correct?

MR. KYNE: They have not. It appears, perhaps, that it's going be stone, but I'm not sure what they're actually proposing.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff? All right, if not, ask the applicant to please come forward. We can give you seven minutes for your testimony. And, before
you speak, just make sure you speak into a live microphone
and state your name for the record.


MR. BATH: Blake Bath.

MR. OLSSEN: So, I just wanted to highlight a
couple of things that are in the Staff Report. Actually,
these are things that you already know but. Per the Chevy
Chase Historic District Guidelines, the property is a
Contributing Resource, so is subject to moderate scrutiny,
which involves things like alterations should be designed so
that the structure still contributes, and use compatible and
new materials rather than original materials should be
permitted. And plan changes should be compatible with the
structure's existing design, but they don't necessarily need
to replicate its architectural style.

In addition, there is three main tenets that they
ask that we adhere to. That we preserve the integrity of
the contributing structures in the district, and that
alterations to contributing structures should be designed in
such a way that the altered structure still contributes.
The design should be restricted to changes that will be
visible from the front and/or side public right-of-way, or
that would be visible in the absence of vegetation or
landscaping. And that alterations to the portion of the
property that are not visible, should be subject to very
lenient review. Most changes to the rear of the property should be approved as a matter of course.

I believe what we are proposing is a modest addition, entirely to the rear of the subject property, including a few modifications to the existing left side elevation with the intent of relieving what is essentially a 42 foot long two story wall plane that's not very visible from the public right-of-way. In fact, I believe, the photos that Staff has shown, it is very, very hard to see anything along that left side from the street. This is actually up the driveway a little ways from where we're standing right here.

We feel that given the degree of previous additions and alterations made to the property, the subordinate scale and massing of our proposed addition, and the minimal impact to the historic resource visible from the public right-of-way, our proposal meets the tenets of the historic district. That being said, we are welcome to answer any questions that you might have.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you. Any questions for the applicant?

MS. HEILER: Can you tell us what the material of this third chimney will be? I think the existing chimneys are brick.

MR. OLSEN: It wouldn't be brick, unless we did a
natural masonry chimney. Are you looking to do a wood
burning chimney?

MR. BATH: We would like a wood burning chimney.

MR. OLSEN: We're open to a suggestion from Staff
on that. But more than likely, brick to match the existing,
but not exactly would be appropriate.

MS. HEIELR: And is it the same height as the
existing chimneys, or would it be -- I guess my question is,
has to do with whether it's going to be visible from the
road?

MR. OLSEN: Well, when you look at it from the
street, it is stacked directly behind an existing chimney,
and the height is going to be as low as we can possibly make
it per code, without being a fire danger. So it's usually
two feet above, 10 feet away from a roof plane or two feet
above the gable. I believe the existing chimneys are
approximately that high, so we'd probably be at that same
height. But we'll hold it as low as we can.

MS. BARNES: My question relates to the proposed
mud room entry, and the alteration of the front facade by
putting in a door and a canopy over the door. And I'm
curious as to whether, because you just referred to the
issue of sort of breaking up the very long wall, which is
not visible from the street. Was any thought given to an
entry into the mudroom, not in the front of the house, but
on the side?

MR. OLSEN: The issue that we've kind of encountered with that, number one, this house is set back pretty far from the street, so any mudroom entry that far back would be even further back. It's a pretty long distance to have to go to enter your house. It's also very tight on that side. So, if you're trying to park a car and get up steps into a mudroom entry, it's going to project even further into that space and just be very uncomfortable. And so this seems like the most logical place to have a mudroom entry, given kind of the sitting and the plan of the house.

MS. BARNES: It may be a logical place, but if one is looking at the question of an alteration to a historic resource, and one that's visible from the street, the changing from a small window to a door with steps and a canopy, represents a substantial change. So, that is for me an issue, and that's why I was curious to hear if there had been thought given to some other approach. I appreciate what you're saying about convenience.

MR. OLSEN: Well, it's not just a matter of convenience. Sorry to interrupt. To be able to actually drive back to this garage that we'd like to put in, if you put a mudroom entry on that side without significantly stepping back the footing, and then you further impacting
kind of the existing design of the house, would render that
driveway essentially useless. And then you'd be parking
cars in the front rather than in the rear at a driveway.
And so we really can't get it anywhere in that side. So
then you're putting it all the way to the rear of the house.

MS. VOIGT: What is the width there of the
driveway?

MR. OLSEN: It looks like it might be 10 or 12
feet.

MR. BATH: It may be a little bit more than that.

It's my guess it's 15.

MR. OLSEN: What we're kind of trying to do is
minimize the impact not only to the house, but the site as
well. A single door for a window, and as minimal of a porch
that we can get there. Just some sort of covering to
protect it, is much different than changing the entire
hardscape of this property. And the functionality of the
existing house, how it's used.

MS. LEGG: I see a fence there. Do you often
drive your car all the way back, or do you stop before the
fence?

MR. BATH: I'm sorry. We don't live in this house
right now. I live in the neighborhood. I've lived there
for 25 years.

MS. VOIGT: I have a quick question. On page 12,
on Circle 12. So in looking at the rear view of the
proposed addition, so that it's all hidden behind the
existing house. So looking at from the front, and I'm
talking about the right hand side. That roof, the new
gambrel roof, is lower -- it's hard for me to tell -- is
lower than the existing front roof now?

    MR. OLSEN: It is, yes.
    MS. VOIGT: And it's set in from -- that's a new
    bump-out in front of it?

    MR. OLSEN: That's an existing bump-out in front
    of it. What we're essentially doing is, there's a two story
    portion right here, that's this whole 42 foot two story wall
    plane that I was referring to.

    MS. VOIGT: Right.

    MR. OLSEN: This portion, rather than having it be
    wall plane, we're converting that to part of a gambrel roof,
    retaining everything from this point forward.

    MS. VOIGT: And bumping out that window on the
    side?

    MR. OLSEN: Yeah, and providing a dormer as part
    of that gambrel roof. So, you know, that portion of what
    was essentially existing wall plane would remain, to be
    rebuilt as a dormer rather than wall.

    MS. VOIGT: So basically from the back of the
    house, so that that addition is not seen from the front of
the street?

MR. OLSEN: It should not be, no. It's pretty far back there, and we're trying to retain as much as we can of that front mass, and incorporate it into a way that makes sense given the existing design of the house.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for the applicant? All right, if not, you can turn off your microphone. We'll give you our thoughts on the case. Anybody want to kick things off?

MR. CARROLL: I just want to kick this off and say that, when I was looking through this earlier today, I was thinking, you know, it's nice to see you, but this is really one of the simpler prelims I've ever seen. Just given the fact that you took that 42 foot wall, tipped it back behind the existing massing, the front of the house. We very rarely see additions that actually move the massing back in behind the house. Everything else filled in to the rear of the house.

I don't have a problem with the covered entryway. The fact the garage in the 1927 Sanborn Map, and all of this is in the rear of the house, I just don't see any problems with this. I'd like to know, you know, about materiality, but like I said, it's very rare that we see an addition that actually makes the house appear a little bit smaller from the street. So, pretty simple for me.
MR. KIRWAN: I'll just jump in. I agree with Commissioner Carroll on everything except the mudroom entrance. I think I do have a problem with the mudroom entrance on that front left side projecting wing. I think there are ways to solve the dilemma of entering the mudroom from the driveway. I mean the entrance could be within the volume of the addition. You could step into something and take stairs up into the mudroom a different way. So there are ways to still have your cake and eat it to in that regard. So, I don't -- so given that, I think I, you know, it leads me to believe there are possible solutions that would allow us to preserve that front facade the way it is. So, that's the only component for me that I think needs to be worked on.

MR. OLSEN: Would I be able to just -- there's one thing I kind of forgot to mention as part of that. So one of the things that we're also trying to do with that front entry and canopy is, what Staff has been referring to as a gambrel like form, to me as an architect, is a gambrel. It's a very poor gambrel, but it is clearly a gambrel, and I would think that the embellishment ever so much would improve that form and make it more pleasing to, and more suitable for the historic district. And while I understand it's a change that is visible from the public right-of-way, that's something we're likely to do. That being said, doing
that and then also finding a different location for the door
opening, to exploring that.

MS. HEILER: I would like to agree with the
Chairman. I think you've made a great improvement by
continuing the gambrel on the side. Everything on the back
is just fine. I agree with you that it would probably
improve the appearance of the house, but there are lots of
historic houses that could be improved by changing them, and
our goal is to preserve them, even with their less than
gorgeous side additions. And so, I could not agree to the
awning or the change to a door. I think you would do
wonders for that house just to complete that gambrel on the
side, and certainly your proposals for the rear are great.

I think also the additional chimney is not going
to be a big deal as long as it's brick, and it's no taller
than the -- or no wider, bigger than the existing chimneys.

MS. LEGG: First, thanks for coming in for a
prelim. I think it's really helpful, and it should make for
a speedy HAWP when you come back in. I, too, would like to
see just some things on materials, the door, the chimney,
and maybe some drawings, like straightforward or just a
little sketch to see how it reads from the street. I align
myself with the Chairman on the door in the front. I think
it's a big change, and it's not something you'd see in that
neighborhood a lot. And so, I would encourage you to try to
find another solution for it. Everything in the back I'm
fine with. That's it.

MS. SALISBURY-JONES: I don't have a whole lot to
add to what's been said. I agree with the Chairman. I
would like to see some possible solutions for the mudroom
entrance. But other than that, everything looks good.

MR. ARKIN: I'm going to suggest a revision to a
prior speaker who was talking about less than gorgeous. I
prefer to think of eccentricities or unique qualities. And,
I think this house has got plenty of those. I don't have
much to add. I think this is -- you're making some very
constructive changes to, I think, a charming house. And, I
do think you need to do a bit more work on the mudroom.
But, I'm glad you came in. Appreciate your coming in, and
I'm looking forward to seeing this in a HAWP in the very
near future.

MS. BARNES: You heard me in the very beginning
raise the question of the door to the mudroom. That is, for
me, a serious problem. I notice that you were using a
window aperture to turn it into a door. There is a current
window aperture on the side, now I think went to a powder
room. That perhaps offers you the opportunity to do a door
on the side for your mudroom. And, I take the point that it
would be better to have it closer to the front rather than
far in the back.
I am supportive of what you are proposing in the rear. I share views of the other Commissioners about the chimney. Then need for it to be compatible with the existing chimneys, both in material and in height. I would favor the gable rather than the hipped roof where you had Option A or Option B. And, I'm sorry, I don't remember which one was which. But, I prefer the gable, which I think is more in keeping rather than introducing yet one other element. And that's it.

MS. VOIGT: I agree pretty much with the Commissioners. I think, you know, we're supposed to pretty much review from the public right-of-way and the impact to the historic building. I think that your addition is hidden behind the existing house. But I certainly agree with that front door, the mudroom door. I thought when we looked at, that it could kind of in some way be switched to the side for access. It seemed easy to me when I looked at it to switch to the driveway. So, that's about it, and thanks for coming.

MR. KIRWAN: So, I think you heard some pretty consistent comments and suggestions. So I think, you know, you'll get some very good interpretation of those from Staff, and you should be well on your way to a solution. Do you have a comment?

MR. BATH: I was just going to say, thank you all
for your comments. The only point I was going to make, and
I apologize if I'm out of order in any way but, part of the
rationale for the placement of that door was there is a
slope, a slight slope of the driveway backward. And so, I
originally wanted the mudroom entrance on the side as you
all did. I've lived in that neighborhood for a long time.
There will be steps up to that, you know, which will now be
visible from the street.

MR. KIRWAN: Well, not necessarily. There's a
solution where that happens inside. So, I mean, there's
creativity that I think they can happen there, that maybe
gives everybody what they want.

MS. HEILER: You had questioned did we prefer
option A or B. And, I think because it's invisible, it's
your choice.

MR. KIRWAN: Very good, thank you. We look
forward to seeing you come back for a HAWP. The next item
on our agenda are meeting minutes. Do we have any minutes
to approve?

MS. SALISBURY-JONES: I move that we approve the
June 8th minutes.

MR. KIRWAN: Is there a second?

MS. HEILER: I second the motion.

MR. KIRWAN: All in favor, please raise your right
hand.
VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: The June 8th minutes are approved. Were there any other minutes? No, that's it? And, do we have a volunteer for this evening? Thank you, Commissioner Arkin, appreciate that. And, are there any Commission items? No? Then we have a Staff item, I believe. Join us up front, Mr. Whipple.

MR. WHIPPLE: We have one Staff item for you that we shared with you previously for 7 East Irving Street in Chevy Chase.

MR. KIRWAN: Yes, we looked at that upstairs, and we approved that. Great. All right, there's no other items, and with that, best wishes for a very happy holiday. We're adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 8:49 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)
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