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Staff: Michael Kyne

PROPOSAL: Addition and other alterations

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC approve the HAWP application.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Master Plan Site

STYLE: Queen Anne

DATE: c. 1904-1908

Except from Damascus-Goshen Historic Resources (Amendment to the Master Plan for Historic Preservation in Montgomery County, Approved and Adopted, April 2009):

John and Mary Wightman built the house soon after they acquired the property in 1904. The Wightmans were white farmers who employed Prathertown residents on their 141-acre property. The property was subdivided sometime after 1965. The Queen Anne-influenced design of the residence reflects a knowledge and acceptance of national architecture trends that is not common in the Damascus area in this time period. The house has replacement siding and windows.

BACKGROUND

The applicant appeared before the Commission for a preliminary consultation at the May 24, 2017 HPC meeting.

PROPOSAL

- Construct a one-story rear addition.
- Construct a small deck at the left side of the proposed rear addition and historic house.
- Construct a raised patio at the right side of the proposed rear addition.
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 outline below.

When reviewing projects at the Wightman House (Master Plan Site #14/S3), the Commission uses information found in Damascus-Goshen Historic Resources (Amendment to the Master Plan for Historic Preservation in Montgomery County, Approved and Adopted, April 2009) for guidance. Specifically, the Commission should refer to the following statements, when applicable:

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: Parcel P775, being 0.49 acres.

The setting excludes the right-of-way for Wightman Road.

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.” Because the property is a Master Plan Site, the Commission’s focus in reviewing the proposal should be the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The Standards are as follows:

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. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

8. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

9. 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.

10. 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.
STAFF DISCUSSION

The applicant appeared before the Commission for a preliminary consultation at the May 24, 2017 HPC meeting. At that time, the Commission expressed the following concerns about the proposal:

- The proposed addition’s large projection beyond the left side of the historic house had the potential to detract from the historic house.
- The proposed vinyl siding and cultured stone on the addition were incompatible with the historic house.
- The proposed stove pipe had the potential to draw attention to itself and detract from the historic house.
- The proposed vinyl siding-clad projecting firebox on the left side of the addition was incompatible with the historic house.
- The proposed addition’s roof was incompatible with the historic house.

The applicant has since revised their application to address the Commission’s concerns and returned with a HAWP application. Specifically, the applicant has made the following revisions:

- The proposed addition is now entirely inset behind the historic house, with a 6” inset on the left side and the large projection on the right side retained.
- The applicant proposes fiber cement siding for the entire addition.
- The previously proposed stove pipe has been removed from the application.
- The previously proposed vinyl siding-clad projecting firebox has been removed from the application.
- The roof plan for the proposed addition has been revised - a gable has been added on the right-side entrance, which takes cues from the historic house, and a flat relief has been added at the hyphen adjacent to the historic house, providing a visual break and differentiation from the historic house.

Staff finds that the applicant has effectively addressed the Commission’s previous concerns. In accordance with the Standards, the revised proposal is unlikely to detract from character-defining features of the historic house, and, although the proposed alterations are generally compatible with the historic house, they are clearly differentiated from the historic house.

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 outlined above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-(b), having found that the proposal 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
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: ALAN@ABRAMSDESIGNBUIL....com
Contact Person: ALAN ABRAMS/HELICONWOR...

Tax Account No.: 0150787
Name of Property Owner: KATHLEEN S. KOWSKI
Address: 9821 WIGHTMAN RD GAITHERSBURG MD 20879
Street Number: 9821 City: GAITHERSBURG State: MD Zip Code: 20879
Contractor: TO BE DETERMINED
Contractor Registration No.
Agent for Owner: ALAN ABRAMS Daytime Phone No.: 202-437-8583

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISES
House Number: 9821 Street: WIGHTMAN RD
Town/City: GAITHERSBURG Nearest Cross Street: BRINE RD
Lot: 3 Block: 9 Subdivision: DORSEY MEADOW 4718/8 03
Lib: 3 Folio: 777 Parent: 777

PART ONE: TYPE OF WORK TO BE DONE AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
☐ Construct ☐ Extend ☐ Alter/Remodel ☐ HISTO ☐ Ext-Ins.
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Work/Wake ☐ Solar ☐ Fireplaces
☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☐ Additions ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Single Family
☐ Other ☐ Renovation ☐ Trash Compactor ☐ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☐ Other:

1B. Construction cost estimate: $200,000

1C. If this is a revision of a previously approved permit, see Permit #: NOTE EXPIRED PERMIT 474227

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTERNAL ADDITIONS

2A. Type of sewage disposal: ☐ 01 WSSC ☐ Other:
2B. Type of water supply: ☐ 01 WSSC ☐ Other:

PART THREE: COMPLETE FOR FENCES, RETAINING WALLS

3A. Height: feet inches: NA
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: ALAN ABRAMS C.P.B.D. Date: 6-7-2017

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS
Existing Structure and Setting
(please refer to Maryland Historic Trust Inventory Form)

Description of Project
The proposal is for a single story addition over a full basement, attached to the north (rear) end of the existing building. The addition will consist of a family room and a master’s suite, including an entry, stairway to the new basement, laundry and bathroom, and bedroom, as well as ancillary outdoor spaces. A covered portico will shelter the entry on the east side of the addition.

A primary consideration in planning the space is universal design for aging in place. This approach requires that all new spaces be on the ground level, with wide transitional spaces, and provision for privacy from the original home, should a live-in care giver, or other shared living arrangement ever be needed.

Another specific requirement is an outdoor living area that is sheltered from traffic noise and disruption from Wightman Road, a busy local thoroughfare.

The addition will be distinguished from and subordinated to the existing historic structure principally by its massing and roof geometry.

All spaces will be covered by low pitched hip roofs with shallow overhangs. At the same time, the meandering hip roofs of the addition will relate to the similar roofs (albeit with minimal overhangs) of the existing wrap-around porch, and the angled bay at the west side of the bedroom will relate to the two-story bay on the opposite side of the existing house.

New cladding will be fiber-cement plank (Hardie or similar). New fenestration will be 1/1 double hung metal clad wood windows, similar to the existing.
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William Kirwan, Chair
Sandra Heiler, Vice Chair
Marsha Barnes
Kenneth Firestone
Robert Sutton
Richard Arkin
Eliza Voigt
Brian Carroll
approval by this Commission this evening and look forward to
seeing your projects completed.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: We're going to move on to the next
item on our agenda, the first one we're going to hear
tonight which is Preliminary Consultation for property at
9821 Wightman Road, Gaithersburg. Do we have a Staff
Report?

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do, thank you. Again this is
9821 Wightman Road, Gaithersburg, Master Plan site known as
the Wightman House and this is a Preliminary Consultation.
It's a Queen Anne style building, circa 1904 to 1908, and
the proposal is to construct a one-story rear addition, to
construct a small deck at the left side of the proposed rear
addition and historic house and construct a raised patio at
the right side of the proposed rear addition.

And I'm going to start out with some photographs
and I'm going to walk you around the property. I'm going to
start approaching the property from the north, from the
public right-of-way of Wightman Road and just approach the
house.

MR. KIRWAN: Michael, I'm going to interrupt you
for just a second --

MR. KYNE: Sure.

MR. KIRWAN: -- and just make a quick announcement
that Commissioner Firestone has rejoined the Commission. He
had recused himself previously during our HAWP review.
Thank you. Please proceed.

MR. KYNE: That’s right. Okay, so this is walking
from the north approaching the subject property. As you can
see it’s pretty heavily wooded and there’s heavy vegetation,
although the Commission does review proposals as if the
vegetation does not exist. But the lot is actually sloped
as well, so that may help to minimize the visibility. And
this is actually on the opposite side of the street, the
same side of the street as the house. Continuing to
approach the drive, I’m sorry, right of the house, now
walking up the drive, looking back towards the house.
Walking around toward the rear. This would be the rear.

This is an existing shed which is at the left side
of the house as you look at it from the front and this is
the existing garage which we saw the front of at the end of
the driveway. And again continuing around the house, this
is approaching the left side. And now we end at the front.
And I have the plans for reference, should we need to refer
to them. And the applicable guidelines are the Damascus
Goshen Historic Resources Master Plan Amendment and the
Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

And I do have some information here which is
almost verbatim from the Staff Report and the Commission
indicated upstairs in the work session that they were
familiar with staff's concerns and prepared to address them.
But just to summarize there is a rear addition that staff is
slightly concerned with because it does project beyond the
left side of the historic house and typically we would want
the addition to be inset. Again, this is addressed in the
Staff Report and I believe the Commission is ready to
provide comments.

As far as materials for the addition fiberglass
shingle roofing is proposed, vinyl siding is proposed and
one over one metal clad wood windows are proposed and
there's also a gray stovepipe, a painted gray stovepipe at
the left side of the addition. And just quickly staff is
concerned about the proposed siding as vinyl does not
accurately reflect the characteristics of a historic house,
and so I asked the Commission to address that.

And again, the stove pipe seems to create sort of
an awkward situation so again if the Commission has some
more appropriate solutions for that. There is a firebox on
the left side of the addition which staff found incompatible
and hopefully the Commission will provide some alternatives.

And then lastly on the addition there is stone
depicted on the right elevation of the hyphen which is
atypical for the addition because the rest of the addition
is showing a clapboard like material. And then for the left
side deck the Commission would typically want the deck to be at the rear, in accordance with the standards and preservation best practices. In this case if you were to put it at the rear of the proposed addition, it would be impossible because of the setback lines and there is an existing deck at the left side that may help obscure the proposed deck and that is it.

So with that, I'd be happy to take your questions, and then we have the applicant here to come forward as well.

MR. KIRWAN: Questions for staff? Ms. Barnes?

MS. BARNES: Michael, could you help me understand something? In looking at circle 13 I'm seeing a door to the left. And I'm trying to understand exactly where that is. Would that be the door that would be the new master bedroom?

When I look at circle 12, so I'm on circle 13 --

MR. KYNE: Yes.

MS. BARNES: -- we have the right door --

MR. KYNE: Yes.

MS. BARNES: -- and then there's another door on the left?

MR. KYNE: It appears so, yes.

MS. BARNES: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for staff?

(No audible response.)

MR. KIRWAN: All right. If not, we invite the
applicant to please come forward and we’ll give you seven minutes for your testimony. And then I’m sure we’ll have some questions for you. And when you’re ready to speak, just make sure your microphone is turned on and you state your name for the record.

MR. ABRAMS: Okay. It’s the small button at the base?

MR. KIRWAN: Yes.

MR. ABRAMS: Is the red indicating that it’s on?

MR. KIRWAN: Yes, that’s good.

MR. ABRAMS: I’m Alan Abrams, I’m representing Ms. Sentkowski. I’d like to thank you for the opportunity to present the project. I’d also like to thank the staff for their constructive comments.

We’ve had time to understand them and we’re prepared to discuss them in detail, as you think it’s appropriate. I trust the physical features of the plan are clear, but beyond that I want to emphasize the intent behind the design. Ms. Sentkowski has enjoyed living in and caring for this house in its unique setting for 23 years. It’s her intent to age in place here, to continue to enjoy and preserve the house for the rest of her life.

And that’s the basis for the layout, the features and the amenities of the project. Specifically, it is to provide a comfortable living suite that the owner can occupy
all on one level with level access to the property and the
existing deck, and to organize it such that another family
member or caregiver could occupy some or all of the existing
space without imposing on the owner's privacy. And
obviously to provide these features with the least possible
impact on the original building.

Do you want to add anything?

MS. SENTKOWSKI: No, I'm good.

MR. ABRAMS: So other than that, I'm ready, I'm
prepared to hear your comments and --

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. Very good.

MR. ABRAMS: -- respond.

MR. KIRWAN: Do we have any questions for the
applicant? Yes, Mr. Arkin?

MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I noticed
though that you have not identified all materials that you
will be using on the addition, and are there any that we
should be aware of at this point? I would presume that if
you should come back for another preliminary review you
would include them on your HAWP application, particularly
I'm interested in the basement.

MR. ABRAMS: I have to apologize in reducing the
size of the plans in order to transmit them to, the notes
may have gotten too small to read but we've identified the
cladding, the roofing, the windows, the major components.
You know we’re regarding this as a preliminary design, so we haven’t, you know, specified all the finishes yet. We want to do a little bit of estimating before we make final decisions.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for the applicant?

(No audible response.)

MR. KIRWAN: If not, we’ll, oh yes, Ms. Barnes.

MS. BARNES: Mr. Abrams, in looking at your plans and this prompted my question about the door, which apparently comes off of the master bedroom. We like to see things behind the historic structure and there is I think about 8 or 9 feet that come off to the side. I noticed that the dining room of the historic structure has a large protruding bay and I am curious as to whether or not you had given any thought to kind of flipping your master bedroom and lavatory and bath, et cetera, so that it would be not protruding beyond the side of the house, but perhaps captured behind the, the bay of the dining room. Do you understand what I’m --

MR. ABRAMS: I completely understand the --

MS. BARNES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ABRAMS: -- suggestion and may I respond? In order to understand the layout as it’s presently configured,
you have to refer to the Site Plan and you’ll see that the
property is non-orthogonal, that there is an oblique
setback, which really I’ve designed it such that it, you
know, barely nicks the corner at the bottom right of the
stairs, so that’s the limiting dimension. Now you know even
before the staff comments, in conversation with Michael, you
know and we’re aware of the projection and the issue that it
raises. There are a few tweaks that we’ve considered that
would mitigate the projection. I don’t think that we can
eliminate it though. I think by turning the long dimension
of the family room 90 degrees, brings the massing in
tighter. It would allow us to shift the T-shape of the
bedroom to the east or down the page, if you will. And we
could at least cut the projection in half. But to eliminate
it, I think we’d either have to come up with some non-
orthogonal type of addition or a two story addition, which
is kind off the table in order to provide the other
features.

And I would like to also comment on the deck that
it’s, it’s maybe misleading I maybe used the wrong term to
call it a deck because its function is really a simple
connector to the existing deck which really wraps even
farther to the right in this. So the intent is simply to
link to the deck which serves as a kitchen garden, you know
for raising herbs.
MR. KIRWAN: Michael, could you pull up --

MS. BARNES: Yes.

MR. KIRWAN: -- a photo of that side of the house --

MS. BARNES: Yes.

MR. KIRWAN: -- just so we can --

MS. BARNES: Yes, it's that one. Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: -- the drawings don't shown, well, I guess they do but, you know.

MR. ABRAMS: So there you get a view of the deck which projects well beyond the back of the house and we simply want to connect to it. I mean it would be feasible to simply not remove that portion of the deck and you know figure out how to link it to the addition in some other fashion.

MS. BARNES: Thank you so much.

MR. CARROLL: Can I ask?

MR. KIRWAN: Commissioner Carroll?

MR. CARROLL: I'm just wondering in looking at the plan, one of the other things that we're so concerned with is the flue pipe, you were talking about that, you know, I understand the Code implications of having it there. Have you guys looked at any other locations, like putting the fireplace on the north wall of the family room which would get it further away from the house and allow you to drop the height of that down a little bit?
MR. ABRAMS: Yes, we’ve looked at various options to address that and I think we can eliminate that dramatic projection in some fashion.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. Good. Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: I just want to jump in with a question, I just want to go back to Commissioner Barnes initial comment, which I thought was a very good one about flipping the master bedroom wing so that the master bedroom is on the right side facing the house. I didn’t quite follow, I think you just sort of said that wouldn’t work. But what’s the reasoning behind not doing that? That seems to be a very easy way to solve a lot of the concerns here and it also gets the bedroom away from the street, which seems to make a lot of sense as well.

MR. ABRAMS: Yes, I understand that as well, but the purpose of the entry on the east side or the lower end of the page, is access to the garage, which functions as a workshop and you know for muddy type of activities, gardening and other hobbies and whatnot, the entry is adjacent to the driveway. So that was the major driver of that configuration. It’s to function as a mudroom, you know, a muddy mudroom, if you will.

MR. KIRWAN: Right, but you can come, either walk along the back of the house and come into a door on the rear --

MR. ABRAMS: Well, your --
MR. KIRWAN: -- in a similar way.

MR. ABRAMS: -- grade is dramatically, you’re losing grade there.

MR. KIRWAN: Like you’ve got to step up to it. I mean you could have a set of stairs on the landing on the back side and nobody would see it, we wouldn’t be concerned about it.

MR. KYNE: Could I interject for a second? Also, you could correct me if I’m wrong, Mr. Abrams, it was my understanding that the issue was the rear setback line, so if you look at the screen in front of you, Mr. Chairman, I think if you were to flip it, it still cannot go any further to the right than it is so it’s going to be the same, and the same approximate footprint no matter if you put, which room you put on either side. Is my understanding.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. That’s helpful, I mean unless the family room reorients and then the house moves further away from the rear property line, then that might also offer the opportunity to fix that too. Okay.

MR. ARKin: Well --

MR. KIRWAN: Well I think that’s something I would want, and I’ll mention that in deliberations but I think that might, we would at least like to see that example, would like to see that explored. Sorry. Commissioner Arkin?
MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for coming back, I missed a question that I wanted to ask you. Based on the first paragraph, my question was based on the first paragraph of your statement that at circle 17, circle 7, I’m sorry, in which you describe the addition being built over a new basement, and is the new basement to be finished, intended to be finished? Will there be any access to the new basement from the house, from the main house?

MR. ABRAMS: Well, there’s a stairway in the lower right side of the floor plan that accesses the basement. There is no exterior access.

MR. ARKIN: Okay. And is there a plan at any time in the future to make that a habitable space?

MR. ABRAMS: No.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MS. VOIGT: I have one question.

MR. KIRWAN: Yes, go ahead.

MS. VOIGT: Hi. Could you talk to us a little bit about the stone on the side and your thoughts about that? I was just curious. Because it’s just the only stone on the –

MR. ABRAMS: Yes, thank you. The preferred product would be a veneer stone, but it’s a natural stone, it’s similar to the stuff that comes out of the River Road
Quarry, so it's, you know, two inches thick but it's stone.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay, any other questions for the applicant? Because I would like us, we have one Commissioner that has to leave early and I'd like to get his comments in deliberation.

MS. HEILER: I do.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. A quick question.

MS. HEILER: The staff noted that the firebox is clad in vinyl and suggested cladding it in brick or stone. Are you willing to consider that?

MR. ABRAMS: Absolutely, although there are other ways of managing this to place the fireplace in the core of the addition rather --

MS. HEILER: On the inside.

MR. ABRAMS: -- than on an exterior wall. It might be one solution. Another solution might be to go to a gas fireplace, which it could be completely contained within the envelope.

MS. HEILER: Okay.

MR. KIRWAN: Why don't we move into deliberations and I won't limit questions for the applicant during deliberations, if anybody has any follow up. So, Mr. Sutton, I know you have to leave early, so if you wouldn't mind giving us your thoughts on the case first.

MR. SUTTON: Yes. I've read through the staff's
recommendations and I actually agree with what the staff
says. I think my major concern is having it set out and I
hope that you’re able to look at alternatives to that, what
you’ve discussed, I think at some length. I’m also a little
concerned about the siding, the vinyl siding and the stone.
I’ve worked with the Secretary’s standards, I know you’re
supposed to show that it’s different than the original
structure, but sometimes different is, you know don’t have
to be like way, way, way different. So I think those are my
concerns as well as the fireplace. I know that there are
all kinds of different, there are many alternatives for
fireplace, gas I think actually works quite well. You don’t
have to be quite as dramatic as a stove pipe. So those are,
I think I almost agree, I agree completely with the staff
concerns, but those are my specific concerns as well. Thank
you.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you. Commissioner Arkin, do
you want to take it from there and we’ll go around the horn?

MR. ARKIN: Thank you. I agree with many of the
comments that were made by the previous speaker. And a
suggestion that you might want to consider, hardiplank as a
substitute for vinyl siding, where siding is necessary.
This Commission has allowed hardiplank because of its
dimensional stability and the fact that it looks almost like
siding, but not quite as opposed to vinyl which tends to
deform and really is quite discernible from siding, with the
siding. I have another concern too. Part of it is the
stovepipe and the stovepipe in my eyes acts as an attention
getter, drawing the eye to the addition as opposed to the
historic portion of the project, of the resource. And the
historic resource is two stories plus attic, or three
stories, I don't know if the attic is habitable. A very
vertical look and the addition is very horizontal. And
apparently is considered a second floor and that is not
feasible for various reasons.

And I very much appreciate the necessity for
having an accessible addition that would allow easy access
to the master bedroom for the purpose of the owner or any
future purchaser who is mobility challenged in some way.
And my concern, this addition is in the rear, that the
roadway, the new addition is in the rear of the property but
the new roadway curves around and we have been instructed to
look at the proposals as if there is no foliage. Right now
it is very adequately screened from view by foliage. Some
of that foliage will probably have to be removed for
cavation, for construction. But my concern is I'm
concerned about the very dramatic change between vertical
and horizontal and my concerns would be alleviated somewhat
if there would be some way you could eliminate or minimize
the very tall stovepipe. My other concern too is that the
basement, a lot the basement on the new addition will be exposed, so I'd be very interested in seeing materials for cladding sometime in the future. Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Commissioner Firestone?

MR. FIRESTONE: I'm going to try and be rather brief. The major concern I have for the siding materials, as the other Commissioners have mentioned, there seems to be first of all, vinyl I don't think really works, at least from the vinyl I have seen. Hardiplank would be an improvement and I guess I'm concerned about having also the stone veneer which just seems to be, you know, it doesn't seem to be part of the whole and I'm also somewhat concerned about the chimney pipe for the fireplace. However, I can understand the desire for having a wood burning fireplace instead of gas. And those are my only comments.

MS. BARNES: I support the idea of the raised patio and I have some reservations about the use of stone facing on what is effectively a hyphen I think in that point. I find that it's jarring with the house. The pictures of the house make it look like such a welcoming and inviting place and very somehow warm. And I find that that stone is just a jarring contrast to that. I have a problem with the extension beyond the plane of the historic house and I think anything that you might be able to do, I understand when I raised the one question with you that that
causes problems, anything you might be able to do to
mitigate that extension would be good.

And I find that the flue is very troublesome and
if there were a way of handling that so that you don’t have
something that sort of appears rather industrial and draws
attention to the addition and away from the historic
structure, which should be the focus because as I said it
looks like a very welcoming and inviting kind of home.

MS. HEILER: Yes, I’d like to echo the comments of
the previous Commissioners, especially with the use of
materials and the stone veneer.

MS. VOIGT: I also am going to echo the
Commissioners. I do want to say I commend you for wanting
to live in this wonderful home and the design and the
concept of a single story design is a great concept. I
think in this case, you know, the bump out it a little, is
too wide. The materials probably need to be adjusted to the
hardiplank and to look at the stone and the stovepipe
extends too high. But in concept, it’s a great idea. We
want people to live in homes, nothing preserves them more.
So thank you.

MR. CARROLL: I would agree with most of the
things that have been said by my fellow Commissioners. If
you can minimize the projection to the west, you know, turn
the living room and get the stovepipe down.
I'm a little troubled by the vinyl, maybe a little bit contrary in terms of the stone, just in the fact that I believe that the stone sitting on the east side of the house and 10 feet back from the side of the historic house, the way the road curves and the way the house is sitting, it's not visible. I mean it may not be the material that I would choose but I would suggest that it's not in any way visible from the road. You'd have to be almost behind the house to see it.

I don't have a problem with the deck. I understand extending the deck. I like the idea of aging in place and setting this up the way that you're doing that.

I did have a quick question. On the east it specifies a patio, but according to the grade change and it looks like there's a deck that wraps around the back of the house now. Would you be actually filling that in so that you would have a patio or would it be a deck, a wood deck?

MR. ABRAMS: The grade is such that there wouldn't be a great deal of change to the grade, the existing grade where the patio is indicated.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. So you would be able to walk in at grade and you --

MR. ABRAMS: Just enough pitch to get it to drain.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. So I really don't have a problem, I'd like to see another material besides the vinyl.
But I think the way the house sits on the lot, the fact that it’s raised, you’ve got this horizontal sort of low addition I mean it’s not going to be terribly visible from the road. So yes, I would just say it was the stovepipe and maybe the vinyl and then my contrarian ideas about what you do back there on that wall I don’t think anyone can really see. So thank you. I appreciate you coming in for this.

MR. KIRWAN: All right. So I’ll just jump in with my comments. I think as I mentioned in deliberation I thought Commissioner Barnes had an excellent idea and just doodling it over your plan and taking into account the setback line and the angle of it, it does appear that if you did reorient the family room you could flip the plan and get the bedroom closer to the one side. Or not, just slide the whole thing forward. So that does seem to work. So I would encourage you to explore that so we can eliminate the projection on the left side.

I agree with the other Commissioners that I think hardiplank siding would be a much better material than vinyl. I would have had a difficult time supporting vinyl without seeing some samples of it and being convinced it’s an appropriate material.

If the fireplace is to stay on the side elevation, I do agree that there ought to be some other material that faces that fireplace. I would think the money you’re
spending on stone on the patio side and put it there, to make it feel more like a true fireplace.

And like the other Commissioners the stovepipe at its height is a nonstarter for me. So I think where you're headed is this reorientation of the family room and burying the fireplace in the plan to deal with that. And again, I think that leads to some other interesting opportunities and solutions to the other concerns.

I'm fine with the left side deck. I don't have any issue with that extension, especially given the existing deck and the modifications you're making to it. I'm fine with the raised patio. I think it'll get changed a little bit in some of these, what you come back to us with.

A new comment I have which I don't think we've talked about tonight, are the roof slopes. I think for me the addition right now is too prairie style, it's two low sloped pitched roofs and broad overhangs and it doesn't to me kind of pick up on the characteristics of the existing house. I would prefer to see the bedroom bathroom wing be a gabled wing with a roof pitch that matches the historic house and then letting the hyphen be a low sloped connector wing. I think that would be a better way to appropriately add on aesthetically to the house and be compatible with it.

So I think you've heard some pretty consistent comments regarding materials and orientation on some of the
concerns about projecting past the side yard and of course
of the fireplace issues. I think again you've heard pretty
consistent concerns raised and so we look forward, I mean I
will leave it up staff but it might be good to come in for
another preliminary before you go into a final HAWP just
because I have a sense it's going to change quite a bit from
what we see tonight. And it would be good for us to take
another look at it before you come in for HAWP. All right.

MR. ABRAMS: Thank you very much.

MR. KIRWAN: All right. Thank you.

MS. SENTKOWSKI: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: All right. I think we have some tax
credits to take into account tonight.

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do. So at the work session we
presented Group II of the 2016 Historic Preservation Tax
Credit applications, Group II includes 14 applications by
which staff is seeking your approval to transmit to the
Department of Finance.

MR. KIRWAN: Yes, we did look at those upstairs
and do we have a motion?

MS. HEILER: I move that we approve transfer all
of the tax credits to the Finance Department.

MR. KIRWAN: All right.

MS. BARNES: I second the motion.

MR. KIRWAN: Any discussion?