MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 4721 Essex Ave., Chevy Chase  Meeting Date: 10/11/2017
Resource: Primary (Pre-1915) Resource  Report Date: 10/4/2017
(Somerset Historic District)  Public Notice: 9/27/2017
Applicant: Richard and Michelle Scurfield  Tax Credit: N/A
Review: HAWP  Staff: Michael Kyne
Case Number: 35/36-171

PROPOSAL: Rear addition, garage, hardscape, and tree removal

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC approve with conditions the HAWP application.

1. Specifications for the proposed standing seam metal roof and any associated features (i.e., ridge caps, vents, snow guards) will be submitted, with final review and approval delegated to staff.
2. The proposed replacement fence at the right side of the historic house will not exceed 4’ in height.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Primary (Pre-1915) Resource within the Somerset District
STYLE: Queen Anne/Four Square
DATE: c. 1900

BACKGROUND

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission for preliminary consultations at the November 16, 2016, January 25, 2017, and June 28, 2017 HPC meetings. At the June 28, 2017 preliminary consultation, the Commission expressed the following concerns regarding the applicants’ proposal:

• The proposed hyphen/stair hall was too deep.
• The proposed stucco chimneys for the rear addition were too large and should be constructed from a compatible material.
• The proposed windows for the rear addition should not have muntins to be more consistent with the windows of the historic house.

PROPOSAL

The applicants are proposing to the following work items at the subject property:

• Remove an existing one-story rear addition and rear deck.
• Construct two-story additions at the rear of the historic house.
• Extend and alter the existing driveway to the rear of the property.
• Construct a one-story one-car detached garage at the rear of the subject property.
• Replace the existing concrete front walkway.
• Install new hardscaping features.
• Remove the non-historic shutters from the front of the house.
• Replace the fiberglass shingle roof with a field-turned, hand crimped, standing seam metal roof.
• Restore/repair in-kind the historic covered porch and screened porch at the front of the house.
• Replace the existing non-historic front storm door with a new wooden storm door.
• Replace the triple-track storm windows on the historic house with new storm windows to match two extant wooden storm windows.
• Replace the existing wooden picket fence at the right side of the historic house with a new wooden picket fence.
• Relocate the existing wooden picket fence at the right of the historic house, making it coplanar with the front porch.
• Removal of 26 trees, including the row of 22 Hemlocks along the front sidewalk.
• Planting of 11 new trees.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Somerset Historic District several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A), the Somerset Historic District Guidelines (Guidelines), and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). The pertinent information in these documents is outlined below.

Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8

(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; 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 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.)

**Somerset Historic District Guidelines**

- The earliest portion of the Town of Somerset was founded in the late 19th Century as a trolley suburb. This area is significant as one of the first trolley suburbs in Montgomery County and is representative of the beginnings of suburbanization.

- Somerset was developed in 1890 by the Somerset Heights Colony Company. This group purchased approximately 50 acres of farmland with the goal of creating a clean, safe, residential community—far enough away from the dangers and dirt of the city, but close enough to commute to work by trolley.

- Five of the original partners of the Somerset Heights Colony Company were associated with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. By 1895, four of these five men had built large homes for themselves within the new community. Three of these houses are still standing.

- From the beginning, sales were brisk and, by 1910, there were 173 residences in Somerset.

- Of particular interest are a number of houses built by Richard and William Ough between 1900 and 1915. These structures were an early examples of standardization—they exhibit a number of common characteristics: mitred bay corner towers, wrap-around porches, and hipped roofs with a gable peak visible on the front façade.

- Houses which were built in Somerset during its primary period of architectural importance (1890 to 1915) represent a wide variety of Victorian styles: Carpenter Gothic, Queen Anne, and Italianate. In addition, there are some good examples of the Bungalow style. As a group, the early houses in Somerset represent one of the best concentrated collections of Victorian residential architecture in the County.

- Other important features which create and enhance the historic character of the Somerset community include: the spacing and rhythm of buildings, the uniform scale of existing houses, the relationship of houses to the street, the ample size lots and patterns of open space in the neighborhood, the mature trees and landscaping, and the grid system of streets with clearly defined streetscapes. These elements should be retained and preserved as the area continues to grow and develop.
- A map of the boundaries of the boundaries of the Somerset Historic District is included at the end of this amendment. Important contributing resources built before 1915 are noted on this map. The later structures in the district are mainly mid-20th Century architectural styles—many are Colonial Revival—although some very recent houses have replicated the Victorian styles of the original buildings. As specified in the Historic Preservation Ordinance, applications for new construction in the district or for work on structures in the district which are of little historical or design significance shall be judged leniently, unless such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding historic resources or would impair the character of the district.

**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.” 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 applicants previously appeared before the Commission for preliminary consultations at the November 16, 2016, January 25, 2017, and June 28, 2017 HPC meetings. At the June 28, 2017 preliminary consultation, 2017, the Commission expressed the following concerns regarding the applicants’ proposal:

- The proposed hyphen/stair hall was too deep.
- The proposed stucco chimneys for the rear addition were too large and should be constructed from a compatible material.
- The proposed windows for the rear addition should not have muntins to be more consistent with the windows of the historic house.

The applicants have returned with a revised proposal and have attempted to address the Commission’s previous concerns. Specifically, the applicants have made the following revisions:

- The depth of the hyphen/stair hall has been reduced by 2′-6″, going from 15′ to 12′-6″.
- The width of the chimneys has been reduced by 1′, going from 5′-6″ to 4′-6″.
- The material of the proposed chimneys has been revised to be brick instead of stucco.
- The previously proposed muntins for the addition’s windows and doors have been removed.

Staff finds that proposed revisions have largely addressed the Commission’s previous concerns; however, at the June 28, 2017 preliminary consultation, there was a specific suggestion of decreasing the depth of the hyphen/stair hall by four to five feet, and, since many of the Commissioners voiced general agreement with the Commissioner who made this suggestion, the Commission may find that the depth of the hyphen/stair hall should be further decreased.

Staff notes that the width/depth of the porches on either side of the proposed hyphen/stair hall has increased, making the porches equal in width/depth to hyphen/stair hall. This change is unlikely to significantly increase the visibility or perceived massing of the proposed additions from the public right-of-way, and the rear corners of the historic house will mostly remain discernible.

Staff is supportive of the proposed new work items at the subject property, including the removal of the non-historic shutters from the front of the house, the restoration/repair of the covered and screened porches at the front of the house, and the installation of a compatible storm door and storm windows.

The proposed removal of 26 trees is unlikely to alter the character-defining features of the subject property, especially with the proposal to plant 11 new trees at the subject property. Removing the row of 22 Hemlocks along the front sidewalk will increase the visibility of the historic house from the public right-of-way and enhance the perceived openness of the property, making it more compatible with the surrounding properties in the historic district.

Staff notes that, although the written description of the project indicates that the proposed replacement fence at the right side of the historic house will be 4′ tall, the submitted plans indicate that the fence will be 4′-6″ (see Circle _45_). Because the fence is forward of the rear plane of the historic massing, staff suggests a condition of approval, stipulating that the proposed replacement fence will not exceed 4′ in height, which is consistent with the Commission’s typical requirements.

LAP Comments

The Town of Somerset reviewed the applicants’ proposal at their October 2, 2017 meeting and were in support of the project.
After full and fair consideration of the applicants’ submission staff finds the proposal, as modified by the conditions, as being consistent with the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-(b) 1 and 2, and having found the proposal is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Somerset Historic District Guidelines outlined above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve with the conditions specified on Circle 1 the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-(b), having found that the proposal is consistent with the Somerset Historic District Guidelines identified above, and therefore will not substantially alter the exterior features of the resource and is compatible in character with the resource 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.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301/563-3400
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: adecker@annedeckerarchitects.com  Contact Person: Anne Decker, AIA
Daytime Phone No.: 301.652.0106

Tax Account No.: 00538080

Name of Property Owner: Richard & Michelle Scurfield  Daytime Phone No.: mhscurfield@gmail.com

Address: 4721 Essex Avenue, Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Contractor: Potomac Valley Builders  Phone No.: 301.656.9422
Contractor Registration No.: 70418
Agent for Owner: Anne Decker, AIA (Anne Decker Architects, LLC)  301.652.0106

LOCATION OF BUILDING PREMISES

House Number: 4721  Street: Essex Avenue
Town/City: Town of Somerset/Chevy Chase  b/w Surrey Street & Warwick Place
Lot: 18  Block: 5  Subdivision: Somerset Heights

PART ONE: TYPE OF ALTERATION AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:  CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:

☐ Construct  ☑ Alter/Remodel  ☑ A/C  ☑ X-structure  ☑ Room Addition  ☑ Porch  ☑ Deck  ☑ Shed
☐ Move  ☐ Install  ☑ Wreck/Remodel  ☑ Solar  ☐ Fireplace  ☐ Woodburning Stove  ☑ Single Family
☐ Revision  ☐ Repair  ☐ Revocable  ☑ X-Fence/Wall (complete Section 4)  ☐ Other: ________________________________

1B. Construction cost estimate: $___________ +/− $2,000,000

1C. If this is a revision of a previously approved permit, see Permit # _______ N/A

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTERIOR ADDITIONS

2A. Type of sewage disposal: 01 ☑ WSSC  02 ☐ Septic  03 ☐ Other: ________________________________

2B. Type of water supply: 01 ☑ WSSC  02 ☐ Well  03 ☐ Other: ________________________________

PART THREE: COMPLETE IF GRAY AREA IS Retaining Wall

3A. Height: ______________ feet

3B. Indicate whether the fence or retaining wall is to be constructed as one of the following locations:

☐ On party line/property line  ☑ Entirely on land of owner  ☐ On public right of way/assmenent

I hereby certify that I have read carefully the foregoing application, that the application is correct, and that the construction will comply with plans approved by the Historic Preservation Commission, and do hereby acknowledge and accept this to be a condition for the issuance of this permit.

Signature: ___________________________  Date: ___________________________

Authorized Agent: ________________________  For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission

APPLICANT: 4721 Essex Avenue, Chevy Chase, MD 20815

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS
THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MUST BE COMPLETED AND THE REQUIRED DOCUMENTS MUST ACCOMPANY THIS APPLICATION.

1. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT  SEE ATTACHMENTS
   a. Description of existing structure(s) and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance:
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

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

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

3. PLANS AND ELEVATIONS  SEE ATTACHMENTS
   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 resource(s) 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  SEE ATTACHMENTS
   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  SEE ATTACHMENTS
   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  SEE ATTACHMENTS
   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  SEE ENCLOSURES [TWO (2) PAGES]
   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.
### HAWP APPLICATION: MAILING ADDRESSES FOR NOTIFYING
[Owner, Owner's Agent, Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's mailing address</th>
<th>Owner's Agent's mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RICHARD AND MICHELLE SCURFIELD  
P.O. BOX 310  
BLUE RIDGE SUMMIT, PA 17214 | ANNE DECKER  
ANNE DECKER ARCHITECTS  
5019 WILSON LANE  
SECOND FLOOR  
BETHESDA, MD 20814 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ROBERT SAMUEL WACHBROI CV. TR.  
4716 ESSEX AVENUE  
CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815 | JOHN R. & A.J.A. BURFIELD  
4714 ESSEX AVENUE  
CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815 |
| MARIE F. BOUCHET  
4712 ESSEX AVENUE  
CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815 | GARY & ROBIN LEE ORSECK  
4722 DORSET AVENUE  
CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815 |
| AMEDEE S. PROUVOST & CLARE HEPBURN CUSHMAN  
4717 ESSEX AVENUE  
CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815 | ALAN B. AND MELISSA G. DAVIDSON  
4727 ESSEX AVENUE  
CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815 |
# HAWP APPLICATION: MAILING ADDRESSES FOR NOTIFYING

[Owner, Owner's Agent, Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's mailing address</th>
<th>Owner's Agent's mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD AND MICHELLE SCURFIELD</td>
<td>ANNE DECKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. BOX 310</td>
<td>ANNE DECKER ARCHITECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE RIDGE SUMMIT, PA 17214</td>
<td>5019 WILSON LANE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SECOND FLOOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BETHESDA, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN GRAHAM &amp; TORIE CLARKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4728 DORSET AVENUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transmittal

Date Issued: September 19, 2017

Issued By: Lori Apfel Cardeli, AIA, NCARB

To: Historic Preservation Office
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Attr bombed by: Michael Kyne, Planner Coordinator

Regarding: 4721 Essex Avenue, Chevy Chase, MD 20815
HAWP Application: October 11, 2017 Meeting

We are submitting two (2) sets of each of the following:

- HAWP Application
  Size: 8 ½”x11”
  Total Sheets: Seven (7)

- Written Description (Including Images + SPECs)
  Size: 8 ½”x11”
  Total Sheets: Sixty-Six (66)

- Site Plan (CAS Engineering)
  Size: 30”x42” (Full-Size)
  Total Sheets: One (1)

- Drawings (Including Site Plan, Architecture, + Landscape)
  Size: 11”x17”
  Total Sheets: Thirty (30)
  *Note: Architecture Drawings are printed to at Full-Size, as noted on drawings. Site Plan and Landscape Plans were reduced to fit on an 11”x17” format and are not to scale.

- Photographic Study
  Size: 8 ½”x11”
  Total Sheets: Forty-eight (48)

Notes:
A copy of this Transmittal has been attached to each individual set, for reference.
Please do not hesitate to let us know if you have any questions and/or require additional materials.
HAWP Application

11 October 2017 Revised.

Scurfield Addition
4721 Essex Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

Note: For a complete account of the proposed changes described below, please refer to the floor plans, elevations, images, SPECS, and photographs included in our application.

PROJECT SUMMARY

Our Clients, Michelle and Rick Scurfield, would like to renovate and construct an addition to the existing, historic structure at their home, 4721 Essex Avenue, Chevy Chase, MD 20815.

Per the feedback that we received at our most recent preliminary MCHPC meeting on June 28, 2017, it appears that the Commission was generally in favor of our proposal. However, there was still some concern that a few minor features of the addition overwhelmed the Historic Home, and thus the Commission requested that we tweak these three (3) items (see below) to even further minimize/disguise the overall apparent massing on-site before we submit our final HAWP application.

01. WIDTH OF LINK:
   Commission requests that we re-visit the width of the "link" due to concerns that the size of the Foyer, Hall 5, and Hall 1 were too gracious of spaces.

   Response:
   Originally submitted at 15'-0"W, the "link" was reduced by 2'-6". At 12'-6"W, it will still allow for proper circulation around the stairs and a correct proportion of windows/doors in elevation.

02. CHIMNEYS:
   Commission requests that we consider the size and material of the new Chimneys to reduce the monumentality of these objects.

   Response:
   We have eliminated the fireplace in the basement in order to reduce the width of the Chimneys from 5'-6"W to 4'-6"W. We also switched the material to painted brick, in lieu of stucco, as suggested by the Commission. These two changes should eliminate the Commission's concern about their size and appearance.
PROJECT SUMMARY, continued.

03. WINDOWS/DOORS:
Commission requests that we simplify the window/door design by eliminating the muntins in an effort to push towards a more modern, clean-lined vocabulary for the addition.

Response:
We have accepted the Commissions’ recommendation to eliminate the muntins on the new windows/doors.

After making these adjustments -- and also adhering to the comments received at the (2) previous preliminary hearings on November 16, 2016 and January 25, 2017 -- we believe that we have made every effort to comply with the Commission’s recommendations to reduce the apparent massing of the addition and make it more complimentary to the existing, historic home. Thus, we are confidently submitting our full HAWP Application for final review/approval.

PROPOSED RENOVATION/ADDITION

4721 Essex Avenue is located on the southern border of the Town of Somerset Historic District. More specifically, the property is sited on the north side of the 4700 block of Essex Avenue, which is located between Surrey Street and Warwick Place on its west and east borders, respectively. Dorset Avenue is north of the property site.

In 1890, purchasers of a 50 acre parcel of tobacco farmland converted it into a residential community. The first residence was completed in 1893 — and by 1905, a total of 35 families were living in the community, including on our site, which was built in 1902. Shortly thereafter, the Town of Somerset’s Charter was issued (1906) and the municipality grew to eventually include almost 400 homes.

Although the original fabric of the main body of the house remains largely intact today, there have been few updates to the home throughout its 115 year history. Currently, the home as it exists, does not meet the needs of a growing 21st century family with three (3) children. It is important to our Clients that the home continue to reflect its rich history, meet the needs of their family, as well as meet the desired square footage for a house at this price point in this neighborhood. Consequently, we believe a few key items such as (1) taking square footage cues from the neighborhood, (2) upgrading the existing building systems, (3) being sensitive to the overall site plan and building footprint, and (4) establishing a more functional interior, will efficiently remedy this.

In addition to interior renovation work, we are also proposing a two-story addition (with basement) behind the existing structure, which consists of a flat roofed, glass link (or “hyphen”) to join the historic home to the new addition. This will require the removal of the haphazardly designed one-story addition added to the original house at some point in time, as well as the removal of a wooden rear deck, currently in disrepair.

By utilizing the link as a connector between old and new, the integrity of the old house is allowed to read intact while allowing the new addition to defer to the existing house. The new addition does not attempt to replicate the Victorian era house, but takes its cues from the old house in terms of overall massing parts and proportion and window style, size, and rhythm. The new structure will reside under a simple gable roof that will take its cues from the pitch seen on the existing home. Stylistically, we are adding in a “warm” modern, transitional manner to compliment the historic home.

2 Id.
PROPOSED RENOVATION/ADDITION, continued.

The addition will remain hidden behind the original structure except for a slight projection (+/- 10") of the Dining Room mass on the right side. This +/-10" projection, reduced from 8'-6¾" (per the original submission on November 16, 2016), will be barely noticeable from the Front Elevation and serve to shield the Kitchen mass at the rear of the home. Those trees remaining on Site, in addition to the replacement trees proposed by Lila Fendrick Landscape Architecture & Garden Design will also help to conceal the addition as viewed from the public right of way. Our Clients are also very interested in reforesting the "implied" driveway zone where the existing trees will need to be removed for driveway access in addition to planting along the right elevation as shown on the proposed Site Plan.

Several trees will need to be removed to accommodate the new implied driveway and one-story, 1 car, detached garage which will be located at the rear corner of the property. (Please refer to drawings and narrative by Lila Fendrick Landscape Architecture & Garden Design, in addition to our photographic study for more information.) Also housed under a gable roof, this garage will be accessible from the original driveway and curb cut.

While our Clients plan to remain in this home for many years to come, they want to feel comfortable that they are making a sound investment. As a result, they are cautiously aware of the square footage and programmatic requirements that a potential buyer would be looking for, and believe that it is vital to implement these built changes to help the home hold its value for re-sale purposes. Thus, the design focuses on creating harmony between old and new, allowing appreciation — and celebration — of both, while meeting the Owners' desire for added living space and modern amenities for their growing family.

REPAIR/RESTORATION OF HISTORIC COMPONENTS

Our Clients were recently made aware of a photograph of their home (see Image 01), taken around the half-century mark. Therefore, in an effort to further restore the current home to it's historic state, we would also like to request an approval for the following:

01. SHUTTERS (see Image 02):
   The current house has three (3) sets of wood, louvered shutters at three (3) windows on the Front Elevation. In an effort to be more consistent with the historic home, we are requesting their removal.

02. ROOF (see Image 03):
   During a recent Site Visit, it was determined that the historic home was actually constructed with a standing seam, metal roof. Should the budget allow, we would like to remove the current, fiberglass roof and re-install a traditional standing seam, hand crimped, field-turned, metal roof on the historic structure. Should the budget prevent this scope for any reason, the current, fiberglass roof will remain, and be repaired, as needed.

03. COVERED PORCH + SCREENED PORCH (see Images 04a-e):
   The current Covered Porch and Screened Porch are in obvious disrepair. Therefore, we will need to repair and remove/replace specific components in an effort to ensure that all items are structurally sound. For all intensive purposes, the look with remain the same (brick-for-brick, wood-for-wood, etc.), but depending on the severity of the damage, certain components may require in-kind replacement.

   Items requiring replacement*:
   :: The wood floor boards are damaged, rotted, and sloping.
   :: The brick piers are leaning and are of structural concern.
   :: The screen panels are torn, full of holes, and covered with patches, thus non-functioning.
   :: There are two (2) types of wood lattice currently installed at the base of the Screened Porch. We believe that the lattice shown on the Front Elevation is likely original to the house. Therefore, since it is damaged, we intend to replace it with a painted wood, orthogonal, light weave lattice by Smoof to match the existing, historic pieces. The oversize, diagonal lattice at the Right and Rear Elevations is not original to the home and will be replaced in its entirety to match the historic lattice noted previously.
REPAIR/RESTORATION OF HISTORIC COMPONENTS, continued.

Items requiring repair:
:: The wood columns and Screen Porch framing can likely remain with some leveling and minor repair.
:: The extent of work at the ceiling is questionable until further exploration/investigation is completed.
:: The railing can likely remain with some repair work. For reference, the railing on the Precedent Property @ 4722 Dorset Avenue was replaced in-kind to match the historic rail on that home. This appears to be similar to what is currently installed at our home and thus, we will use this as a precedent for our own work.

*All of the components on the Covered Porch and Screened Porch are subject to further exploratory demolition work required to confirm existing conditions and structural integrity.

04. STORM DOOR (see Image 05):
The current home has a wood Storm Door at the Entry, while the historic photo shows a (likely, wood) Screen Door. Thus, neither appears to be original to the house. Therefore, we would like to replace the current wood Storm Door with a more simple design (single panel, wood door with thin tiles and rails) so that the original Entry Door is more visible.

05. STORM WINDOWS (see Image 06):
Only two (2) original, historic storm windows remain on the current house on the Left Elevation/Bay Window. The rest have been replaced with triple-track, non-historic ones. Therefore, we are proposing to replace all of the non-original storm windows with those that match the historic design. The remaining historic storm windows will be repaired, as necessary. Not only will this eliminate the non-original, non-historic components, but it will make the original, historic windows more visible.

PROPOSED HARDSCAPE/LANDSCAPE
Per Lila Fendrick Landscape Architecture & Garden Design

Existing Site Work
The density of the existing tree canopy contributes to the environmental canopy of the Town of Somerset. The open space of the east side yard contributes to the uniform rhythm of side yards in the Town.

01. The existing site looks abandoned. A front hemlock row along the sidewalk is covered in ivy (see Photographic Study, image 2), overgrown shrubs crowd the house and numerous trees are closely spaced, creating dark, shady conditions on two sides of the house. Several trees are in poor condition, with trunks which are severely leaning.

02. The existing concrete walk from public sidewalk to front of house is cracked and in poor repair (see Photographic study, image 6). The top five risers of the front steps are wood and the bottom step is a concrete slab. This slab is pulling away from the wood steps, creating a gap between the slab and the bottom wood riser (see Written Description, image 7).

03. An existing stacked stone curb around perimeter beds at the base of the front porch is in poor condition, with stone falling out of place (see Photographic Study, image 7).

04. A gravel driveway is too short to access the rear of the property (see Photographic Study, image 5).

05. Existing accessory structures (an elevated play house with rope ladder and shed) are located along the west property line and are in moderate to poor condition.

Proposed Site Work
The proposed site design provides reasonable use of the property while maintaining many of the original trees, reforesting the property, and improving the safety and aesthetic value of the site. It will not substantially alter the exterior features of the site within the historic neighborhood. Materials will be locally sourced bluestone, flagstone, fieldstone, and native plants where practical.

01. The existing front concrete sidewalk will be replaced with a 4'-5" wide bluestone/flagstone walk. The existing concrete slab step at the bottom of the front wood porch steps will be replaced with a bluestone slab step composed of three butt-jointed bluestone slabs.
02. The existing gravel and concrete driveway will be replaced with a driveway built on the west side of the house. It will be composed of granite cobbles and exposed concrete aggregate strips flanking a center lawn panel. A cobblestone threshold approximately 5'-0" deep will transition between the public concrete sidewalk and the exposed concrete aggregate strips. Following the cobblestone threshold, a 26'-0" long strip between the two aggregate strips will be paved in cobblestone. Beyond this area, the center strip between the concrete aggregate strips will be planted with grass. The driveway will lead to an exposed concrete aggregate turnaround at the northwest corner of the lot in front of the proposed garage. The double strip driveway with central grass strip references historic two strip driveways.

03. The 15' x 24' garage will be centered behind the house addition, and set back 12'-0" from the rear property line. This is the appropriate location for the garage as it is less visible from the Right-of-Way.

04. The low stacked curb framing plantings at the front base of the house will be rebuilt of the existing fieldstone and organized in a more geometric manner to frame the front porch. Re-using the existing stone will preserve and recycle existing resources.

05. On the west side of the house there will be two sets of landings and steps. One will extend off the foyer and connect to the driveway and one will extend off the mudroom and connect to the drive court in front of the garage. Steps and landings will be built of masonry with fieldstone risers to match the proposed house foundations and bluestone/flagstone treads.

06. On the east side of the house there will be a landing and steps extending off the foyer with materials matching those of the opposite (west) side.

07. A landing off the dining room east-facing doors will meet a raised terrace off the east side of the kitchen/family room. The terrace will descend to the north garden via four steps (to be built of fieldstone and bluestone/flagstone). The height of the elevated terrace will be low enough to not require a guardrail, and its distance of +/-101'-6" from the street will make it visually unobtrusive.

08. A door on the east-facing end of the garage will open onto a bluestone/flagstone landing and dining terrace. The dining terrace will be built on grade and will not be visible from the street.

09. A built-in grill will be built off the rear corner of the house for comfortable access from the kitchen and outdoor dining terrace. This will not be visible from the street. The grill will be housed in a fieldstone surround, with locally sourced bluestone for the countertop.

10. The garden will be fenced for the family dog. The existing picket fencing off the east mid-point of the front porch (see Written Description, image 8) will be shifted to the front right corner of the porch and will be rebuilt with an open picket fence. Fencing to be 4'-0" tall. Fencing will extend off the northwest corner of the addition and tie to the garage. Existing wood fencing at the property perimeter will complete the enclosure.

11. A turnaround made of Grasspave2 or similar will be sited to the east of the proposed driveway, close to the entry to the property. This will be a below-grade paving system that can support a car, but will not be visually different from adjacent sod.

Tree Removal & Tree Replacement

01. In addition to trees previously approved for removal as per a permit document from November 2, 2016, three trees are requested for removal. One was originally scheduled to remain, and two were not included in the Feather report. Two trees on the west side are requested to be permitted for removal in order to build the turnarounds and driveway, and one tree requested for removal on the east side will provide space for a healthier and more attractive canopy tree. These trees include:

   a. A twin dogwood, labeled as T-1 in the Feather Associates report of Nov. 2, 2016, should be removed to permit the construction of a Grasspave2 (or similar) turnaround in the front of the house.
   b. A severely leaning 8" redbud tree, which branches horizontally 12" above grade, is in the footprint of the garage turnaround. This is labeled this as T-13 on the Site plan.
   c. A severely leaning redbud is located on the east property line, where a replacement canopy tree is scheduled to be planted. This is labeled this as T-14 on the Site plan.

02. Two trees were listed to be removed contingent on the root interference of the drive path. A 10" black cherry, T-3, is in the driveway pathway. This tree should be removed. A 15" American Holly, T-6, previously approved for removal, will remain.
03. The removal of the row of 22 Hemlocks along the sidewalk, labeled T-15, on the Site plan, has been requested. These are in poor condition and obstruct visibility.

04. Replacement trees are scheduled to include two evergreen trees, six flowering/ornamental trees and three shade trees. Two evergreen trees are to be planted along the east property line. Three flowering trees are scheduled to be planted along the front sidewalk and three more along the east property line. Three shade trees are to be planted along the rear, west, and east property lines.

In summary, the proposed Site plan, Tree replacement plan, and design and detailing are compatible with the character and nature of the historic site and district. The proposed changes will enhance the preservation of open space and private utilization of the lot at this historic property. The design will maintain the cultural value of the historic site by preserving its use as a residential garden within a wooded canopy. The proposed changes will not be detrimental to the public safety or environmental character of the neighborhood.
MATERIALS

See SPECS: Attachments for precedent images and additional information.

EXISTING HOUSE (TO REMAIN)

Main Body: Wood Siding with Brick Base.
Painted brick chimneys.

Windows and Doors: Wood windows and doors to remain, U.N.O.
Existing painted wood, double hung, (3) unit, Attic window at Rear Bay is in disrepair. It
is not original to the house, thus it is to be replaced with a Windsor painted
wood, double hung, (3) unit, window to match existing.
Two (2) original, historic storm windows to remain on Left Elevation/Bay Window;
repair, as needed. New storm windows to match existing, historic design at all
remaining locations.

Roof: Existing fiberglass roof to be replaced with standing seam, hand crimped, field-turned
metal roof to restore existing home to historic state should the budget allow.
Should the budget prevent this scope, the current fiberglass roof will remain,
and be repaired, as needed.

NEW ADDITION

Main Body: Wood Siding w/Stone Base.
Shou Sugi Ban Vertical Siding w/Stone Base @ Mudroom Entry only.
Painted brick chimneys.

Windows and Doors: Loewen painted wood, push-out casement windows, fixed windows, doors, and fixed
doors, typ., U.N.O.
Western aluminum fixed windows and doors at “Link” and Master Bedroom/Breakfast
Bay (Right Elevation).

Roof: Standing seam hand crimped, field-turned metal roof @ Cross Gable.
Rubber membrane roof @ Flat Roofs (@ “Link” and Master Bedroom/Kitchen).
Flat seam copper roof @ Mudroom Bay.

NEW GARAGE

Main Body: Shou Sugi Ban vertical siding w/stone base.

Doors: Clopay frosted glass and aluminum overhead Garage Door.

Roof: Upstate Door custom mahogany flush passage door with single v-groove at center.
Standing seam, hand crimped, field-turned metal roof.

LANDSCAPE/HARDSCAPE (INCLUDING DRIVEWAY)

Refer to drawings by Lila Fendrick Landscape Architecture & Garden Design for Landscape and Hardscape plans.
SQUARE FOOTAGE

Existing
Existing House: 1,169 SF
Existing House (SF to remain): 1,169 SF – 29 SF = 1,140 SF

Proposed
Existing house (SF to remain): 1,140 SF
Addition: 2,490 SF 1,350 SF
Garage: 360 SF
Total: 2,850 SF

INFILL DEVELOPMENT LOT COVERAGE

As defined by Section 4.4.9, Residential 60 Zone (R-60) Standard Method Development Standards, project must comply with Infill Develop Lot Coverage requirements since the addition is more than 50% of the existing floor area of all floors of the dwelling.

Infill Development Lot Coverage
Allowable Infill Development Lot Coverage is 20%* of Total Lot Area.
Lot area equal to or greater than 16,000 SF.
Lot Size per CAS Plan: 17,291 SF
17,291 * 0.20 = 3,458.2 SF (Allowable)

Proposed: Adjusted Area
By definition, this does not include any bay window, chimney, porch, or up to 240 SF of a detached garage if less than
350 SF of floor area and less than 20'-0" in height:

| Window Well | 27 SF |
| Covered Porch | 143 SF |
| Screened Porch | 176 SF |
| Bay Window | 54 SF |
| (2) Chimneys | 18 SF |

Detached Garage: Does not qualify (>350 SF).
Total: 418 SF

Lot Size per CAS Plan: 17,291 SF
Proposed Adjusted: 2,850 SF (Proposed) – 418 SF (Adjusted) = 2,432 SF
Infill Development Lot Coverage: 14% (<20%: MEETS REQUIREMENT!)
Precedent Property
4722 Dorset Avenue (Rear Neighbor)
Historic House: 1,034 SF
Addition: 2,590
Total: 3,624 SF

Addition is 2.5x SF of Historic House.

Project Site
4721 Essex Avenue
Historic House: 1,169 SF or 1,140 SF (w/29 SF to be removed in proposed scheme.)
Addition: 1,350 SF
Total: 2,490 SF

Addition is 1.15x SF of Historic House. It is 1.18x SF of Historic House w/29 SF to be removed in proposed scheme.)

-End of Written Description-

Endolosures:
Photographic Study.
Written Description: Images.
SPECs: Attachments.
Roof Plan - Proposed

1/8" = 1'-0"
Garage Roof Plan - Proposed
1/8" = 1'-0"

PLAN NORTH

Standing seam metal roof (pre-colored, field tinned).

First Floor Garage Plan - Proposed
1/8" = 1'-0"

PLAN NORTH
WRITTEN DESCRIPTION
Images.

Scurfield Addition
4721 Essex Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

HAWP Application
October 11, 2017
Earlier architectural styles continued to mature alongside the rapid development of new Somerset. Theo and Wilhelmina van Hemert’s home on Essex Avenue was built in the early 20th century for James E. Tibbetts, a schoolteacher who came to Washington to work at the government printing office. It was passing its half-century mark when this photograph was taken. (Courtesy Corrie Morsey.)

IMAGE 01:

Source: “Somerset: One Hundred Years a Town.”
IMAGE 02:

Shutters: Current Front Elevation.
Non-original shutters to be removed to be more consistent with the historic home.
IMAGE 03:

Metal Roof: Current Attic.

Original metal roof discovered under layers of plywood, insulation, and ridge beams in current Attic.
Covered Porch: Current Conditions.

In disrepair. Components to be repaired/replaced, as needed.
Covered Porch: Current Conditions.
In disrepair. Components to be repaired/replaced, as needed.
IMAGE 04c:

Precedent @ 4722 Dorset: Front Elevation.
Current railing replaced in-kind to match original, historic railing.
IMAGE 04d:

**Screened Porch:** Current Conditions.

*In disrepair. Components to be repaired/replaced, as needed.*
Screened Porch: Current Conditions.

In disrepair. Components to be repaired/replaced, as needed.
IMAGE 05:

Storm Door: *Current* Front Elevation.

Non-original/non-historic Storm Door proposed to be replaced.
Storm Windows: Current Left Elevation @ Bay Window.
Original, historic storm windows to remain; repair, as needed. New storm windows to match existing, historic design.
IMAGE 07:

Landscape: Front Elevation/Stair.
View of wood steps with concrete slab bottom step.
IMAGE 08:
Landscape: Side Elevation/Fence.
View of fence to be relocated and rebuilt.
ATTACHMENT A:

Railing: Precedent @ "Link"/Foyer (Both Sides) + Master Bedroom Deck.

*Images to be used for stylistic reference only.*
ATTACHMENT B:

Canopy: Precedent @ "Link"/Foyer (Both Sides) + Mudroom.

Images to be used for stylistic reference only.
ATTACHMENT C:

LOEWEN WINDOWS + DOORS:

SPECs/Details:
Location(s): See Plans/Elevations.
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.

R.O. 46 5/8” [1184mm]
F.S. 45 7/8” [1165mm]

Glass 33 1/4” [844mm]
Panel 44” [1117mm]

Heatsmart D.272
(5.7/63-115/5.7)
Glazing Stops #49115
Tempered

Glass 103 3/4” [2636mm]
Panel 116 15/16” [2970mm]

TD1-Inswing-Wide Stiles
Non Clad

0003; DINING; QTY: 1 (L)
0003A; DINING; QTY: 1 (R)
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.

R.O. 46 5/8" [1184mm]
F.S. 45 7/8" [1165mm]

Glass 33 1/4" [844mm]
Panel 44" [1117mm]

Heatamart D 272
(5.7/83-115/5.7)
Glazing Stops #49115

Tempered

Glass 103 3/4" [2635mm]
Panel 116 15/16" [2970mm]

TD1-Insingl-Wide Stiles
Non Clad

0003B; DINING SIDE LITES; QTY; 2 (F)

NOTES:
- STRUCTURAL SUPPORT MAY BE REQUIRED AROUND & BETWEEN MULLED UNITS. THE SIZE & TYPE TO BE DETERMINED BY A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER.

Sales Order No: 18831-02-02A
Requester: John Sanders
Project Name: Scurfield Primed
COS Contact: Raylene Laurin
Company: The Sanders Company
Date: 13SEP2017
Unit ID: 18831-02-02A

Drawn by: Harley F
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.

R.O. 36 3/16" [919mm]
F.S. 35 7/16" [900mm]

Tempered
CA1 - Push Out
Non Clad

0001: GUEST RM EGRESS WELL (VERIFY): QTY: 1
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.

R.O. 24 3/8" [619mm]
F.S. 23 5/8" [600mm]

R.O. 48" [1219mm]
F.S. 47 1/4" [1200mm]

0007: MUDROOM: QTY: 1
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.

R.O. 37 1/8" [943mm]
F.S. 36 3/8" [924mm]

Tempered

TP1-Insingw
Non Clad

0009: MUDROOM: QTY: 1

Sales Order No: 
Signature: 
Requester: John Sanders 
Project Name: Scurfield Primed 
Date: 13SEP2017

Unit ID: 18831-06-01 

COS Contact: Raylene Laurin 
Company: The Sanders Company 

NOTE: STRUCTURAL SUPPORT MAY BE REQUIRED AROUND & BETWEEN MULLED UNITS. THE SIZE & TYPE TO BE DETERMINED BY A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER.
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.

R.O. 36 3/16" [919mm]
F.S. 35 7/16" [900mm]

R.O. 63 3/4" [1619mm]
F.S. 63" [1600mm]

Tempered

CA1 - Push Out Non Clad

0012: MASTER BATH: QTY: 1 (L)
0016: BATH 1: QTY: 1 (R)
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.

0015: MASTER CLOSET: QTY: 1 (R)
0017: BED 1: QTY: 1 (L)
All exterior trim and sub sills to match existing profiles will be supplied by other.
ATTACHMENT D:
WESTERN WINDOWS + DOORS: SPECs/Details.
Location(s): @ “Link” + Master Bedroom/Breakfast Bay.
Western is driven by the unifying vision that we exist as a company to create products that not only enhance the value of a home or property but also the quality of life they promote. We want to help you live better – let us show you how.

Presented by
The Sanders Company

SCURFIELD White

Quote Name: SCURFIELD White 08-22-2017
PO Number: Bid by:
Ship Date: Quote Not Ordered
Ship Via:

Billing Information

Customer Name:
Address:

Phone:
Fax:
Contact Person:

Shipping Information

Address:

Phone:
Fax:
Contact Person:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Net Price</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outside View (Scaled to Fit)**

**Line Item Description**

- **PRODUCT TYPE**
  - Row 1: Series 670 Direct Set 48 x 106
  - Row 2: Series 900 Entry Door Right 48 x 106
  - Row 3: Series 670 Direct Set 48 x 106
- **Frame Width** = 48, **Frame Height** = 106
- Unit 1, 3: Complete Unit, Thermally Broken, High Base Sill, Sill Only, Shipped, and Crated by Western Window Systems
- Unit 2: Complete Unit, Swing In Direction, Medium Stile, Standard Bottom Rail, Standard Sill, Shipped, and Crated by Western Window Systems
- **COLOR OPTIONS**
  - Navajo White
- **GLASS OPTIONS**
  - Unit 1, 2, 3: Glass Provider = Cardinal, Insulated Low E, Cardinal 366, Argon Gas, Stainless Steel Spacer, Black Spacer Color
  - Unit 1, 2, 3: Tempered Glass, 1" OA (6mm/.50"/6mm), NFRC Unit Glass Strength = Tempered
- **HARDWARE OPTIONS**
  - Unit 1, 3: Coastal Stainless Package
  - Unit 2: Coastal Stainless Package, Hardware Option = Multi-Point w/ Premium Dallas, Black Hardware, Keyed, Standard Deadbolt Location, Standard Continuous Hinge
  - NFRC
    - U-Factor = 0.41, U-Factor-Metric = 2.33, SHGC = 0.24, CR = 35, VT = 0.53, CPD = WIG-A-28-00255-00007
    - Wrapping - Perimeter Options
      - Perimeter Frame = Nailing Fin, Drip Cap = Yes, Drip Cap Application Method = Shipped Loose, Drip Cap Cut Length = 144
      - Jamb Width = 4.5"  
    - Wrapping - Mull Options
    - Mull Method = Verticals Run Thru

**Special Order Notes:**
- **Warnings:** The overall frame size is over 60 square feet and may require some units of glass to be field glazed.

**Line Notes:**

**Weight (lbs):** 628.392
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside View (Scaled to Fit)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Line Item Description**

**Room ID:** FOYER

**PRODUCT TYPE**
Row 1: Series 670 Direct Set 48 x 106
Row 2: Series 900 Entry Door Left 48 x 106
Row 3: Series 670 Direct Set 48 x 106
Frame Width = 48, Frame Height = 106
Unit 1, 3: Complete Unit, Thermally Broken, High Base Sill, Sill Only, Shipped, and crated by Western Window Systems
Unit 2: Complete Unit, Swing In Direction, Medium Stile, Standard Bottom Rail, Standard Sill, Shipped, and crated by Western Window Systems

**COLOR OPTIONS**
Navajo White

**GLASS OPTIONS**
Unit 1, 2, 3: Glass Provider = Cardinal, Insulated Low E, Cardinal S66, Argon Gas, Stainless Steel Spacer, Black Spacer Color
Unit 1, 2, 3: Tempered Glass, 1" OA (6mm/.50"/6mm), NFRC Unit Glass Strength = Tempered

**HARDWARE OPTIONS**
Unit 1, 3: Coastal Stainless Package
Unit 2: Coastal Stainless Package, Hardware Option = Multi-Point w/ Premium Dallas, Black Hardware, Keyed, Standard Deadbolt Location, Standard Continuous Hinge

**NFRC**
U-Factor = 0.41, U-Factor-Metric = 2.33, SHGC = 0.24, CR = 35, VT = 0.53, CPD = WIG-A-28-00255-00007
Wrapping - Perimeter Options
Perimeter Frame = Nailing Fin, Drip Cap = Yes, Drip Cap Application Method = Shipped Loose, Drip Cap Cut Length = 144
Jamb Width = 4.5"
Wrapping - Mull Options
Mull Method = Verticals Run Thru

**Special Order Notes:**

**Warnings:** The overall frame size is over 60 square feet and may require some units of glass to be field glazed.

**Weight (lbs):** 628.392
Line Item | Quantity | Line Item Description | Room ID: ABOVE FOYER
---|---|---|---
3-1 | 2 | Outside View (Scaled to Fit) | |

PRODUCT TYPE
Row 1: Series 670 Direct Set 48 x 94
Row 2: Series 670 Direct Set 48 x 94
Row 3: Series 670 Direct Set 48 x 94
Frame Width = 48, Frame Height = 94
Complete Unit, Thermally Broken, High Base Skin, Sill Only, Shipped, and crated by Western Window Systems

COLOR OPTIONS
Navajo White

GLASS OPTIONS
Unit 1, 2, 3: Glass Provider = Cardinal, Insulated Low E, Cardinal 368, Argon Gas, Stainless Steel Spacer, Black Spacer Color
Unit 1, 2: Tempered Glass, 1" OA (6mm/.50"/6mm), NFRC Unit Glass Strength = Tempered
Unit 3: Tempered Glass, 1/8" OA (5mm/.50"/5mm), NFRC Unit Glass Strength = Tempered

HARDWARE OPTIONS
Coastal Stainless Package
NFRC
Unit 1, 2: U-Factor = 0.41, U-Factor-Metric = 2.33, SHGC = 0.24, CR = 35, VT = 0.53, CPD = WIG-A-28-00255-00007
Unit 3: U-Factor = 0.41, U-Factor-Metric = 2.33, SHGC = 0.24, CR = 35, VT = 0.54, CPD = WIG-A-28-00255-00002
Wrapping - Perimeter Options
Perimeter Frame = Nailing Fin, Drip Cap = Yes, Drip Cap Application Method = Shipped Loose, Drip Cap Cut Length = 144
Jamb Width = 4.5"
Wrapping - Mull Options
Mull Method = Verticals Run Thru

Special Order Notes:
Warnings: The overall frame size is over 60 square feet and may require some units of glass to be field glazed.

Line Notes:
Weight (lbs): 1194.475
### Project Information 182031

**Project Name:** SCURFIELD White  
**Quote Name:** SCURFIELD White 08-22-2017  
**Ship Date:** Quote Not Ordered  
**PO Number:**  
**Ship Via:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Net Price</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Line Item Description**

**Room ID:** KITCHEN

**Outside View (Scaled to Fit)**

- **PRODUCT TYPE**
  - Row 1: Series 900 Entry Door Left 36 x 96
  - Row 2: Series 570 Direct Set 72 x 96
  - Row 3: Series 900 Entry Door Right 36 x 96
  - Unit 1, 3: Frame Width = 36, Frame Height = 96
  - Unit 2: Frame Width = 72, Frame Height = 96
  - Unit 1, 3: Complete Unit, Swing Out Direction, Narrow Stile, Thermally Broken, Standard Bottom Rail, Standard Sill, Shipped, and crated by Western Window Systems
  - Unit 2: Complete Unit, High Base Sill, Sill Only, Shipped, and crated by Western Window Systems

**COLOR OPTIONS**
- Navajo White

**GLASS OPTIONS**
- Unit 1, 2, 3: Glass Provider = Cardinal, Insulated Low E, Cardinal 366, Argon Gas, Stainless Steel Spacer, Black Spacer Color
- Unit 1, 2, 3: Tempered Glass, 1" OA (5mm/.50"/.6mm), NFRC Unit Glass Strength = Tempered

**HARDWARE OPTIONS**
- Unit 1, 3: Coastal Stainless Package, Hardware Option = Multi-Point w/ Premium Dallas, Black Hardware, Keyed, Standard Deadbolt Location, Standard Continuous Hinge
- Unit 2: Coastal Stainless Package
- NFRC
- Unit 1, 3: U-Factor = 0.56, U-Factor-Metric = 3.18, SHGC = 0.2, CR = 28, VT = 0.4, CPD = WIG-A-21-00523-00001
- Unit 2: U-Factor = 0.41, U-Factor-Metric = 2.33, SHGC = 0.24, CR = 35, VT = 0.53, CPD = WIG-A-26-00255-00007
- Wrapping - Perimeter Options
- Perimeter Frame = Nailing Fin, Drip Cap = Yes, Drip Cap Application Method = Shipped Loose, Drip Cap Cut Length = 144
- Jamb Width = 4.5"
- Wrapping - Mull Options
- Mull Method = Verticals Run Thru

**Special Order Notes:**
- **Warnings:** The overall frame size is over 60 square feet and may require some units of glass to be field glazed
- **Line Notes:** 1Mull line 5-1 above
- **Weight (lbs):** 657.7831
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Net Price</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside View (Scaled to Fit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line Item Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room ID:</strong> KITCHEN TRANSONM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRODUCT TYPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 1: Series 870 Direct Set 36 x 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2: Series 870 Direct Set 72 x 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 3: Series 870 Direct Set 36 x 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1, 3: Frame Width = 36, Frame Height = 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2: Frame Width = 72, Frame Height = 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Unit, Thermally Broken, Standard Sill, Shipped, and crated by Western Window Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLOR OPTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLASS OPTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1, 2, 3: Glass Provider = Cardinal, Insulated Low E, Cardinal 366, Argon Gas, Stainless Steel Spacer, Black Spacer Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1, 2, 3: Annealed Glass, 1&quot; OA (6mm/.50&quot;/6mm), NFRC Unit Glass Strength = Annealed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HARDWARE OPTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Stainless Package</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Factor = 0.41, U-Factor-Metric = 2.33, SHGC = 0.24, CR = 35, VT = 0.53, CPD = WIG-A-28-00255-00007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping - Perimeter Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Frame = Nailing Fin, Drip Cap = Yes, Drip Cap Application Method = Shipped Loose, Drip Cap Cut Length = 144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamb Width = 4.5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping - Mull Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull Method = Verticals Run Thru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Order Notes:**
- **Warnings:** Vertically stacked units will ship combined when verticals run through; Horizontally stacked units will ship separately when verticals run through.

**Line Notes:** 185.0489

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Net Price</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside View (Scaled to Fit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line Item Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room ID:</strong> KITCHEN SIDE LITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRODUCT TYPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 1: Series 870 Direct Set 36 x 96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2: Series 870 Direct Set 36 x 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1: Frame Width = 36, Frame Height = 96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2: Frame Width = 36, Frame Height = 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1: Complete Unit, Thermally Broken, High Base Sill, Sill Only, Shipped, and crated by Western Window Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2: Complete Unit, Thermally Broken, Standard Sill, Shipped, and crated by Western Window Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLOR OPTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLASS OPTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1, 2: Glass Provider = Cardinal, Insulated Low E, Cardinal 366, Argon Gas, Stainless Steel Spacer, Black Spacer Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1: Tempered Glass, 1&quot; OA (6mm/.50&quot;/6mm), NFRC Unit Glass Strength = Tempered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2: Annealed Glass, 1&quot; OA (6mm/.50&quot;/6mm), NFRC Unit Glass Strength = Annealed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HARDWARE OPTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Stainless Package</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Factor = 0.41, U-Factor-Metric = 2.33, SHGC = 0.24, CR = 35, VT = 0.53, CPD = WIG-A-28-00255-00007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping - Perimeter Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Frame = Nailing Fin, Drip Cap = Yes, Drip Cap Application Method = Shipped Loose, Drip Cap Cut Length = 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamb Width = 4.5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping - Mull Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull Method = Verticals Run Thru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Special Order Notes:**

**Warnings:** Vertically stacked units will ship combined when verticals run through; Horizontally stacked units will ship separately when verticals run through.

**Line Notes:**

**Weight (lbs):** 422.8897

**Line Item** | **Quantity** | **Net Price** | **Extended Price**
---|---|---|---
7-1 | 1 | Line Item Description | Room ID: Master Bedroom

**Outside View (Scaled to Fit)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row 1: Series 600 Direct Set 38 x 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2: Series 900 Double Entry Door Active/Inactive 72 x 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 3: Series 600 Direct Set 36 x 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1, 3: Frame Width = 38, Frame Height = 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2: Frame Width = 72, Frame Height = 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1, 3: Complete Unit, Thermally Broken, High Base Sill, Sill Only, Standard Stops, Shipped, and crated by Western Window Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2: Complete Unit, Swing Out Direction, Narrow Stile, Thermally Broken, Standard Bottom Rail, Standard Sill, Shipped, and crated by Western Window Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLOR OPTIONS**

Western White

**GLASS OPTIONS**

Unit 1, 2, 3: Glass Provider = Cardinal, Insulated Low E, Cardinal 366, Argon Gas, Stainless Steel Spacer, Black Spacer Color

Unit 1, 3: Annealed Glass, 7/6" OA (5mm/.50"/5mm), NFRC Unit Glass Strength = Annealed

Unit 2 Left, Right: Tempered Glass, 1" OA (5mm/.62"/5mm), NFRC Unit Glass Strength = Tempered

**HARDWARE OPTIONS**

Unit 1, 3: Coastal Stainless Package

Unit 2: Coastal Stainless Package, Hardware Option = Multi-Point w/ Premium Dallas, Black Hardware, Keyed, Standard Deadbolt Location, Standard Continuous Hinge NFRC

Unit 1, 3: U-Factor = 0.35, U-Factor-Metric = 1.99, SHGC = 0.24, CR = 44, VT = 0.55, CPD = WIG-A-15-00529-00001

Unit 2: U-Factor = 0.56, U-Factor-Metric = 3.18, SHGC = 0.2, CR = 28, VT = 0.4, CPD = WIG-A-21-00521-00001

Wrapping - Perimeter Options

Perimeter Frame = Nailing Fin, Drip Cap = Yes, Drip Cap Application Method = Shipped Loose, Drip Cap Cut Length = 144

Jamb Width = 4.5"

Wrapping - Mull Options

Mull Method = Verticals Run Thru

**Special Order Notes:**

**Warnings:** The overall frame size is over 60 square feet and may require some units of glass to be field glazed.

**Line Notes:**

**Weight (lbs):** 507.5899

---

**Printed by:** Paul G  
**Printed on:** 9/11/2017 8:10 AM  
**Page:** 7 of 8
Review Full Terms and Conditions at:
http://westernwindowsystems.com/terms-and-conditions

Quotes & Orders

- Quotes must be "Certified" for the pricing to be valid
- Pricing is valid when orders are received for immediate production before the "Quote Expiration Date" shown on the cover page
- Taxes are NOT included
- 50% deposit and signed quote are required to start production (Volume Program Excluded)

Lead Times

Please refer "Lead Times" on the Custom View homepage for current production lead time

Important Note

- When an order is submitted you should expect to receive a "Dealer Acknowledgement" the following business day
- Once ordered, the dealer has 48 hours to make any corrections or changes (Volume Program Excluded)
- If you have not received an Acknowledgment, your product is not on order
- After 48 hours corrections will not be accepted and a new order must be placed

Estimated Weight (complete units only)

Total Weight of All Units NOT including the crate weighted value in lbs (This is an estimated value only): 4224.571

---

be a yardstick of quality

some people aren’t used to an environment where excellence is expected

» steve jobs

---

Date:

Authorized Signature Required
Series 900: Hinged Door - Narrow Stile
1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame - (HLSI) - Fixed Window Sidelite Both

Hinged Door
- 1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame
- Tempered Dual Pane Glass
- Hinged Right Swing Out
- Continuous Hinge
- 0.60" High Threshold Sill

Fixed Window Sidelites
- 1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame
- Dual Pane Glass
Series 900: Hinged Door - Narrow Stile
1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame - (HLSI) - Fixed Window Sidelite Both

Section @ Mull @ Sidelite
Series 900 Narrow Stile Door (Swing-In)
Series 600 Fixed Window Sidelites
Hinged Door
- 1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame
- Tempered Dual Pane Glass
- Hinged Pair Swing - In
- Active Door Leaf at Left
- Continuous Hinge
- 1.69" High Threshold Sill

Fixed Window Sidelites
- 1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame
- Dual Pane Glass
- 1.75" High Base Sill

Series 900: Hinged Door - Narrow Stile - Left Active
1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame - (HPSI) - Fixed Window Sidelite Both - High Base Sill
Series 900: Hinged Door - Narrow Stile - Left Active

1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame - (HPSI) - Fixed Window Sidelite Both - High Base Sill
Series 900: Hinged Door - Narrow Stile - Left Active
1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame - (HPSI) - Fixed Window Sidelite Both - High Base Sill
Series 600  Fixed Window - (Thermally Broken)
Triple Horizontally Stacked - 1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame - Drip Cap
Series 600  Fixed Window - (Thermally Broken)
Triple Horizontally Stacked - 1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame - Drip Cap
Series 900: Hinged Door - Narrow Stile - Left Active

1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame - (HPSI) - Fixed Window Sidelite Both

Hinged Door
- 1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame
- Tempered Dual Pane Glass
- Hinged Pair Swing - In
- Active Door Leaf at Left
- Continuous Hinge
- 1.69" High Threshold Sill

Fixed Window Sidelites
- 1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame
- Dual Pane Glass
Series 900: Hinged Door - Narrow Stile - Left Active
1.00" Nail-On Fin Frame - (HPSI) - Fixed Window Sidelite Both
ATTACHMENT E:
WINDSOR WINDOWS + DOORS: SPECS/Details.
Location: @ Existing Attic.
THE SANDERS COMPANY
7117 ROLLING MILL RD
PO BOX 25758
BALTIMORE MD 21224
Phone: 410-288-6974 Fax: 1-410-282-9566

Customer Information:

Delivery Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUOTE #</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>CUSTOMER PO#</th>
<th>DATE PRINTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1214630</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/11/2017 7:31 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUSTOMER JOB NAME</th>
<th>TERMS</th>
<th>QUOTE NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scurfield</td>
<td>Scurfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Room ID</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Overall RO</th>
<th>Overall Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108 3/4&quot; X 38 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>108&quot; X 38*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Units viewed from exterior.
* Units meeting Egress size conform to 2015 IRC Section R310.2 Egress requirements; Local codes may differ. Customer is responsible to confirm units meet all applicable requirements.

Submitted By: _______________________________ Date: _______________________________

Accepted By: _______________________________ Date: _______________________________

We appreciate the opportunity to provide you with this quote!
Job Name: Scurfield Garage- Exterior Door
Potomac Valley Builders

Ship To:
The Sanders Company
7117-7201 Rolling Mill Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21224-0458
USA

john@thesanderscompany.com
Dear John Sanders,

We are pleased to present the following proposal. Please review this document, which includes a summary of the items proposed and a detailed description of the specifications requested. Pricing for each line item is broken down on the last pages of this document, within the door list section.

To proceed with order, all proposals will need shop drawings produced by Upstate Door. After pricing is approved, please notify us and we will submit this proposal for drawing upon request. A Purchase Order Number may be required prior to drawing production, based on size of order. All drawing revisions will require a Purchase Order Number to finalize order, please sign all pages of this document and all accompanying copies of shop drawings. Orders will not be processed until all pages of both documents are signed. Please note that your Account Representative may require additional documents to be signed per Upstate Door policy, based on the specifications of your project. This includes, but is not limited to, a warranty disclaimer form for units that do not meet our warranty parameters and/or a pre-finish authorization form that outlines our factory finishing standards.

Please allow 1-2 days for the order to be processed once all documents are signed and received by Upstate Door. An order acknowledgment will be sent to you to confirm the order. Lead time begins based on the processed order date, and not the date that the signatures were received.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions. We appreciate your continued business.

Thank you,
David Farrell

---

Ship Via: Upstate Door Truck; 1 3/4" thickness
FOB: Destination
Add $910 for 2 1/4" thickness

Lead Time: within 5 weeks FROM FINALIZED ORDER.
Delivery: Included to tailgate of truck for distribution by others.

Changes: Minimum of $100 charge for changes after order is processed.
** All errors are subject to correction; estimate is valid for 30 days.
** Customer is responsible for verifying all information is correct before order is approved
** All orders are produced in accordance with Upstate's approved paperwork.
** Any changes to specs, door list or delivery address, must be noted on Upstate paperwork prior to sign off
** Please see www.upstatedoor.com for complete warranty information.
** Any claims for damaged or missing items must be submitted to Upstate within 5 days of delivery to The Sanders Company

Approved by: 
Date: 

Sub Total: 
6% Sales Tax: 

Est Total: 
Terms: 1% 10 Net 30
** plus applicable sales taxes based on ship to address unless resale cert on file

We appreciate your business!!
**Details**

**Line 1: DOOR 101**

**Door:** 1 3/4" x 40" x 90" Exterior SG African Mahogany Flush Door  

**Construction:** Solid Extra@ core with 3/16" Planks  

**Includes:** Engineered Core in Stiles  

**V-Grooves, Inswing, RH**  

**Notes:** Unit to have one groove down the middle of the door that is the full length of the door  

**Prehang:** 1 1/4" x 4 9/16" SG African Mahogany Single Rabbeted (and kerfed) Jamb (Standard hinge layout)  

**Hardware:** 4"x4" Brass BB Oil Rubbed Bronze Emtek Square Hinge, (2) pair  

**Bottom:** Standard Intek Sweep  

**Stilt:** Adjustable Stilt (Aluminum, Dark Bronze Finish), 1 1/8" x 8 3/4", with 4" horns  

**Includes:** Weatherstripping, Q-Lon, Brown  

**Prefinish:** Top and Bottom Sealed with Clear Coat.

**Line 2: MISC**

**Miscellaneous:** Delivery Charge  

**Notes:**  

Anything not specified, such as casing, locksets, or bores, is not included.

Upstate Door reserves the right to apply Primed Steel hinges to units if hinges specified have yet to arrive to our facility. This is attributed to our vendor having longer lead times than our lead times stated to our customers. Should this occasion arise, back charges from our customer are null and void for the cost to remove the primed hinges and the installation of the proper hinges that are on back order.

Doors that are Downsized and Bevelled will be approximately 1/4" smaller in width than the specified size (per door). Prefinishing will add 1 - 2 weeks onto the stated lead time.

Standard hinge layout is: 7" from top, 10 1/2" from bottom, middle hinge(s) evenly spaced between top and bottom hinges. Upstate will follow the hinge manufacturer’s stated and/or measured swag when machining for hinges to maintain proper reveals. This may cause hinges to be proud of jambs/door.

There will be natural variations in wood color and grain that show when the finish is applied because different pieces of wood accept finish differently. This is viewed as part of the natural beauties of wood.

Clear Coat Sealing T & B indicates finish sanding with clearcoat sealing on top and bottom of door(s).

Warranty Information

Exterior units must have an overhang/awning above that extends 1/2 the distance of the entry height. Please see our warranty or ask your customer service representative for more information.

Units must be finished or sealed within 1 week from delivery of the product. Please see our warranty or ask your customer service representative for more information.

**Door List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ln</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Jamb</th>
<th>Swing</th>
<th>Door</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75&quot; x 40&quot; x 90&quot;</td>
<td>1.25&quot;x4.5825&quot;</td>
<td>Inswing</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SG African Mahogany Flush Door, w/Eng Stiles, w/PH, V-Grooves, , , Delivery Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery Charge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total:

Approved by:  

Date:  

**We appreciate your business!!**
ATTACHMENT G:

*Driveway Materials:* Exposed Aggregate and Grass Strip.

*Image to be used for stylistic reference only.*
PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDY

Scurfield Addition
4721 Essex Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

HAWP Application
October 11, 2017
* Old view prior to two-story addition.

Bird's Eye View Looking North from Essex Street

Image Source: Bing.com
* Old view prior to two-story addition.

Bird's Eye View Looking West from Essex Street

Image Source: Bing.com
Front Elevation. View from End of Driveway.

Image Source: Google.com
Street View.
View from Essex Street looking West.
House on Right, Beyond Tree Cover.
4727 Essex Street (Front Elevation). View from Essex Street looking West. House is Neighbor to Left of Project Site.
Front Elevation.
Close-Up View.
Front Elevation.
View looking West at Front Yard.
T12.
28" Poplar to remain.

Side Elevation.
View looking at Right Yard.
Rear Elevation.
View looking at Rear Yard from Deck.

T10.
46" Empress in decline.
To be removed.
T4.
18” Black Cherry proposed to be removed to accommodate extended driveway.

Partial Rear Elevation.
View looking South.
4717 Essex Street (West Elevation). View to Neighbor from Rear Yard.

T11. Holly to remain.
Partial Side and Rear Elevation.
View looking East at Rear Yard.

*Note: Panoramic View may cause slight distortion to image.
Side and Rear Elevation.*
View looking West.

*Note: Panoramic View may cause slight distortion to image.
T12.
28" Poplar to remain.

T10.
46" Empress in decline.
To be removed.

Side and Rear Elevation.*
View looking West at Rear Yard.

*Note: Panoramic View may cause slight distortion to image.
Rear Elevation.
View from Rear Yard.
Partial Side Elevation.
View looking South.

a. Partial Side Elevation.
View to Second Story.

b. Elevation Detail.
View at Bay Window.

c. Elevation Detail.
View to Front Porch.
Tree Location Diagram.

T15 (Qty. 22)
Neighbor (Left) @ 4727 Essex Avenue.
Side Elevation.
View looking from Project Site.
Neighbors.

Project Site
4721 Essex Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Neighbor (Right)
4717 Essex Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
Neighbor (Right) @ 4717 Essex Avenue.
Side Elevation.
View looking from Project Site.
Precedent @ 4722 Dorset Avenue.
Partial Front Elevation.
View looking up Driveway.
June 28, 2017

Plans and Elevations
Existing Roof Plan

1/8" = 1'-0"
First Floor Plan - Proposed

1/8" = 1'-0"
Second Floor Plan - Proposed

1/8" = 1'-0"
June 28, 2017
Preliminary Consultation Transcript
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

- - - - - - - - - - - - - X
::
PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION ::
4721 Essex Avenue ::
- - - - - - - - - - - - - X

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
June 28, 2017, commencing at 7:34 p.m., in the MRO
Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland
20910, before:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Kirwan, Chair
Sandra Heiler
Brian Carroll
Kenneth Firestone
Richard Arkin
Eliza Voigt
Robert Sutton
ALSO PRESENT:
Scott Whipple
Michael Kyne

APPEARANCES

STATEMENT OF: PAGE
Anne Decker 12
Michelle Scurfield 13
Lila Fendrick 18

TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE

I. HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMITS 4
   Case A 4
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   Case C 4
   Case D 4
   Case E 4
   Case F 4
   Case G 4
   Case H 4
   Case I 4
   Case J 4
   Case K 4

II. PRELIMINARY CONSULTATIONS 4
    Case A 5

III. MINUTES 27
    A. February 8, 2017

IV. OTHER BUSINESS 27
    A. Commission Items
    B. Staff Items
Chase; Case 35/13-17M at 101 Primrose Street, Chevy Chase; Case 14/53-17A at 9821 Wightman Road, Gaithersburg; Case 37/03-17PP at 22 Montgomery Avenue, Takoma Park; Case 31/07-17D at 10022 Pratt Place, Silver Spring; Case 35/13-17N at 15 East Lenox Street, Chevy Chase; Case 37/03-17QQ at 312 Tulip Avenue, Takoma Park; Case 37/03-17RR at 612 Philadelphia Avenue, Takoma Park; and Case No. 28/14-17A Revised at 16501 Norwood Road, Sandy Spring.

MR. KIRWAN: Is there a second?

MR. FIRESTONE: I'll second the motion.

MR. KIRWAN: Any discussion? All in favor, please raise your right hand.

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: The motion passes unanimously. Those cases have been approved. We want to thank the applicants for doing good work on those applications to make those easily approvable by the Commission this evening. And, for next steps, please contact Staff during regular business hours.

The next item on our agenda is a preliminary consultation, Case II.A at 4721 Essex Avenue in Chevy Chase. Do we have a Staff Report?

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do have a Staff Report. This is a third preliminary consultation, and this is a primary pre-1915 resource within the Somerset Historic District, a
Queen Anne foursquare style house, circa 1900. And some background. The applicants have been here before for two preliminary consultations. One at the November 16, 2016, and one at the January 25, 2017 HPC meetings. And at the latest meeting, the Commission's concerns were the scale and massing of the proposed additions was too large and overwhelmed the historic house; the ridgeline of the proposed center addition exceeded that of the historic house, and it should be lower than that of the historic house. The proposed additions were too large and would reduce the open space detracting from the streetscape. The proposed rear additions were too linear and should take visual cues and shapes from the historic house.

So, the applicant has returned with a revised proposal, and that current proposal is to remove an existing one-story rear addition and rear deck, construct a two-story addition at the rear of the historic house, extend and alter the existing driveway to the rear of the property, construct a one-story, one car detached garage at the rear of the property, replace the existing concrete front walkway, install new hardscaping features and remove trees.

So, some of these photographs may be familiar to you. I'm just going to walk around the property. And we've all seen this property twice before at least. And we can return to these later if we need to reference them. And
some with the plans. So, these are the current plans, and
I'll just sort of go through slowly, but feel free to ask me
to reference these later. And the applicable guidelines in
this case are the Somerset Historic District Guidelines, and
the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. And
because we haven't seen this one in a while, the Staff
Report went out two weeks ago, I'm just sort of going to go
over the Staff Report in my presentation just to make sure
we're all up to speed.

So, Staff's remaining concerns about this
property, or not necessarily concerns, but the issues that
Staff would like to address and for the Commission to
comment on are, scale and massing, the ridgeline and the
side projections. So the square footage of the proposed
rear additions have been reduced from 1,592 square feet to
1,406 square feet. The applicants have attempted to reduce
the perceived scale and massing by reorienting the center
addition, eliminating the side projections at the extreme
rear, and reducing the ridge height of the center addition,
making it to the ridge, equal to the ridge height of the
historic house.

The proposed hyphen and extreme rear addition have
flat roofs, making them much lower than the historic house.
The proposed revisions have reduced the perceived scale and
massing of the proposed additions, diminishing the potential
for scale and massing to detract from the District. And, Staff asks the Commission to provide any guidance that would further minimize the visual impact of the additions. And, Staff does note the slight 10-inch projection which is still proposed at the right side. And, there are two stucco-clad chimneys proposed for the center addition. That will be one on each side, and the chimney on the right side will project into the right-side yard and be clearly visible from the public right-of-way. 

Staff is concerned with the selected material for the chimneys as there are no instances of stucco cladding on the historic house, and it may be incompatible. So, I ask for your guidance regarding the chimneys and the chimney materials.

Shape and orientation. The proposed center addition has been reoriented reducing the depth of the proposed additions. The depth of the additions have been reduced from the previously proposed 67 feet, four inches, to 57 feet, five and a half inches. By reorienting the proposed center addition, the proposed addition has become a series of repeating shapes taking cues from the foursquare historic house. Side gables are proposed for the center addition, providing visual reference to the cross gables on the house. Staff asks the Commission to provide any guidance regarding the shape and orientation which may make
the proposed additions more compatible with the house.

And then other issues or aspects of the proposal include the driveway. The existing driveway will be replaced with a driveway composed of exposed aggregate ribbons with a center grass panel, a five feet deep cobblestone threshold will transition between the public sidewalk and the ribbons, a 26 feet long cobblestone strip is proposed between the ribbons at the front of the driveway adjacent to the proposed turnaround. A second exposed aggregate turnaround is proposed at the rear adjacent to the garage. The garage will be clad with wood siding and will have a standing seam metal roof, and an aluminum and glass garage door is proposed at the left side of the garage.

And there are a variety of hardscaping issues. I'll just run through them quickly. The applicants propose to replace the existing concrete walkway at the front with a bluestone or flagstone walkway. Rebuild an existing ornamental stacked stone planting bed wall with fieldstone, with a more formal design. Construct two landings with steps at the left side of the proposed hyphen addition. Construct similar landings on the right side of the hyphen at the right side of the extreme rear addition. Construct a raised terrace with steps at the right side of the proposed additions. Construct a dining terrace at the right side of the proposed garage. Install stepping stone paths from the
garage to the driveway and terraces.

And, given the importance of open space as referenced in the District Guidelines, Staff asks for your guidance regarding the amount of the proposed hardscaping and its potential to detract from the streetscape.

Continuing with other items, a fence. The applicants propose to relocate and rebuild an existing fence at the right side/front. The existing fence is a four-foot-high wooden picket fence, and it is located at the approximate mid-point of the historic front porch, while the proposed fence will be a four foot high wooden picket fence that will be coplanar with the front of the porch.

And trees. The applicant proposed to remove five mature trees to accommodate the construction of the garage, turnaround and additions. A row of 22 hemlock trees is proposed to be removed from the front of the property. And again, referring to the Guidelines, given the importance of mature trees in the District, Staff asks for your guidance regarding the tree removals.

The LAP has commented on this project. At their June 5th meeting, they recommended approval. And, with that, I can take any questions that you might have for Staff.

MR. KIRWAN: Any questions for Staff? Yes, Commissioner Arkin?
MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On Circle 25, has the applicant said what material will be used in the -- for the exterior of the basement on the far right? It's actually past the hyphen.

MR. KYNE: If it is in the application, but not noted in the Staff Report, it may have been overlooked by Staff. So, I think the best thing to do is ask the applicant when they come forward, since they are here, if they can clarify the material for the foundation.

MR. ARKIN: Okay, thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff?

MS. VOIGT: Have we seen the driveway treatment previously? I can't remember all the -- the detail.

MR. KYNE: I believe that we have seen a conceptual, sort of a location of the driveway, but we haven't seen materials previously. I could be mistaken. This thing has -- it goes back to November of 2016, but that's my recollection.

MR. KIRWAN: Another question, Michael. The windows on the historic house are just one-over-one no divided lites, is that correct? It's a little hard to gather from the, that's what the drawings indicate.

MR. KYNE: I think that is correct. Let's see if the photographs can shed any light on that. I think I also heard from the audience that that is accurate, but let's
just take a look. So, yes, that does appear to be the case.

One-over-one.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff? All
right, if not, we welcome the applicant to please come
forward. We can give you seven minutes for your testimony,
and we probably have some follow-up questions. I think you
know the drill, Ms. Decker. Make sure that the microphones
are turned on before you speak, and state your name for the
record.

MS. DECKER: Hi, Anne Decker, Anne Decker

Architects.

MS. FENDRICK: Lila Fendrick, Lila Fendrick

Landscape Architects.

MS. SCURFIELD: Michelle Scurfield, I am now the
owner of the house. It's nice to meet all of you finally.

MS. DECKER: Regarding your questions, the house,
we're proposing is stone based for the addition of the rear
of the house.

MR. ARKIN: I'm having trouble hearing you.

MS. DECKER: I'm sorry. I don't do this often.

Stone based for the rear of the house, the addition. You'd
asked about what the material was for the foundation.

MR. ARKIN: Right.

MS. DECKER: Yeah.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.
MS. DECKER: And then in terms of the window, it is a one-over-one on the existing house.

MR. KIRWAN: Do you want to provide any specific testimony, or do you just want to take our questions?

MS. DECKER: Oh, I was thinking we would take the -- field your questions. But one thing, just in terms of reorienting that, the main body of the addition which houses the dining room and kitchen, we've turned that. Again, I think by the turning, we've gone back to the first scheme, the initial presentation, although it's shrunk quite a bit in terms of overall the square footage. But the hope with this mass in turning it was, again, to speak to bite size pieces on the existing house while also shielding the addition further beyond at the kitchen, mudroom zone. So, I think the perceived scale of the house feels a lot, feels a lot smaller.

MS. SCURFIELD: And, if I could just add, we came, I think we had not purchased the house when we were -- we had just purchased the house in March. So, I heard him say, you know, we had come before you, but I think they were like feasibility studies on really what was buildable. And then, we got a sense of what you were asking for, and then we went forward with much more detail. And it's not that it matters, but I thought I'd just clarify that while we're here so many times.
MR. KIRWAN: All right. Do we have any questions for the applicants?

MS. HEILER: Can you tell me the dimensions of these chimneys? I'm less interested in the height than the width. It looks like it's only about two feet.

MS. DECKER: We have it there at one foot 10 and a half projection past the addition. And it's five six, I'm sorry. Five-foot six wide.

MS. HEILER: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: And what is the material of the base of the existing house?

MS. DECKER: It's a mesh of brick, and I think, concrete. Yeah, concrete block.

MR. KIRWAN: And what was your thinking about switching over to stone versus the --

MS. DECKER: Versus brick?

MR. KIRWAN: Versus brick.

MS. DECKER: The thought was that we could have it emerge from the ground a little bit more. So it links more to our side walls.

MR. KIRWAN: And when then the switch to stucco on the chimneys as opposed to stone?

MS. DECKER: Just articulating and keeping a little more clean line. I think that was a personal preference.
MR. KIRWAN: The other question I have is, so with all the existing windows being one-over-one, no divided mutins. Some of the windows on your addition having no mutins, but then other windows do. What's the thinking there?

MS. DECKER: Part of was again to break down the scale of it, and then also, and differentiate so there's a little articulation at the top and this link. But you can see that we've also tried to speak to the old house in terms of our bay having more glass, and then the windows in our side addition may as well, so that those being clear glass kind of relates a little bit more to the base of the house, which picks up the modulation and rhythm of the screened porch, for instance. Because I think what that does is, it creates more of a horizontal line. So that was part of it just to open up a little bit more in that area and then the areas above to differentiate it a little bit.

MR. KIRWAN: I have another question. I think the one component to this revision that I still feel is a little large is this, the stair hall. When you look at it and the scale of the other rooms in the plan, it looks enormous and vast. I'm just curious what's driving the size of that, your hyphen piece, basically. The size of that space?

MS. DECKER: Part of that was just to create a little bit more gracious feel to the entry, which I know is
really important to Michelle.

MR. KIRWAN: I guess when you compare it to the entry of the historic house, it's enormous. So, I'm trying to --

MS. DECKER: Yeah.

MR. KIRWAN: -- find what's driving it? You know, I mean, it seems like it could be four feet narrower, and still feel gracious. I mean, I, you know, I'm trying to understand what is establishing that dimension of 15 feet?

MS. DECKER: I think, again, that was, I guess, to create a little bit more of breathing room when you entered into the house. And then also to read through and pull that link so that it wasn't -- just a little bit more gracious, and that is the reason for the stair hall being so big. Michelle do you have anything to add?

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions?

MS. SCURFIELD: For me, this link, I see what you're saying. I think it was to, you know, kind of separate the new from the old so they could compliment each other, and was not to be a glassy portion. It is on the large scale but, I guess it, you know, it's meant to feel gracious on purpose, maybe.

MR. KIRWAN: I'll speak more about that in deliberations. I don't have a question specifically.

Commissioner Arkin?
MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have two questions. Directing your attention to pages for Circle 25 and 24. It appears that they're overhangs at the ends of each of the roof pieces everywhere but on the cross-gable middle of new construction. Can you tell me why it is that you decided not to do overhangs on that piece?

MS. DECKER: That was just to create a little bit more, again, a more clean line, which was the main direction we were hoping to take this.

MR. ARKIN: And then, similarly, on the fairly significant chimneys, what was your thinking of having a smooth stucco exterior and the very simple shapes, no detailing?

MS. DECKER: Yeah, that was also, again, to just go a little bit more modern. We tried the stone base, which is, I guess, which you may perceive. We have a stone base, and then have it go around to the chimney. We took a look at that, but I think the feeling was that we'd like to have it even more clean-lined.

MR. ARKIN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. VOIGT: Since the landscape architect is here. I don't want her to be bored. So, I hadn't seen the driveway, I guess we hadn't seen it, and I just wanted to hear a little bit more about it because this is kind of now such a nice natural setting, and it seems like there's a lot
going on there. But maybe there's not. Maybe that's just how I'm reading it. And maybe talk about some of the trees that you're also removing?

MS. FENDRICK: When we started the project, we actually looked at three different locations for the garage, and we started looking at the garage in the east, northeast corner, and realized that would have a very devastating impact on the widest part of the site, the most open part of the site. And also, there were grading concerns, and we couldn't actually bring a new curb cut in because of the utility pole and a street tree. So that was not possible.

We looked at the driveway in the northwest corner, and realized we wouldn't have very good turning access actually into the garage, so that became unfeasible. And we ended up putting the garage directly behind the addition where it could be the least visible from the street, and it also gave us a turning space outside the garage. And it worked better for the, in terms of grading. And it worked well with the preliminary proposal to remove a certain number of trees that had been presented last Fall to the Town of Somerset. And they had previously approved the removal of a number of trees on the west side to allow a driveway on this west side.

So, the driveway on the west side allows us to use an existing curb cut. We're trying to minimize the amount
of paving in this driveway, and so we're using a traditional
historic motif of two concrete strips, except these would be
exposed concrete aggregate, and there's an attached photo in
the application which shows exposed concrete aggregate
strips with an inner band of cobblestone. The photo is
really just to show you the exposed concrete aggregate.

We have already done a driveway in the Town of
Somerset with two driveway strips of concrete, an this is a
historic detail. So that the grass up in the middle, this
makes this look grassier. Towards the front, we're
proposing a transitional zone, a bridge between the apron
and the sidewalk of just cobblestone, and there will be a
cofflestone band in place of grass for the first 20 some
feet, I don't remember the exact dimension. And that's to
allow the owners to turn around and come and back up, or
park a couple of cars in the front yard. And there are a
number of new houses in the Town of Somerset that do have
front yard turning spaces or parking spaces.

And, another precedent image we included in this
package was a picture of cobblestones with grass joints.
So, we're proposing that as a space in the front yard. So,
the grass will make it look very soft and pretty and the
cobblestone is a historic material that's used in a lot of
historic neighborhoods.

We're actually saving a couple of trees that were
originally designated to be removed in the prior tree removal report. There is a Dogwood in the front yard that we need to remove to provide this turning space, and there's a very low branched Redbud in the northwest corner that's branching at 12 feet and going off about 18 feet that's not really a tree, that would need to be removed to provide the turn around space in the garage.

There are a number of doors that allow the owners the access the garden, and so we're providing landings and steps down from those. Those would be traditionally detailed. And the largest outdoor space is a raised terrace off the family room/kitchen with steps down, and there's a walkway system leading to the garage.

MR. KYNE: I just want to interject for a second. So the plan with the proposed driveway and the turnarounds, etcetera, was inadvertently left out of the presentation tonight. It's actually Circle 28, which would have been right after the one on the screen. So, if you have your Staff Reports with you, you can turn to Circle 28 for that. And then the photograph that was referenced is on Circle 13.

MS. DECKER: Michael, do you have an image of this that can be shown on the screen, this actual site plan?

MR. KYNE: That's the one I'm referring to, 28, it was inadvertently left out.

MS. DECKER: Oh, okay. It's in the report. Okay,
great, thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for the applicant? All right, if not, we'll move into deliberations. If you'd turn your microphones off, we'd appreciate that, and we'll give you our thoughts on this revision. Do we have a volunteer to kick things off, either end of the dais?

MS. HEILER: I want to say that I think you've come a long way. The current design does not in any way resemble the massing of the earlier things. It doesn't have that look of a giant addition attached to a smaller house, and I commend you on changing the orientation of that center part of your addition, lowering the roof ridge. I think I'm very much in favor of what you've done here.

I have two issues. And one is, one that the Chairman brought up earlier, the size of the stair hall. It's very large, and I can appreciate that it's quite gracious. You know, our biggest concern has been on the size of this addition, and making that shorter could save, say four or five feet on the depth of this very large addition. I think that that's something that you need to at least to consider, because it's one place where there just appears to be more space than is needed, and it's a place where you could save.

My other concern is more serious, and that has to
do with the chimneys. These chimneys are almost monumental compared to the rest of the house. They're very large rectangular structures in a contrasting material. So they draw attention to themselves. Obviously, the best thing that I can mention would be to inset them, so that there aren't these two very large structures attached to the sides of the house. And let the material that pierces the roof be brick like the chimney on the historic house.

Another possibility, I know you want it to be modern, you know, there is no prior place plan to put the second floor. So that they could be larger where the firebox is, and narrower where they come out the side. Doing them, you know, in brick would at least match the chimney on the historic house. I think in their current form, they just add enormously to the bulk of this addition by doing these two large contrasting material structures on either side of the house. And I think that they need another solution. Otherwise, I think you've come a long way, and I have no objections at all to the plans for the landscaping or the driveway.

MR. KIRWAN: I'll just follow-up on that, because I have some similar concerns. I agree with Commissioner Heiler, the monumentality is a good word to use in this case, of the chimneys is just too monumental. I think they ought to be, the inset idea is a good one, or scaling them
better with, in addition with materials as well as in their
form, I think would help quite a bit.

I too agree with Commissioner Heiler that the
stair hall is just too large. I mean, I think it would
really benefit the entire project by just squeezing that
down as well, making that a little bit narrower and, you
know, I think if you take your clues from the front hall and
living room portion of the house, that sort of width we see
in the floor plan before we get to the projected bays of the
resource might be a good width to emulate in the stair hall.

Just to keep it consistent.

Again, I think with both of those two components,
The chimneys and the stair hall, the word monumental, the
word gracious has been used, I think the understated nature
of the historic resource is fighting that. And I think you
ought to pull a little bit more from that understated nature
of the resource when tackling those two components.

The last concern I have is the windows. I think,
I agree with you that pushing this toward a more modern
clean-lined vocabulary is terrific. I think that's a good
way to approach this addition. But I think the mutins on
the windows are really fighting against that. And, I think
you really could go consistently with no mutins, and have
large panes of glass or maybe a mixture of double-hungs like
on the house with casements. But, I don't think the mutins
help the project at all. I would just go with all, you know
full lite glass where possible on that.

And, like Commissioner Heiler, I feel very good
about where this is going, where this has come from, and I
think the landscape plan is terrific, and the terraces and
the garden elements, I think all that's looking terrific.
So, I think it's just a few tweaks to the project at this
point, from my perspective, would make this an approvable
HAWP.

MS. VOIGT: I'll just concur with the other two
commissioners, and say that I really appreciate you coming
in for the third time, and I thank you for highlighting
what's important for this historic community, and this
historic house by shrinking the massing of the property.
You know, the chimneys, I agree with them, and it may be as
simple as the material change to lighten up. And I think
the landscaping, when I heard you explain it, I was a little
concerned that it was going to be, you know, complicated and
overbearing, you know, because this is kind of like a
country, you know, 1900 country home. But, I think it looks
great. And, as they said, I think with some tweaks in
reducing some of these larger features, it will be great.
Thank you.

MR. CARROLL: I don't have a lot to add. Thank
you. I think it's a big improvement from where you started.
I think it's going to do a lot more for the existing house at this point. You know, I guess, just echoing the comments of some of the other commissioners, maybe just changing the materials of the chimneys would call this attention. It seems like they're, just because they're on a corner of the house, that white stucco is really going to call a lot of attention. But other than that, I think it looks great and congratulations.

MR. SUTTON: I'm the new kid on the block, I wasn't here for the first two times. So I don't know what it looked like to begin with. It must have been pretty big. I agree with my fellow commissioners. I think the -- I mean, I look at it, the addition looks very large to me, and I'm just not used to that. But, I guess, the original one was much larger. But, I think the comments that have been made about the chimney, the stair hall, anything that can shrink the addition, and personally, I think the chimneys seem to be the big issue. If something could be done to make them less prominent, that would be very good.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with the comments that this has evolved a great deal over the long period of time that you've been working on this with us. And I think it's greatly improved. I do have real problems, I think, with those very modern and very attention getting chimneys as they're rendered on these elevations.
And I think that in combination with the lack of overhang on the roof of the middle addition, makes that element look very modern, more modern actually than the right piece on Circle 24, the left piece on Circle 25. I think the stucco element that you've used for, on 25, on the left elevation at the left side works very well. But I think on the chimney, a light stucco will really be the focus of attention more than it need be.

The suggestions that have been offered to inset the chimneys or to narrow them, I think would be helpful. Changing material would be helpful. But, with that middle element being so very modern looking, and I think more modern looking than the final element, I think it will be somewhat jarring when it's built. So I'd like to see you play around with that a little more. Thank you.

MR. FIRESTONE: I want to thank you for your perseverance in going through three of these preliminaries, and I'm going to concur with the, all the other commissioners, and I really have nothing to add.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay, I think you've heard consistent feedback from us. Staff will do a good job of helping you interpret that, and from what I hear, I think you're ready for your HAWP when you come back with some of the revisions that we've suggested, and we look forward to seeing you then. Thank you so much for all the work on this. I think
It's looking great.

All right. The next item on our agenda are minutes. I think we have one, the minutes of February 8th to approve tonight. Do we have a motion?

MS. VOIGT: Motion to approve the February 8, 2016 minutes.

MR. KIRWAN: Do we have second?

MS. HEILER: I second the motion.

MR. KIRWAN: Any discussion? All in favor, please raise your right hand.

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: The minutes of February 8, 2017 are approved. Do we have a volunteer for this evening?

MS. VOIGT: I'll volunteer.

MR. KIRWAN: Very good. Any Commission items tonight? Any Staff items? All right, then we are adjourned. Thank you.

(whereupon, at 8:14 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)