MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 12 Hesketh St., Chevy Chase  
Meeting Date: 1/11/2017

Resource: Contributing Resource  
Report Date: 1/4/2017
Chevy Chase Village Historic District

Applicant: Neil Cullen  
Public Notice: 12/28/2016
(Jason Gagen, Architect)

Review: HAWP  
Tax Credit: N/A

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

PROPOSAL: Rear addition and window replacement

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that HPC approve with conditions the HAWP application.

1. The proposed replacement roofing materials will be architectural asphalt shingles, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

2. The proposed front door replacement is not approved.

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

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District
STYLE: Dutch Colonial
DATE: c. 1916-1927

BACKGROUND

The applicant previously appeared before the Commission at the December 7, 2016 HPC meeting for a preliminary consultation. At that time, the Commission expressed the following concerns regarding the applicant’s proposal:

- The proposed stone chimney was incompatible with the historic house, and a brick chimney would be more appropriate.
- Replacing the original windows on the front elevation has the potential to detract from the streetscape of the historic district. The Commission was less concerned about replacing the original windows on the side elevations.
- A spread mull is needed at all proposed paired and ganged windows.
- The ridgeline of the proposed rear addition was too high.

There was also some concern about the general incompatibility of the proposed rear addition with the
historic house, and the Commission encouraged the applicant to explore alternatives that may be more compatible; however, the Commission did indicate that, due to a lack of visibility, the proposed rear addition would be reluctantly approved.

The Commission also encouraged the applicant to create a tree protection plan to ensure that two elm trees (one at 10 Hesketh Street and one on the property line between 10 Hesketh Street and the subject property) would not be impacted by the proposal.

The applicant has revised their proposal consistent with the Commission’s comments and returned with a HAWP application.

**PROPOSAL:**

- Remove an existing two-story rear addition
- Construct a new two-story rear addition
- Replace the historic windows with new windows
- Restore/extend the existing driveway to the existing rear garage
- Remove one 7" dbh sycamore tree
- Replace the existing asphalt shingle roofing on the historic house with synthetic slate roofing
- Replace the existing front door within the existing opening

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

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

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

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

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

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

(4) The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or

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

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

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

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

*Chevy Chase Historic District Guidelines*

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

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

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

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

The Guidelines state three basic policies that should be adhered to, including:

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

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

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

The Guidelines that pertain to this project are as follows:
Doors should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not. For outstanding resources, they should be subject to strict scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way. Addition of compatible storm doors should be encouraged.

Driveways should be subject to strict scrutiny only with regard to their impact on landscaping, particularly mature trees. In all other respects, driveways should be subject to lenient scrutiny. Parking pads and other paving in front yards should be discouraged.

Lot coverage should be subject to strict scrutiny in view of the critical importance of preserving the Village’s open park-like character.

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

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

Roofing materials should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not. In general, materials differing from the original should be approved for contributing resources.

Tree removal should be subject to strict scrutiny and consistent with the Chevy Chase Village Urban Forest Ordinance.

Windows (including window replacement) should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not. For outstanding resources, they should be subject to strict scrutiny. Addition of compatible exterior storm windows should be encouraged, whether visible from the public right-of-way or not. Vinyl and aluminum windows (other than storm windows) should be discouraged. Addition of security bars should be subject to lenient scrutiny, whether visible from the public right-of-way or not.

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 applicant previously appeared before the Commission at the December 7, 2016 HPC meeting for a preliminary consultation. At that time, the Commission expressed the following concerns regarding the applicant’s proposal:

- The proposed stone chimney was incompatible with the historic house, and a brick chimney would be more appropriate.
- Replacing the original windows on the front elevation has the potential to detract from the streetscape of the historic district. The Commission was less concerned about replacing the original windows on the side elevations.
- A spread mull is needed at all proposed paired and ganged windows.
- The ridgeline of the proposed rear addition was too high.

There was also some concern about the general incompatibility of the proposed rear addition with the historic house, and the Commission encouraged the applicant to explore alternatives that may be more compatible; however, the Commission did indicate that, due to a lack of visibility, the proposed rear addition would be reluctantly approved.

The Commission also encouraged the applicant to create a tree protection plan to ensure that two elm trees (one at 10 Hesketh Street and one on the property line between 10 Hesketh Street and the subject property) would not be impacted by the proposal.

The applicant has revised their proposal consistent with the Commission’s comments and returned with a
HAWP application. Specifically, the applicant has made the following revisions:

- The currently proposed chimney is brick.
- The original windows on the front elevation will be retained.
- The ridgeline of the proposed rear addition has been lowered by 4", making it a total of 8" below the ridgeline of the historic house.
- A 6" spread mull has been added at the paired and ganged windows, which have been limited to the rear elevation.
- The applicant proposes an alternative design for the addition, with a gambrel roof form that takes cues from the historic house.
- A tree protection plan is proposed to ensure that the elm tree at 10 Hesketh Street and the elm tree on the property line between 10 Hesketh Street and the subject property are not impacted.

New aspects of the applicant’s proposal include replacing the existing asphalt shingle roofing on the historic house with synthetic slate and replacing the existing front door within the existing opening.

The Guidelines state that “[r]oofing materials should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not. In general, materials differing from the original should be approved for contributing resources.” The Commission generally discourages the use of synthetic slate, and, in this case, staff suggests that architectural asphalt shingles may be more appropriate, with less potential to detract from the subject property and surrounding historic district. The applicant has indicated that they would be amenable to using architectural asphalt shingles in place of synthetic slate. Staff recommends a condition of approval, stipulating that the proposed replacement roofing materials will be architectural asphalt shingles, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

The Guidelines state that “[d]oors should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not.” The applicant has provided photographs of the existing front door, which suggests that it is likely historic. No documentation has been provided to indicate that the existing front door is severely deteriorated and in need of replacement, and staff recommends that the proposed front door replacement not be approved.

The applicant has indicated that the proposed new windows (including the replacement windows on the side elevations) will be wood clad SDL windows, but has not provided any additional information. In accordance with the Commission’s typical requirement, the proposed SDL windows should have permanently-affixed 7/8” profile muntins with spacer bars. Staff recommends a condition of approval, stipulating that window details be submitted, with final review and approval delegated to staff. Details should also be submitted for any doors on the proposed rear addition, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

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

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

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

Contact Person: Tom Flanagan
Contact Email: jflanagan@flanaganarchitects.com
Daytime Phone No.: 301-652-4811

Tax Account No.: ____________________________

Name of Property Owner: Neil Cullen
Daytime Phone No.: 340-418-7708

Address: 12 Hesketh St, Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Contractor: Northcliff Builders, Inc.
Phone No.: 301-988-8140

Contractor Registration No.: 120900
Agent for Owner: William Maloney
Daytime Phone No.: ____________________________

LOCATION OF BUILDING PROPOSED

House Number: 12
Street: Hesketh Street
Tow/City: Chevy Chase
Nearest Cross Street: Magnolia Pl
Lot: B3-17
Block: 24-15
Subdivision: Chevy Chase
Section 2

PART ONE: TYPE OF PROPOSED ADDITION AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
☑ Construct ☐ Extend ☐ Alter/Renovate ☐ A/C ☐ Stair ☐ Room Addition ☐ Porch ☐ Deck ☐ Shed
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Window/Refrigerator ☐ Solar ☐ Fireplace ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Single Family
☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☐ Removable ☐ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☐ Other:

1B. Construction cost estimate: $250,000

1C. If this is a revision of a previously approved active permit, see Permit #: No

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTENSION ADDITIONS

2A. Type of sewage disposal: ☑ WSSC ☐ Septic ☐ Other:

2B. Type of water supply: ☑ WSSC ☐ Well ☐ Other:

PART THREE: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCE/RETAINING WALL

3A. Height feet inches

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

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

Signature: ____________________________
Date: 11/14/10

For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission

Approved: ____________________________
Disapproved: ____________________________
Application/Permit No.: ____________________________
Date Filed: ____________________________
Date Issued: ____________________________

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

1. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
   a. Description of existing structure(s) and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance:
      The existing house is a two-story wood frame house w/ a basement. It has wood siding, single pane windows and asphalt shingle roofing on a mansard roof. It is considered a contributing asset to the historic district, but does not appear to have any significant historical features of value to the neighborhood.

   b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district:
      The proposed addition is two stories at the rear of the original house and inset on both sides to minimize it visually from the street. New simulated divided sash windows to replace existing single pane windows. Exterior materials to complement original house and or to be in keeping w/ the surrounding neighborhood.

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

3. PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
   You must submit 2 copies of plans and elevations in a format no larger than 11" x 17". Plans on 8 1/2" x 11" paper are preferred.
   a. Schematic construction plans, with marked dimensions, indicating location, size and general type of walls, window and door openings, and other fixed features of 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. MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS
   General description of materials and manufactured items proposed for incorporation in the work of the project. This information may be included on your design drawings.

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

6. TREE SURVEY
   If you are proposing construction adjacent to or within the dripline of any tree 6" or larger in diameter (at approximately 4 feet above the ground), you must file an accurate tree survey identifying the size, location, and species of each tree of at least that dimension. — SEE SP-1

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

1. EXISTING WINDOWS TO REMAIN.
2. NEW SYNTHETIC SLATE ROOF.
3. NEW ENTRY DOOR IN EXISTING OPENING.
4. EXISTING SIDING TO REMAIN ON ORIGINAL PORTION OF HOUSE.
5. LAUNDERED RIDGE ON ADDITION ROOF. (4" LOWER)
6. ROOF ELEVATION AT ADDITION TO MATCH CHARACTER OF THE ORIGINAL HOUSE.
   (SHEET METAL ROOF PANS)
7. GUTTER AT GABLED END. (REAR ELEV. ONLY)
8. BRICK CHIMNEYS.
9. HARDIE SIDING AT ADDITION.
10. REMOVED BRACKETS ON ADDITION.
KEYNOTES

EXTERIOR FINISH MATERIALS

CULLEN RESIDENCE

LEFT ELEVATION

RIGHT ELEVATION

NOTES:
1. NO MULLED WINDOWS AT SIDE ELEVATIONS.
2. BRICK CHIMNEY AND PORCH BASE.
3. METAL ROOF AT NEW PORCH TO MATCH EX'S.
4. NO BRACKETS AT ADDITION.
5. REVISED ELEVATION TO BE MORE SYMMETRICAL TO ORIGINAL HOUSE.

LOWERED ROOF RIDGE AT ADDITION.
NEW WINDOWS SHALL BE WOOD CLAD WINDOW W/I. SDL'S, TYP.
7228 — BUNGALOW (TDL)

**SERIES:** Bungalow Series®
**TYPE:** Exterior Decorative

**APPLICATIONS:** Can be used for a swing door, with barn track hardware, with pivot hardware, in a patio swing door or slider system and many other applications for the home's exterior.

**Construction Type:**
Engineered All-Wood Stiles and Rails with Dowel Pinned Stile/Rail Joinery

**Panels:** 1-7/16" Innerbond® Double Hip-Raised Panel, Beaded V-Groove
**Profile:** Ovolo Sticking
**Glass:** 3/4" Insulated Glazing (shown with optional beveled glass)

**STANDARD FEATURES**
- Any Wood Species
- Virtually Any Size
- Glass Options
- UltraBlock® Technology
- Privacy Rating: 1

**DETAILS**

- 1 7/16" Bungalow Panel
- Rail
- Glazing Bead
- 3/4" Insulated Glazing
- Stile
- Sticking
- 1 1/4" Medex Panel
1. PROVIDE TREE PROTECTION AT REAR ELM TREES AT 10 HESSETH - PER NEIGHBOR'S REQUEST.
### 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>NEIL CULLEN</td>
<td>PLANAGAN ARCHITECTS, AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 HESKETH STREET</td>
<td>% JASON GAGEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
<td>B120 WOODMINT AVE # 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BETHPESA, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerry Goodis</th>
<th>David Blake Barth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 HESKETH STREET</td>
<td>James Meisel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
<td>7 HESKETH STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Nancy Watters           | Julie Chapman                   |
| Stephen Sayre           | David Cushing                   |
| 10 HESKETH STREET       | 14 HESKETH STREET               |
| CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815   | CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815           |

| Charles Train           | Robert Levin                    |
| Georgia Sanger-         | 13 GRAPTON STREET               |
| 11 GRAPTON STREET       | CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815           |
| CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815   |                                 |
A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on December 7, 2016, commencing at 7:36 p.m., in the MRO Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910, before:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Kirwan, Chair
Sandra Heiler
Brian Carroll
Marsha Barnes
Kenneth Firestone
Kathleen Legg
Richard Arkin
Eliza Voigt
And I think that the, you know, it's subtle, but I think the really high note for this, for me, is bringing the corners of the building back on both sides. Keeping that flair, I understand what they did with the addition before, they tried to keep it going all the way down because they thought that was picking up the queues of the house, and I just think that was not right so thank you for putting the corners back. I think that really is a very nice touch. So, thank you. I'm really in support of this. I'm looking forward to seeing it.

MR. KIRWAN: So, I think you've heard some unanimous support for the project, so I think you're ready to come back with a HAWP, and we look forward to seeing you come back then.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you all, it's been a pleasure.

MR. KIRWAN: Great. Thank you. All right, the next preliminary consultation is Case II.B at 12 Hesketh Street in Chevy Chase. Do we have a Staff Report?

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do. This is 12 Hesketh Street in Chevy Chase. A contributing resource within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District. Dutch Colonial style, circa 1916 to 1927. The proposal on this case is to remove an existing two-story rear addition, construct a new two-story rear addition, replace the historic windows
with new windows, restore/extend the existing driveway to
the existing rear garage. And remove one 7 inch dbh
Sycamore tree.

   Again, I'm going to walk you around the
property, starting at the left side. I do want to point
out that, if you look at the screen, this is part of an
existing addition which will be removed. This is the
existing rear addition, with a gambrel roof to reflect the
Dutch Colonial style of the main house.

   MR. KIRWAN: That's a non-historic addition?
   MR. KYNE: That's right. And also, it's an
extension of this addition that I showed you previously.
Looking at the house from the left side of the rear yard
as viewed from the street. And then this will be the rear
of the left side as viewed from the street. And this is
the existing garage at the rear right side, which the
driveway will be extended to. And just a couple photos of
the existing windows which appear to be historic. And I
have the plans if we need to refer to them.

   The applicable guidelines in this case are the
Chevy Chase Village Historic District Guidelines, and the
Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. And,
Staff asks the Commission's guidance regarding the
following: so for the addition, scale and massing. The
proposed rear addition is much larger than the existing
rear addition, appearing to double the size of the
historic house. Style. The existing elevation has a
gambrel roof, which is compatible with the Dutch Colonial
style of the historic house, while the proposed new
addition has a hipped roof, giving it a four square like
appearance when viewed from the rear. The ridge line of
the proposed new addition is slightly lower than the
historic house. However, in this case, Staff suggests
that the ridge line is not low enough to make the addition
differential to the historic house.

And fenestration. The fenestration of the
historic house is symmetrical and Staff thought while that
of the proposed addition is not. There are also paired
windows on all the elevations of the proposed addition,
but they are absent from the historic house. Chimney.
The proposed chimney on the left elevation appears to have
a cultured stone veneer, but I cannot confirm that's what
it appears to be. In the past, the Commission has found
that cultured stone veneer is generally incompatible for
features that are visible from the public right-of-way.

The porch. Staff asks for the Commission's
guidance regarding the proposed covered porch with
standing seam metal roof on the left elevation of the
proposed new addition. And brackets. The proposed
brackets on the rear/side elevations of the proposed
addition are incompatible with the historic house, as
decorative brackets are not a common features on Dutch
Colonial style houses.

And, on to window replacement. The proposed
replacement windows will be generally consistent with the
existing windows. With six-over-six and 4-lite casement
windows being replaced with the same. Where the existing
addition/wraparound will be removed from the right
elevation of the historic house, and that was the addition
I had pointed out earlier. The applicant proposes to
install or perhaps restore, you will have to ask them,
three new 4-lite casement windows to match the existing
window on the same elevation.

Staff visited the property and many, if not all
of the windows, appear to be original. As we saw in the
photographs. The Guidelines instruct the Commission to
review window replacement that is visible from the public
right-of-way with moderate scrutiny. And, Staff asks for
the Commission's guidance regarding the proposed window
replacement, and any specific requirements for approval.
And, as an example, in the past we had required that the
applicants matched the dimensions of the existing windows.

And driveway. The Guidelines instruct the
Commission to review driveways with lenient scrutiny,
except where trees will be impacted. And according to the
site plan, one 4 inch dbh tree will be removed to accommodate the proposed driveway extension. The removal of a 4 inch dbh tree is outside of your purview, and is unlikely to impact the park-like character of the historic district. Other tree removals to look at. The applicant proposes to remove one 7 inch dbh Sycamore tree to accommodate the proposed new addition. And the proposed tree removal is unlikely to detract from the subject property or surrounding district, but in accordance with the Guidelines, the applicant should adhere to the Village urban forest ordinance.

In this case, we did receive public comments from the neighbors at 10 Hesketh Street. The comments were in opposition, generally, and they were -- they largely had a concern with the porch, and they also voiced concern about two American Elm trees. One which is 42.2 inches in diameter, and the other which is 37.1 inches in diameter that may be impacted by the proposed project. And the trees in question, according to the neighbor, are at Hesketh, or at 10 Hesketh, and/or straddle 10 Hesketh and the subject property. At the HAFP stage, the Commission might add a condition requiring that the applicants have a tree protection plan in place prior to beginning their project.

And then, finally, LAP comments. As summarized
by Staff, the LAP generally concurs with Staff, but is somewhat less concerned with the fenestration pattern of the rear addition. The LAP concurs with Staff that the proposed addition is substantially larger than the existing addition, but notes that it is at the rear of the property. The LAP has stated that from the drawings, the addition appears to be hidden when viewed from the street, and therefore, it would seem to have no adverse impact on streetscape or open park-like setting of the Village, which has been an issue with other projects. The LAP hopes the final design can be sensitive to adjacent properties. The proposed tree removal must be handled separately for the Village.

And, with that, I recommend that the applicants make any revisions and return with a HAWF based upon the recommendations. And I'll take any questions you have for me.

MR. KRIWAN: Thank you. Michael, I have one question. Is it clear in the Staff Report, what is the material for the window replacements? Is it wood or is it, or do we not yet know?

MR. KYNE: I believe that they are proposing wood windows, wood SDL windows to replace the original windows, or we can confirm that with the applicants.

MR. CARROLL: Michael, do you have an image that
shows the two trees in question, the 37 and 42 inch?

MR. KYNE: I do not. These comments were ones
that were received within the last day or two. I did
forward the comments to you as a Commission, but I did not
have a chance to go back out to the property and take
photographs of those trees.

MS. BARNES: Michael, do you know what the
square footage is of the existing house and what the
square footage of the proposed addition is, by chance?

MR. KYNE: I do not have the numbers. I do
believe the numbers were provided. But again, this might
be something --

MS. BARNES: For the applicant? And, the other
question, on the driveway, was there, did I miss it, was
there information about the material to be used for the
driveway?

MR. KYNE: I believe the material proposed is
gravel extending what is or was there previously. And
again, we can confirm that.

MS. BARNES: Thank you.

MS. HEILER: Michael, what's the material on the
house? In the information it says that it compliments,
the addition materials compliment the house. Are they the
same as the house, and is it wood?

MR. KYNE: That is something that we should,
again, address to the applicants, because they have it
written like proposed to remove the existing wooden siding
from the front of the house, along with the corner coins,
and I'm not sure if they revised their proposal consistent
with my recommendation to not propose that, because it's
unlikely to be approved. I know at one point they had one
iteration of the project, they were proposing Hardie
shingles on the second floor, and Hardie siding on the
first. And, I believe now in this iteration that it is
all Hardi on both floors. Does that answer your question?

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff? If
not, we invite the applicant to please come forward. We
can give you seven minutes for your testimony, and anyone
who speaks should state their name for the record before
they do.

MR. FLANAGAN: Good evening, my name is Tom
Flanagan, I'm the architect of the project. And next to
me is Jason Gagen, who is the project architect. I think
the summary, real quick summary of this is, we're taking
the existing structure that has an addition to it, and
removing it a series of additions that have been done over
time. There's on the right hand side, then one to the
rear. So we've kind of taken it back to the basic house
that's already there. The addition that we're proposing,
we have seven -- it's all in the back, we're not doing
anything to the front with the exception of windoweplacement -- and then we set in on both sides in the
rear, and our addition is completely to the rear of the
house but set in. And it's also lower in scale. The
ridgeline is matching the existing house. We're not going
higher in any way.

We worked with Staff. We did, we were trying to
do some work in the beginning to the front of the house.
We just talked briefly about some siding. About some ship
lap siding that is flush, kind of a water issue, it's like
no siding we've ever been seen before. It's not really
siding. I'm not sure what it is. The coins in the wood,
we're leaving all that. We're not doing anything with it
at this time, so it's a non-issue for the front of the
house. All the windows in the front will be wood, SDL
replacement windows with the same mutin patterns that are
present now there. And, we have worked with Staff, to go
through some comments. We kind of addressed a lot of
those. Take no exception with most of them. And looking
for a little bit of direction on a couple of items that
are identified.

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

MS. BARNES: I would address to you the question
that I put to the Staff, could you let me know the square
footage of the original house, and then what is proposed
for the addition? And you just noted that the addition
will be inset from the original house, and how much of an
inset are we talking about? I'm curious about materials
for the drive, and I believe there is a sort of stone
veneer chimney proposed, and I wanted to check on that
because that's something that's --

MR. FLANAGAN: We were proposing a stone
chimney. I don't know where the stone veneer came from,
or the fake stone. We were never proposing that.

MS. BARNES: Maybe it was in the drawing. That
it conveyed that sense.

MR. FLANAGAN: Maybe the graphic looked like it,
but it is a real stone chimney.

MS. BARNES: It's real stone?

MR. FLANAGAN: Yes, it is.

MS. BARNES: Well, that's very good news to
hear.

MR. GAGEN: Jason Gagen with Planagan
Architects. The existing square footage, would you like
the whole house or just the footprint?

MS. BARNES: Footprint.

MR. GAGEN: So the first floor footprint is 1179
square feet currently. That includes the addition. We
are proposing to add 439 square feet to that original
footprint, for a total of 1618 square feet. First floor.

MS. BARNES: Can you separate out the original
house from its additions so that chunk without the old
additions?

MR. GAGEN: I would need to do a little math for
you here. If you give me a couple of moments, I'll do
that for you.

MS. BARNES: Thank you. And the issue of inset
and materials perhaps can be -- while you're doing your
math, is somebody else able to do that one? Sure.

MR. GAGEN: The inset is two feet on either side
of the existing house.

MS. BARNES: Thank you.

MR. GAGEN: The driveway material, you asked
that. We were proposing a concrete driveway.

MR. ARKIN: Would you be replacing the asphalt
or would you have a change in material on the driveway?

MR. GAGEN: I'll defer to the owner for that
one. I assume we would probably do concrete the entire
length.

MR. CULLEN: Neil Cullen, Chevy Chase,
homeowner. I want it to be consistent with the house.

MR. FLANAGAN: So, no change in material.

Concrete the entire, from the front to the garage.

MR. ARKIN: Could you discuss the condition of
the windows and why it is you want to replace them?

MR. FLANAGAN: They're not insulated glass. They're for energy efficiency. For ease of operation, they've been painted for many, many years, and they don't operate very well.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MS. VOIGT: And, are you replacing the windows in the front of the house as well, did you mention?

MR. FLANAGAN: We are planning to replace the windows in the front with wood SDL, yes, to match proportions.

MS. VOIGT: And, I just had another quick question. Just looking at the elevation, No. 21, so talk to me -- so looking at that roofline, so you have the Dutch Colonial roof and then the addition roof is, it's just coming right off the --

MR. FLANAGAN: There is a roofline in that set of drawings, I believe, as well. So we had a hipped roof that failed. So the lower portion of that is the existing Dutch Colonial with a hipped roof that comes off the -- we looked at several other forms to continue the Dutch Colonial, and we thought that this was the most appropriate, and being respectful to the existing structure. To do a side elevation, that is sitting back there.
And one option is to do the big brother, little brother, which is very disruptive to the existing historic structure. And then the other is to do identical twin next to it, which seems like it was somewhat inappropriate as well to try to match and have an old and new side-by-side. It didn't feel like those were really compatible solutions to the resources out there. By setting it in, doing a hipped roof, we felt that the eaves would be the main portion of the roof you would see from the ground, and because the buildings on both sides go the same depth or deeper on the property, there's really no place to even understand the roof, honestly. We didn't want gables that would compete with the Gambrel form. We thought that that would be the lowest profile roof to provide the abutting form to the historic structure.

MR. GAGEN: So, going back to your square footage question. The historical house is 821 square feet. Our proposed addition would be 801 square feet.

MS. BARNES: Thank you.

MS. HEILER: So, is it your view that none of the addition, because it is directly behind the house, will be visible in any way from the street?

MR. FLANAGAN: I don't know that I said none of it. But very limited. We pushed it back in two feet on each side. There's a very narrow side yard. I think we
had 12 feet on the side yard on the right hand side. Do you know what is on the left? It's like seven.

MR. GAGEN: It's like seven, yes.

MR. FLANAGAN: It's like seven feet is the side yard on the left hand side. So you're not seeing very -- from the street you're not seeing very far down the driveway. There may be a photo in here. Yeah, there was a photo showing the trees of all the driveway as well on the right hand side, which would limit your view to the rear on that side of the house. The left side of the house has the one-story porch, and we are continuing that porch in our addition which would also help to conceal the body of the addition at the rear as well.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for the applicant? I guess not. I think we have testimony from a speaker.

MR. GAGEN: If I may add? There was a question about the trees. We have a graphic showing the location of those trees, if that will be helpful to you guys. Do you want to pass it around or show it to you.

MR. KIRWAN: That's fine. Yeah, why don't you pass it around.

MR. GAGEN: This is the porch. And this is our proposed addition. And this is the closer of the two Elms that were in question. It's 29 feet from our porch, and
approximately 35 feet from the addition. And 44 feet
here.

MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry, could you point at
them, even approximately?

MR. GAGEN: So, these are the two Elms here.

Elm 1 and Elm 2. This Elm is approximately 29 feet from
the porch here. And this one, I believe, was 44 is what I
had. The Chevy Chase arborist had no concern with those
trees when he visited the site.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions? We have a Ms.
Michele Rosenfeld who's going to provide some testimony.
If you could make room for her up at the table. And just
make sure you state your name for the record before you
speak. And we can give you three minutes for your
testimony.

MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. Michele Rosenfeld,
and I'm here on behalf of the owners of 10 Hesketh,
Stephen Sayre and Nancy Waters. And they apologize for
not being here tonight in person. They had a previous
conflict that they could not reschedule. And so they asked
me to appear tonight to represent them. And, you do have
copies of some written testimony that they have provided.
I just would like to highlight several points in here.
That are, I think, overriding concerns. First, the
representation that the -- a new addition is in keeping
with the scale and the massing of existing homes in the neighborhood, it's their view, based on their observations, that that in fact is not the case. That the addition will result in a structure that's significantly larger than the predominant characteristics within the neighborhood. They also are concerned with the use of stone on the chimney, that that is not characteristic of the chimneys. Chimneys elsewhere on the block are brick, and so this would introduce a new type of feature in the neighborhood and not, again, characteristic with the predominant historic features on the existing homes.

They also believe that the size of the addition will have an adverse effect on the park-like characteristics in Chevy Chase. That it will reduce the open and park-like characteristics and views along the street. And, there is the belief that the addition would be visible from the street. And again, would have the effect of reducing the open space and the park-like characteristics. In addition, they do support the Staff recommendations and the concerns regarding the roof style, regarding the size and the massing, regarding the use of stone on the chimney, and they do have concerns about protection of the trees.

And, as you see in their letter, they have consulted with their arborist, who has been maintaining
the Elms, who did recommend that there be some root protection for the critical root zones during the period of construction. And we would ask that you take that into consideration as well. Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you very much. Any questions for the speaker? Thank you very much for your testimony. Appreciate you coming out this evening and providing us with some helpful considerations.

MS. BARNES: Michael, at the beginning of your Staff presentation you had shown the street view and an overhead. Thank you.

MR. FLANAGAN: I have a street view if that's helpful.

MR. KIRWAN: Well, when we are ready, we should give our thoughts on the case before us. Commissioner Carroll, could I ask you to -- impose on you to kick things off?

MR. CARROLL: Sure. So, I think, you know, you've done what we typically ask by moving the sides of the addition in. I think the narrow lot, you know, you have, really a case with the porch on the left side, seven feet to the lot line, 12 feet to the next house on the right side. It's going to be difficult to see much of what's going on behind the house. I don't have any problem with the fenestration pattern on the rear
addition. I think whoever put that addition on the back
of the house made your task easy for you because there's
very little you could do to make it more, because it's,
you know, just add that overhang in the back.

Replacing windows. I would want to see some
details. You know, you're replacing the original windows
on the front facade of the house, and we've got to be
pretty clear that there's a real good reason to do that.
Once you move around to the sides and rear it becomes a
different issue for us. But, that's one of the things
that, if there's a compelling case for replacing those
windows, and then giving us a cut pattern so we can see
the molding profiles and so forth, so that we can make the
argument that they're going to maintain the same
proportions and look and so forth.

And then, with the trees, I think, you know, an
easy way to go about this if there's a debate about
whether the trees are in danger, is to put a tree
protection plan in there so it's, you know, the root zones
don't get compacted and so forth. And I think that's the,
you know, the reasonable way to go about that. You know,
there's, I'd like to know if there's any other stone
chimneys around. You know, if the streetscape is all brick
chimneys, it's going to be easier to get it through if
it's got brick.
MR. PLANAGAN: We'll be happy with brick.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. I'm just trying to get through my list here. I think I'm going to leave it there. Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: And just to clarify, you're okay with the scale and massing?

MR. CARROLL: I'm generally okay with it. I think that the, you know, looking at the numbers, it looks like it's about 50 percent increase. All things considered there's, you know, between what you're taking off and what you're adding, it's not a concern, it's certainly within your rights to do that. And I'm looking at a streetscape, you know, we're always, I would rather see something smaller, but I don't think it's outrageous. And it's not a huge house.

MS. LEGG: Thank for coming in for a prelim. Sorry it's so late. I'll be brief. I actually think this addition will improve the property because I think it'll be less visible than the current addition. The massing does not bother me if it's consistent with the Village. I think especially in the chimney the brick will be an improvement. That's it. Sorry. And also, I mean, I would encourage you to work directly with the arborist and protect the roots.

MS. HEILER: I would agree with the previous
Commissioners. Ordinarily, I would think that really doubling the size of the historic house was a problem. But, I do agree that it's likely to be hidden from the street. Usually, we like the ridge to be lower, and the roofline to be more compatible with the house. However, again, I don't think it will be visible. I echo the remarks about the chimney that, I think that really would stand out. And overall, I think it does less damage than the existing addition, and it will not be visible.

MS. BARNES: I appreciate your willingness to switch your materials for your chimney, and also the fact that you've chosen to inset your addition substantially. There are some graphics that you have on Circle, I think 22, on the upper story, that seem to me a little odd. And I'm not sure what that's all about. This is clearly what we would describe as a major addition, so it does require some attention from us.

And, the one thing that I find really remarkable when I look at the drawings, is that I feel that I look at the front of the house and I see one house, and I look at the proposed rear elevation, and I see a totally different style house. And, for me, that is somehow jarring. In that it doesn't seem to provide for a kind of compatibility.

I appreciate your comments earlier about the
challenges of how do you deal with this roofline, you
don't want to have, you know, a junior partner and
duplicate. And, I suppose this is what makes architecture
a very challenging profession, is coming up with the
appropriate solution. So, while it's a major addition, it
is at the rear. It is inset. That's all to the good.
But, I must say that I find myself struggling with the
compatibility question. Perhaps I shouldn't, since it's
the rear and not visible. But it is something that, for
me, is jarring.

MR. FIRESTONE: I don't have much to add to
what's been said before. My initial impression from some
of the drawings was that this is going to be something,
you know, massive and overpowering the original house.
But then when I realized that it is inset quite a bit,
it's to the rear, it's on a fairly narrow lot. I can see
that it, you know, could work. And while you'll be
increasing the size of the house, which is probably
desirable from the owner's standpoint, it looks like
you're not going be really doing something that would be
obnoxious to the neighborhood.

I guess, thinking about it awhile, I'm not quite
as concerned about the different styles of the addition
and the front of the house, because it does at least
differentiate it, since the addition wasn't here when this
house was originally built. So, I can see that being a
good thing as well. That's all I have to say.

MS. VOIGT: Thanks for coming in. I agree with
Commissioner Barnes. I think that, and I do appreciate
you insetting it. I think this Dutch Colonial, I think
what's unique about the house is the roof, and I think
that although it is a rear addition, I think that it's a
large addition, and I think that whatever you can do to
make the addition more compatible in terms of proportions
and kind of relating to the uniqueness of the Dutch
Colonial style, I think would really help not only make it
a more compatible addition, but it would seem to lessen
the impact of the addition. And, I don't mean it to say
to copy the existing home, but I think that this addition
lacks a consistency in terms of kind of the proportions
with the Dutch Colonial. So, I think if you could look at
that, you know, and kind of figure that out in terms of
the roof, you know, the totally different, the two
different styles of roof and how they kind of interact up
there on the ridgeline.

MR. ARKIN: What first struck me about -- I
guess I should start off by thanking you for coming in for
the preliminary consultation, because generally they're
very helpful. And, though what struck me about this house
when I first looked at it, this proposal, proposed
addition, is its size. It is good that it's inset. And it is good that the addition is entirely in the rear. I think the historic house, the Dutch Colonial historic house, really is a very charming house. And, I would agree with the comments that were made that the back of the house looks like a different house. I think that nowhere more striking than if you look at the back elevation of the house. But that will be invisible from the public way. And because there are narrow -- we're supposed to look at a building or a proposed building, as if there is no landscaping, no foliage at all. But because of the narrowness of the lot, and the narrow side lot lines, I think most of the addition will be only barely visible, if visible at all from the public way.

There is a simplicity to the Dutch Colonial that I think you missed on your addition. But again, that's more a matter of taste than the requirement, because we are basically supposed to look only at what's visible. I would be more comfortable if the ridgeline of the roof were slightly lower. But, I would be much more comfortable if you do end up replaying the stone chimney with a brick chimney.

I would like to see you try to preserve the front windows, the historic front windows to see if there is an answer that might be workable perhaps inside
interior storm windows, something of that nature. At least look into it. And also, the historic windows on the two sides of the historic house, I think, would be worth taking a look at whether those windows can be preserved and retained.

The addition is certainly differentiated from the original house. There's certainly no question about that. And, I guess I would agree with the other comments that have been made, and I don't really have much to add beyond that. So, thank you very much.

MR. KIRWAN: And just to close, I would sort of characterize my feeling on this case as very reluctant approval. You know, one of the great characteristics of a Gambrel roof is that you get the impression of a one-story building with the second floor being in the attic. And, your addition completely ignores that characteristic of the house and just creates a two-story volume. A very large two-story volume on the back of this house. I think there are solutions where a Gambrel could come off the back of the house and be broken up scale-wise on the rear facade, and you would have dormers for your second floor instead of a shield wall, and you would effectively get the same second floor footprint that you would be after.

In the case of the siting of this house, the siting of this house, there's very minimal impact that the
addition has on the front. So, you know, I don't think I could be compelled to force you to a different design solution because again, the levels of scrutiny we can apply to this matter given its visibility to public space is somewhat limited. But I do think there are better solutions that are more sensitive to this house. And I would encourage you to explore those. But I think we're hearing a general consensus that what's been proposed is likely acceptable.

But, again, in the spirit of, you know, being good neighbors, I would encourage, you know, the neighbors had very similar comments to the concerns that Staff raised. I would encourage you to try to work with your neighbors concerns, and try to modify the design to address those. I think that would go a long way to making this a much more easily approvable project when it came back to us. And, I do want to reiterate the concerns that Commissioner Carroll had about particularly the front facade windows. I think we need to have, for you to replace those, we would need to have some pretty clear documentation that those are not repairable or could be restored.

So, I think you got general approval on your project with some concerns about the form of the massing of the rear. But the footprint seems to be generally okay
and, you know, I would encourage you to continue to work
the design and try to make some improvements to it, and
then come back in with a HAWP.

MR. WHIPPLE: Mr. Chairman, can I just jump in
with two points about the windows?

MR. KIRWAN: Yes.

MR. WHIPPLE: It's generally the practice of the
Commission to require when you have paired or ganged
windows to have mulls, wide mulls.

MR. KIRWAN: And that's, I think, a comment
Commissioner Carroll wanted to make.

MR. WHIPPLE: Yeah. That the drawings don't
show. So, I think that that probably needs to get
revised. Another thing that the Commission generally
requires with window replacements is drawings that
establish that the new windows maintain the daylight
openings of the existing windows. And so, the applicant
will have to give, I think, pretty clear and extensive
documentation to that end.

MR. KIRWAN: Mutin sizes included. Great. All
right. Thank you for coming in tonight. And, I do -- it
was mentioned before, but I think, we do appreciate you
coming in for a preliminary. It gives us a chance to give
you some general feedback, and I think it'll make the
approval process go much smoother.
MR. FLANAGAN: Great. Thank you. Thanks for
staying late for us.

MR. KIRWAN: We're not done. I think Item No.
III, Tax Credit applications for Calendar Year 2015. This
is the final third group for tax credits.

MR. KYNE: Yes, that is correct. This is the
third and final group of tax credits for the year 2015.
And we are asking you to approve the transmittal of the
final 25 out of 98 tax credits to the Department of
Finance.

MR. KIRWAN: Yes. And I think we discussed that
upstairs in our worksession.

MR. BARNES: Mr. President, could I make a
motion that we recommend that these 25 tax credits be
transferred to the Finance Department for action.

MS. HEILER: I second the motion.

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

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: The motion passes unanimously. Do
we have a volunteer for tonight's meeting minutes?

MS. VOIGT: I think I haven't done it in a
while. Okay.

MR. ARKIN: What about the Staff items, Mr.
Chairman?
MR. KIRWAN: Yes, we'll get to those. And do we have any minutes to approve this evening?

MR. WHIPPLE: Are you ready to move the July 27th?

MS. VOIGT: Yes, I sent those in.

MR. WHIPPLE: So those are good?

MS. VOIGT: Yeah.

MR. WHIPPLE: And then also September 21.

MR. KIRWAN: So we need a motion for the July 27th and the September 21st meeting minutes.

MS. HEILER: I move that we approve the July 27th and September 21st minutes.

MR. CARROLL: I'll second that.

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

VOTE:

MR. KIRWAN: The motion passes unanimously.

Those minutes are approved. And Commissioner Voigt is taking the minutes for this evening. Any Commission items? If not, then we have some Staff items.

MR. KYNE: Yes, that is correct. We have four Staff items which were approved in the worksession. You had revisions at 5923 Baltimore Street in Kensington; 4209 Bradley Lane, Chevy Chase; 36 Philadelphia Avenue, Takoma Park; and 43 West Ninth Street in Chevy Chase.
MR. KIRWAN: We looked at those upstairs, and we
were fine with those revisions. And with that, we're
adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 10:46 p.m., the meeting was
adjourned.)
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