MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 10915 Kenilworth Ave., Garrett Park  Meeting Date: 4/19/2017
Resource: Non-Contributing Resource  Report Date: 4/12/2017
(Garrett Park Historic District)
Applicant: Patrick Keating  Public Notice: 4/5/2017
(Luke Olson, Architect)
Review: HAWP  Tax Credit: No
Case Number: 30/13-17A  Staff: Michael Kyne

PROPOSAL: Demolition of Non-Contributing resource and construction of new two-story house

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

1. The proposed solar panels will be black with matte black frames.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Non-Contributing Resource within the Garrett Park Historic District
DATE: 1964

BACKGROUND

The applicant previously appeared before the Commission at the February 8, 2017 HPC meeting for a preliminary consultation. At the preliminary consultation, the Commission expressed support for the applicant’s proposal, but expressed the following concerns/preferences:

- The Commissioners unanimously preferred Option 1, with a rear porch and one-car garage.
- There was a preference for a contemporary design, without any traditional elements such as brackets or frieze boards.

There was a suggestion regarding alternative designs for the front entrance, resulting in a more contemporary design. There was also discussion regarding the size/number of windows, particularly on the front elevation and left-side stair tower; however, staff asked the Commission to clarify their stance on this matter at the meeting, and the majority found the size/number of windows appropriate.

PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to remove the existing c. 1964 two-story house, which is a Non-Contributing resource within the Garrett Park Historic District, and construct a new two-and-a-half-story house in its place.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES
Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8

(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:

(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.

Secretary of the 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.”

#2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

STAFF DISCUSSION

The applicant has returned with a HAWP application and has addressed the Commission’s previous concerns/preferences. The applicant proposes what was previously referred to as Option 1, which includes a rear porch and one-car garage. The previously proposed brackets under the second-floor bay on the left elevation have been removed.

The proposed front entrance has also been modified. Whereas the previously proposed entrance extended the full width of the proposed front bay, the current proposal is for an entrance that is approximately half the width of the front bay, with the other half of the bay being enclosed. Although this design does result in a slightly more contemporary appearance, some traditional elements remain, such as the small frieze board, column, and pilaster. Nonetheless, staff supports the proposed front entrance revision, as the majority of Commissioners did not express concerns or preferences regarding the entrance at the preliminary consultation.

The only new aspect of the applicant’s proposal is solar panels on the right-side/rear roof slopes. Staff supports the proposed solar panels, finding that they are in the preferred location, where they are less visible from the public right-of-way. Staff recommends one condition of approval, stipulating that the proposed solar panels will be black with matte black frames, further minimizing their visibility and potential to detract from the surrounding historic district.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission approve 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 will not
substantially alter the exterior features of the historic resource and is compatible in character with the district and the purposes of Chapter 24A;

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

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

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

and with the general condition that the applicant shall notify the Historic Preservation Staff if they propose to make any alterations to the approved plans.

Once the work is completed the applicant will contact the staff person assigned to this application at 301-563-3400 or michael.kyne@montgomeryplanning.org to schedule a follow-up site visit.
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: Idson@gtmerchitects.com  Contact Person: Luke Olson
Daytime Phone No: 240-333-2021

Tax Account No: __________________________

Name of Property Owner: PATRICK KEATING  Daytime Phone No: 301-949-1706
Address: PO BOX 61  GARRETT PARK  MD  20896

Contractor: TBD  Phone No: __________________________

Contractor Registration No: __________________________

Agent for Owner: LUCAS OLSON / GM ARCHITECTS  Daytime Phone No: 240-333-2021

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PRECEASE

House Number: 10915  Street: KENELWORTH AVE
Town/City: GARRETT PARK  Nearest Cross Street: STRANDLAKE AVE
Lot: 46  Block: 99  Subdivision: GARRETT PARK

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT ACTION AND USE

1A. Check all Applicable:  
- Construct [ ]  Extend [ ] Alter/Renovate [ ]
- Move [ ] Install [ ] Wreck/Removal [ ]
- Revision [ ] Repair [ ] Removable [ ]
- Single Family [ ]  Detached Garage [ ]

1B. Construction cost estimate: $700,000

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

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTERIOR ADDITIONS

2A. Type of average disposals: 01 [ ] 02 [ ] 03 [ ]

2B. Type of water supply: 01 [ ] 02 [ ] 03 [ ]

PART THREE: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCE/RETAINING WALL

3A. Height: 6 feet 0 inches

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

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

__________________________  01-18-17
Signature of owner or authorized agent  Date

__________________________
For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission

Approved: __________________________  Signature: __________________________  Date: __________________________
Disapproved: __________________________  Signature: __________________________  Date: __________________________
Application/Permit No: __________________________  Data Filed: __________________________  Date Issued: __________________________

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS

794096
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:

   DETACH EXISTING NON-CONTRIBUTOR STRUCTURE & CONSTRUCT NEW 2-STORY SINGLE FAMILY HOME AND DETACHED GARAGE WITH A TOTAL FOOTPRINT OF 4,209 SF

   
   
   

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

      SEE ABOVE

   
   
   

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;
   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 and proposed work.
   b. Elevations (front, side, and rear) with marked dimensions, clearly indicating proposed work in relation to existing construction and, where appropriate, context.

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

5. PHOTOGRAPHS
   a. Clearly labeled photographic prints of each facade of existing resources, 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 8" 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 CONFIRMING PROPERTY OWNERS
   For ALL projects, provide an accurate list of adjacent and confirming 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAT KEATING</td>
<td>LUCIE CLSND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po Box 61</td>
<td>GML ARCHITECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Park, MD 20896</td>
<td>7735 Old Georgetown Rd, Ste 700</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>Hazel Chapman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po Box 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Park, MD 20896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Brocato &amp; Mahmood Yasser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10918 Kennetwood Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Park, MD 20896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Casassa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10914 Kennetwood Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Park, MD 20896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron &amp; Kelly Oskvig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10908 Kennetwood Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Park, MD 20896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick &amp; Jessica Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10913 Kennetwood Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Park, MD 20896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Lysen &amp; John Poussin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po Box 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Park, MD 20896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Jackson &amp; William Riestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po Box 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Park, MD 20896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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in a lot more danger if it's not occupied.

MR. KIRWAN: Can I make a friendly amendment that
the foundation walls of the ramp and the new landing are of
parged concrete block. Do we have a second?

MR. ARKIN: Second.

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

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: The motion passes unanimously. I
want to thank the applicants for their cooperation on this
case, and we do wish you the best with your renovations.
It's a great thing you're doing as Commissioner Barnes said.
Thank you.

Move on to the next section of our agenda tonight,
the preliminary consultations. The first of which is II.A
at 10221 Montgomery Avenue in Kensington. Do we have a
Staff Report?

MR. BRUCHERT: Mr. Chairman, would you mind if we
did those in opposite order?

MR. KIRWAN: No, not at all.

MR. BRUCHERT: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Then we're going to switch it up and
first hear Case I.B at 10915 Kenilworth Avenue in Garret
Park.

MR. KYNE: Sorry about that.
MR. KIRWAN: No problem.

MR. KYNE: So this is 10915 Kenilworth Avenue in Garrett Park. A non-contributing resource in the Garrett Park Historic District. And this would be a preliminary consultation. So the subject property is on the screen in front of you under the purple dot. And what I have here is actually the Garrett Park Historic District and the subject property is circled in red. And what I'm attempting to show here is that the property is on the opposite side of the street or not within the boundary of the historic district.

Again, a non-contributing resource, circa 1964. And the proposal before you is to remove the existing 1964 two-story house and construct a new two and a half story house in its place. So this is the site as it exists today. And I'm starting at the front/left of the house. Walking around to the right. This is looking back at the house from the rear yard. This is looking into the rear yard from the front. And then this is what is adjacent to the rear. And, what I'm going to show you next are the neighboring properties to the right. So, the house, we have the subject property on the left and then the house to the right is also circa 1964, as is the house in the center.

And then we have a outstanding resource, Queen Anne style. And then at the end of the block we have a, what's called a Chevy house, which is obviously the smallest
block. Going back in the other direction and the
photographs I've taken here, I'm trying to include the.
houses and the relationship to their neighbor in showing the
differences in height along the block.

And then, this is looking past the subject
property to the left. And this is the property on the left.
Looking back toward the subject property. To the left of
the last property we looked at. And this is at the end of
the block before it makes a sharp turn. And then, we're now
looking at the properties on the opposite side of the street
which are considerably smaller. But again, outside of the
boundary of the historic district. And it includes new
construction as you can see here.

And I have the plans, if we need to refer to them
later. But I will move through them slowly. Showing two
options the applicants are considering. Option 1 and Option
2. The differences that I've noted are that Option 1
includes a one-story rear porch and a smaller garage,
whereas Option 2 does not have a rear porch and has a larger
garage.

And the applicant has also provided 3-D models,
and I will note that in the 3-D models, the rear porch has a
different design. Please take note of that. And the
applicants have also provided a streetscape study which
Staff did suggest in the Staff Report but, the applicants
provided, I believe before they even received the Staff Report. And just a summary, because it's hard to make out, the existing height of the subject property at peak is approximately 361 feet, and the proposed height is approximately 372 feet. Most neighboring houses range from between 360 feet to 375 feet, with one example being approximately 347 feet, which would be the Chevy house.

And, the applicant has also provided examples of similar construction not in the Garrett Park Historic District, I do not believe, but this gives you a good idea of what the house may look like without the attached garage to the side of course.

The applicable guidelines are Montgomery County Code, Chapter 24-A-8, and Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Staff Discussion. The applicant proposes to remove the existing house, construct a new house in its place. The footprint of the existing house is approximately 946 square feet, while that of the proposed house is 1650 square feet. As noted, the applicant is proposing the two different options, one with the smaller garage and attached one-story porch, and one with a larger garage.

And again, as I noted earlier, we do have two different designs of the rear porch. And the elevations we have a more traditional design, while on the 3-D models we
have a more contemporary design with a flat roof and railing on top. And Staff has no preference for either design of the porch, but I do prefer, in my opinion, Option 1 is preferable finding that the one-story porch properly terminates the telescoping effect of the overall design. And I also prefer the smaller 264 square foot garage, finding that with a rear porch, the garage could result in, a larger garage could result.

Like the subject property, the two adjacent properties to the right are circa 1964 non-contributing resources. The adjacent property to the left is a 1892 Queen Anne style outstanding resource, and the properties on the opposite side are all outside of the district. We'll move on from there. The house to be removed is roughly rectangular with its broad side parallel to Kenilworth Avenue, while the front section of the proposed house is square with a series of square, telescoping in the rear.

The proposed new house includes several projections and bays, with a recessed front porch under a two and a half story bay with cross gable, which takes cues from the turrets and towers of the Queen Anne style houses in the district. When reviewing proposals within the district, the Commission is instructed to use the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

The relevant Standard in this case is Standard No.
2, which states that the historic character of a property
will be retained and preserved. Removal of distinctive
materials or alterations of features, spaces and spatial
relationships that characterize the property will be
avoided. And, in this case, the property is the designated
resource for the district itself. And the features, spaces
and spatial relationships that characterize the district
include, lot coverage, the distance between houses, and the
view from house to house.

The proposal will result in approximately double
the lot coverage, and the house with a different shape and
orientation to the street. However, the proposed new house
will retain the same approximate front setback, and Staff
suggests that the proposed design is more compatible with
the size and design of neighboring outstanding resources
such as the Queen Anne style houses that’s at 10925 and
10909. As noted in Places From the Past, Garrett Park
reflects nearly a century of diverse architectural styles,
and those styles include the lavish Queen Anne style houses,
and the modest Chevy houses.

The house to be removed is a non-contributing
resource which does not contribute to the historic character
of the streetscape. In accordance with the Standards and
preservation best practices, new construction in the
historic district should be compatible with the houses that
do contribute to the streetscape. And due to the diversity
of architectural styles, compatible new construction could
take cues from either the modest Chevy houses, or the lavish
Queen Anne houses, as in this case.

So, Staff asks the Commission to provide guidance
that can make the proposed new construction more compatible
with the district. Specifically, Staff asks the Commission
to provide guidance on the following details, the projecting
bays on each side elevation with the appearance of stacked
pediments in the gable ends of the main house. The overall
design of the projecting bay at the front of the house,
which will be its most prominent feature. And the
cantilevered bay on the second floor of the left side
elevation which also serves as a canopy for the entrance
below. And Staff notes that with its brackets and
ornamentation, the cantilevered bay appears inconsistent
with the overall design of the house, which is a
contemporary and simplified approach to a more traditional
form.

Staff asks the Commission to provide guidance
regarding the compatibility and preference of Options 1 and
2. If the Commission has a preference for the design of the
proposed rear porch, we saw both the contemporary and
traditional design. I ask you to voice your preference.
And the applicant has stated that the proposed materials
include hardiplank siding, Azec trim, clad wood windows and asphalt shingles. And the proposed materials are typical of what you approve for new construction, but I ask for you to provide any guidance regarding materials that can make the proposal more compatible with the historic district. And, I will now turn it over to you for any questions you might have for me.

MR. KIRWAN: Any questions for Staff?

MS. HEILER: In the photograph that you showed us, it appeared that the existing house is set back substantially more than the neighboring houses. Is that true?

MR. KYNE: Bear with for a moment to find the photograph. So, the subject property is the green house in this photograph. And hopefully I have a photo to illustrate it. The green house and the house directly to the right, actually are canted to sort of follow the curve of the street, past the green house, the subject property, whereas the houses to the right are more straight on. But, when you're walking along the street, you do not get the impression that it is set back much further than the neighboring houses.

MS. HEILER: So the proposed house will be set back about the same distance as the neighboring houses?

MR. KYNE: That's correct.
MS. HEILER: Thank you.

MS. VOIGT: And just to follow up, and the proposed house will have the same setback as the existing house?

MR. KYNE: Yes, that's my understanding.

MR. KIRWAN: Commissioner Barnes?

MS. BARNES: Since you visited the property, could you tell me -- we've seen two variations on this rear porch, one of which seems to have a terrace above. And, in your experience having been there, do you think any of that would be visible from the road?

MR. KYNE: If it is visible, I think it will be minimally visible at best. I would guess that it's probably not going to be visible from the front, but I can't say for sure.

MS. BARNES: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Michael, could you flip through the photos of the example project, just flip through them slowly for us, if you could?

MR. KYNE: And, I will note that this design is a little different. The proposed design includes a recessed porch under the sort of faux turret that's created by that projecting front bay. And also, again, no side projecting garage which we don't really like here.

MR. KIRWAN: This photo shows what appears to be a
more traditional looking porch compared to the one in the 3-
D. Okay. Is that it? Thank you. Any other questions for
Staff? You're up applicant. I'll give you seven minutes
for your testimony. Just state your name for the record.

MR. MYERS: Hi everybody, nice to see you all.
I'm George Myers. I've been in front of you guys a few
times. Pat Keating is the builder and owner. I thought I'd
just walk you through quickly the thought process on the
design. A couple things about Garrett Park is that they
have more strict setbacks, side yard setbacks are a total of
25 as opposed to a total of 18 would be in the county. So
it makes for a little bit thinner longer footprint.

Another thing about Garrett Park is they have much
more restricted lot coverage requirements there. So it's
only a 20 percent maximum. And that's for everything, that
includes porches, garages, everything. Whereas in the
county, on a lot like this, we would have about 25.5
percent, but that excludes porches, it also excludes a
detached garage. So, Garrett Park sort of already limits
the size of the house, which I think is good. But that was
sort of a design consideration.

A couple things about the initial design is, the
idea of it, because it was apparent that it was going to be
a fairly long thin house, the idea is sort of a telescoping
house seemed to make sense to me where we have one cross
gable that's the main gable, and then a gable behind that
goes back and steps down with the size of the gable being
about 26 or 27 feet which, we thought was kind of in
proportion to the rest of the neighborhood. So tried to
break it down into smaller pieces, and the pieces that would
be in scale with the neighborhood.

The actual front porch or sort of the smaller
front porch, when Pat actually, initially told me that he
would prefer as big of a back porch as he possibly could
have, and really did not want a front porch, so the
configuration of the house, the smaller front porch came
about really as an overhang. I really needed the square
footage for the second floor which kind of dictated the
footprint. And initially, I just carved out a recessed kind
of, you know, smaller front door with a recess, and then
came up with the idea of the overhang.

It's a little unusual, but I think, again, part of
the idea of this house is that we're trying to use forms but
in a little bit more contemporary way, so that we're not
trying -- we could take this exact form probably and do a
historic replica using the same exact massing. But decided
to take it to a little bit more contemporary feel. And
that's why we sent those pictures over, because that's a
house that's actually being built over in Somerset. It has
some similar ideas. It's just a more modern version of a
farmhouse, basically larger windows, a little bit cleaner
detailing, not so much trim. And so that's kind of the
effect that we were after.

I think height-wise, we're right in line with most
of the other houses on the street. And we do prefer, as
does Staff, the single car garage. Mainly because it's an
either or. We really can't have both. If you go to a two
car garage, you lose the porch because of lot coverage. And
so, we prefer the single car as well. So, with that, we'd
love to hear any of your thoughts.

MR. KIRWAN: I do have a question. Could you talk
about the porch, differences in the porches between the
drawings and the 3-D model, and the porch we see in your
example versus this one?

MR. MYERS: The difference is mainly, I drew the
porch myself, and then Luke Olson from my office did the 3-D
and submitted it. He didn't tell me. And I said where did
that terrace come from, and he said, I thought that'd be a
good idea. I think we're a little bit on the fence of it
ourselves. I think one of the things about -- I think
second floor terraces are really kind of, I don't think
anybody ever goes out on them, but one of the things that's
nice about it, is it allows you to get glass much lower into
your bedroom in the back. So, I'm going to leave it up to
Pat. I think either one is appropriate.
MR. KIRWAN: What about the detailing of the screen panels. It looks much more contemporary in this rendering versus the photograph example, versus the hand drawing.

MR. MYERS: Again, I think, Bill, it's more in flux a little bit right now. I'd like to see your input. Our main goal here tonight is to see if you're okay with the overall massing and size, and get your suggestions on how you think we should take it. Okay?

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions?

MS. HEILER: Yes, I have a question. In one of your drawings you show a chimney, a fireplace chimney, and in the upper you show a little box.

MR. MYERS: Same issue. I drew, thinking we were going to do a masonry chimney. An again, we did the 3-D model and we just submitted it, and we probably should have done a better job of coordinating the two. It's the same line of influx. I think Pat would prefer to just do a gas fireplace as opposed to a wood burning masonry chimney. So the 3-D model is probably the more up to date one to look at.

MS. HEILER: Okay. I guess, this question is, this is to Staff, if it is a gas fireplace and it's just a little box stuck on the side, how visible is that from the street or will it be?
MR. MYERS: I don't think it'll be visible from the street at all.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions? Commissioner Arkin?

MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are certain elements in your proposal that caught my eye that I'd like to ask some questions about. Are the floating bay windows functional or are they basically a stylistic measure?

MR. MYERS: There's a bay window above the side entry, sort of, it actually helps us get a little bit more floor space for the master bath up there, and provides a small covering as you come in the opening into that side entry. The bay that we're showing in the 3-D in the back, would be a bay window that would, you know, in the family room. So it would be useful floor space.

MR. ARKIN: The cantilever design is really a much more modern feature. Going back a couple slides, one more, and another. I think you're going forward.

MR. KYNE: Tell me what you're looking for, Richard, and I'll --

MR. ARKIN: I'm looking for the very long window on the side. I think it's the other side. That's a stairwell?

MR. MYERS: That's correct.
MR. ARKIN: It kind of screams modern, and I was wondering if it was a design element that you're married to, or if you could do stacked windows?

MR. MYERS: You're talking about the very large expanse that's up -- near the stair tower right?

MR. ARKIN: Yes.

MR. MYERS: Well, I think our intent is to use predominantly casement windows. That would probably be a large fixed window. Are we against maybe less glass? Is that what you're -- I think all of the windows we're proposing a consistent feel more in line with those photos of the house in Cumberland. I'm sorry, in Somerset, that we put up there.

MR. ARKIN: Well, I guess I'm more concerned about the, being compatible with the houses in the Garrett Park district.

MR. MYERS: You mean the proportion of the glass being too much glass? I think it would be hard to see that from that street.

MR. ARKIN: Well, it's closer to the front of the house. You could make that argument. No, I don't know, it looks pretty visible to me.

MR. MYERS: Well, I think, remember, this is a 3-D model that doesn't have any context in it. And probably an angle that you probably wouldn't get because there's another
house in the way.

MR. ARKIN: Well, that might shield the overhang over the entry door. So that would be essentially it. Is there -- you have an alternative to a porch design.

MR. MYERS: The rear porch or the front?

MR. ARKIN: The front porch.

MR. MYERS: No.

MR. ARKIN: Would it pose a problem for you to have something more conventional?

MR. MYERS: Well, the one thing is, on our lot coverage right now is sort of a zero some gain. So, if we filled that in and added a one story porch, I'd have to remove some porch from the rear. I would be -- again, initially, the first design I actually had had no porch at all, just a small, just a recessed door, a recessed door within that piece, mainly because of wanting to preserve as much porch in the back.

MR. KEATING: I live in a house now that has a traditional porch from porch.

MR. KIRWAN: State your name for the record.

MR. KEATING: My name is Pat Keating, I'm the owner of the property, and my wife gave George specific instructions not to put a front porch on the house because she didn't want, that's just an element she didn't want. So I got to speak for her.
MR. ARKIN: So, you are saying that it is not what you want?

MR. KEATING: We don't want the traditional front porch because the lot coverage is so expensive and right now we're fighting for every square foot we can on this property. And I'd much rather have a useable screen porch on the back, than I would a front porch that I don't use. I do like the look of this property. I think it's very clean, very simple, and it's practically, the front door is covered, which is what I like as well.

MR. ARKIN: To the right of that on the front, and around the corner on the right side of the house, you have some, again, some very long windows. Do they need to be that long? Are you trying for dramatic affect or?

MR. MYERS: No. I mean, nothing needs to be. It was just a, you know, it's just a more contemporary look. A little bit more glass than you would typically see. It could certainly be, you know, less.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions? All right, if not, thank you for your testimony. We'll give your our thoughts on the matter. I think it would be good for the applicant to hear from all of us, so if we could just sort of go around the dais and give our thoughts on the matter. Paying close attention to the points that Staff have raised
on Circle 3. You mind starting us off, Commissioner Arkin?

MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Staff has asked for guidance on the projecting bays, and because they're far back, I have less problem with them. And, the cantilevered bay that's over the door, I think it's far enough back that, this is my own opinion, I think it's far enough back that it's not a major problem. My personal opinion is that the front of the house, although it's a little unusual, is less of a problem than some of the other issues. To me it doesn't shout at me. This is not a -- we're not trying to replicate a period house. This is a non-contributing resource, or will be a non-contributing, so I think what we're most concerned about is compatibility.

And, to that end, I am concerned about the very long floor to ceiling windows on the first floor. I'd like to see them less prominent and more compatible. A little shorter than that. Otherwise, I think this is headed in the right direction. I do like the idea of the porch, even though that will not be truly visible from the street. And I do like the idea of the smaller garage too, which I think is the applicant's, the owner's preference and is more consistent with many of the surrounding houses.

MR. FIRESTONE: I don't have too much to add. I feel as the Staff pointed out, this house will be more compatible with the historic district than the 1964 house
that's currently there. So, I encourage you to continue
with this project. I also prefer the single car garage and
porch configuration that the owner seems to like also. And,
the other thing that Commissioner Arkin pointed out is,
maybe a little less glass to make it a little more
compatible with some of the other houses.

MS. BARNES: I want to thank you for bringing this
project to us. I think you have sought to have in massing
something that is very compatible with the neighborhood, and
you have at the same time made a very distinctively new
house by using some rather sleek approaches. And the large
windows, I think, are part of that. I'm not troubled by
them as they fit into this. I would be troubled if massing
were rather different.

We were asked about this sort of use of, I think,
brackets on the cantilevered window over the door, and I
wonder if it would be more appropriate to repeat the sort of
sleeker approach that you've used on the front of the house
where you have created a little covered space for a person
fiddling with his or her key trying to get in the front
door. I think that your choice of materials, based on what
the Staff has told us, is consistent with what we have
generally approved, and it seems to me that if you go with a
screen porch, and based on what I've heard, if you do a
terrace above or not, it does not seem as if that would be
particularly visible from the right-of-way. And, I think the smaller garage is a better option. And, as I understand it, if you want the porch basically the only option.

MR. MYERS: That's correct.

MS. BARNES: So, thank you.

MR. MYERS: Thank you.

MS. HEILER: I'd like to echo Commissioner's Barnes' suggestions. I think you've been quite successful at picking up some design elements from the neighborhood and still coming up with a really very contemporary design. I think the large windows are an important part of that contemporary look. Staff asked us to comment on the brackets and ornamentation on the bay. I think they're probably minimally visible from the road, maybe not at all. And, it may well be another example, picking up a little bit of design hints from the neighborhood, so I don't object to them. I wouldn't require them. I also agree with everyone else that the smaller garage and the porch is a better overall use of the space.

MS. SALISBURY-JONES: I don't have a lot to add. I am in support of the project. The materials are fine. As far as options go, I think, Option 1 is the better choice. And the size and massing is appropriate, and compatible with the neighborhood. And I appreciate that you're not trying to replicate exactly, but taking cues from the style of the
MR. CARROLL: I don't have too much to add either. I think the massing is right on. I think it's a big improvement over the house that's, you know, parallel to the road. This makes a lot more sense in Garrett Park. You know, the brackets on the cantilevered window on the second floor, I think it's going to be minimally visible because of the stair tower just in the front of it and the narrow lot. You know, I could see them go away because all the rest of this is so clean. I really like the minimal trim. It looks like there's no corner boards on here, so it's really a stripped down, it's a huge acreage kind of a shaker house without all the who ha's on it. I like the glass in the front. That's what we want to put, even a suggestion of a tackle on that column in the front, just clean, when you go out on the screening.

I really like the modern rear porch, but I think it's minimally visible from the right-of-way. I don't think it really falls under our purview too much. And, yeah, I think I could be in support of this. I like it. I like where you're going with it. I think it's a big improvement. Thank you.

MS. VOIGT: I also don't have a lot to add. I think this a successful project. I think when evaluating new construction in a historic district, you're looking at size
and setback, and scale and massing, and I think the
periscope affect to the house, the height of the house, the
massing, I think it's all successful. And I think it's
important that, you know, impact the sense of place that
Garrett Park Historic District has, and I think that this
will, you know, fit in successfully.

MR. KIRWAN: And, I would agree. I echo the
sentiments of the other Commissioners. I think it's a nice
project. The massing is a very successful way to address
the site in this district. I do agree that Option 1 is the
better option with the porch and the single car garage. And
I don't have any issues with the materials. You know, the
only little details that concern me a little bit is the
front porch.

There's something about it that, it's almost a
little bit too traditional for me. I almost want to push it
a little more contemporary. I don't know whether it's that
frieze board, that maybe goes away and the siding just comes
down to the top of the columns. There's something about
that that just to me doesn't feel consistent with the other
details. I sort of feel the same way about the brackets on
the projecting bay. I almost think the brackets ought to go
away, and the projecting bay ought to be more contemporary,
you know, visually unsupported cantilever. But, those are
details, and minor details. And I think those are things
that, you know, are probably going to, you're going to study a lot more as you develop it.

I think the only other, you know, I think you know this already, but just consistency between the drawings, the floor plans and the model, and the elevations. You know, we don't see the projecting bay on the floor plans yet. I'm sure that'll show up next time around. So, we look forward to seeing you come back for your HAWP.

MR. MYERS: Thank you very much.

MR. KIRWAN: All right, thank you.

MR. WHIPPLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. KIRWAN: Yes?

MR. WHIPPLE: I think we heard from two Commissioners who wanted shorter windows, and I think by inference, the balance of you are good with the windows as they are, is that correct? So staff can give appropriate guidance?

MR. ARKIN: Does that include the stair tower too?

The very long window in the stair tower.

MR. KIRWAN: I don't have an issue.

MR. FIRESTONE: I can go with the shorter windows, or the ones on this. I'm not that concerned about that.

MR. KIRWAN: All right.

MR. ARKIN: What gives me heartburn is the stair tower. So, if you could look at see if there's any way to
make it a little less screamingly modern.

MR. MYERS: Thank you very much.

MR. KIRWAN: All right, thank you. We're going to
jump back to Case II.A at 10221 Montgomery Avenue in
Kensington. Do we have that Staff Report ready?

MR. BRUCHERT: Thank you. We're in Kensington,
10221 Montgomery Avenue. The proposal here is for a
relatively modest addition to this circa 1898 Queen Anne
that has a non-historic addition back to the rear. And the
proposal is to install a mudroom between the side and the
back. And, if you look to the left of the tree in the
center, you can see a new entrance introduced into the non-
historic addition. It's a better view. What you see on the
right with the solid brick foundation is historic. The
brick piers are actually a non-historic addition.

So the proposal is to actually build closer to the
street the mudroom and continue on a hardiplank side, the
new construction. Again, this is, you can see the contrast
between historic wood on the right with the shutters and the
one over one windows, and then on the left you see non-
historic addition. That entrance will go away and then a
new one will replace it.

So, there's a site plan of the house. You can see
sort of the octagonal section, octagonal shaped addition in
the rear is the non-historic. The new mudroom will be added
basically where the porch and stairs are, and project
slightly. And you can see the two existing and proposed
floor plans. There will be the loss of one historic window.
And you can see that on the existing first floor plan, that
window will be turned into, basically a passway between the
mudroom and the kitchen. As proposed, the porch will then
become smaller. And there will be two small windows
introduced into the new mudroom, which will project two feet
six inches outside beyond the edge of the non-historic
addition to the rear.

   Again, this is the side elevation that we're
looking at. So, we'll have a projecting addition. The
roofline will remain pretty consistent with the non-historic
addition. It does come forward of the house, but I think
that the hipped roof shape blends in better with the
addition than a gable that sort of truncates at the entrance
itself.

   Lastly, the other proposal is to replace this
vent, this roof vent that you see with a window. The window
details were not provided with Staff. Sorry, I didn't
include in my photographs. There is a front window in the
dormer that's a six over six. Staff is interested in
figuring out whether a one over one that would match the
window configuration found around the rest of the house
would be appropriate, or if a six over six is consistent
with the dormer would be better.

The questions that I have for you is regarding new
construction. This is sort of the push and pull of
Standards 9 and 10, is it compatible enough, yet
differentiated enough with the historic to be successful? I
think that it's placement is appropriate. I think that it's
scale is appropriate. Based on the site from the plan, it
won't be prominently visible. And then, my last question for
the Commission is whether or not, or what the appropriate
window configuration would be for replacing a dormer vent
with a window? Otherwise, it's a simple modest project.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you. Questions?

MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What is the
siding on the house? What material is it?

MR. BRUCHERT: The house is wood. The addition
is, I believe, Hardie.

MR. ARKIN: Okay. The proposed addition is
Hardie?

MR. BRUCHERT: Well the proposed addition is, but
the extant non-historic addition that is on your screen now
is also Hardie, I believe.

MR. ARKIN: And the trim materials are, presumably
they're wood on the existing house, will be Azec or
something similar to that on the --

MR. BRUCHERT: That's correct.
MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MS. HEILER: Are the six over six windows in the upper dormer original? Are they new or do we know anything about them?

MR. BRUCHERT: I think they're in-filled sometimes. I don't have specifications on those. I'm sorry I didn't include the image that I had.

MS. VOIGT: You can see it in one of the pictures.

We have an image.

MR. BRUCHERT: Oh, thank you. You know, I mean, the placement looks appropriate. You know, as to whether or not that was original, I would have to guess. My guess would be it's a later, but still historic addition. And the dormer with the vent is original.

MS. BARNES: Commissioner Barnes just pointed out, the dentils over those six by six, or the six over six windows which make them suspiciously newer than the house.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff? Would the applicant please come forward. I think you know the drill, but before you speak, just make sure your microphone is on and state your name for the record.

MS. DEICHMAN: Hi I'm Laurie Deichman, and I'm the homeowner. And obviously, I haven't done this before.

MR. BRESLIN: I'm Steven Breslin, the architect. I have done this before, and I sat up there for six years,
so I'm familiar with the process. Well, okay, to answer
some of the questions, I've been around up in the attic, I
believe all the dormers are original. The windows on the
front, if you go to my drawings, the double-hung windows on
the front are the only windows in the entire house that have
muntins. So, my assumption is that those are -- can you go
to the front of the house? They're the only windows in the
entire house that have muntins, so our assumption is that
they are the right size windows, but they were replaced at
some point.

And, as far as replacing the attic fan, which is
obviously not original to the house, the dormer appears to
be original. The attic fan vent is not original. And
there's a dormer on the opposite side that has either an
awning or a hopper. And I replicated that in the drawing.
It's either an awning or a hopper, a vertical, I'm sorry, a
horizontal window. So the assumption is that this had a
awning or a hopper that was replaced. It was replaced by an
attic fan, and will go back to an awning or a hopper. And
you can see the proportion of that, the vent is square, and
I think I drew a double-hung here. And a double-hung here
looks very high. So I think the horizontal window, first of
all, looks better. And if you look at the window on the
opposite side, it's what's on the opposite side. So that's
the story with the attic window.
As far as the first floor addition, when you look at the house now, the addition is clearly an addition. It's very similar materials. The detailing of the windows are the same, but it's clearly an addition. Complimentary. I think it looks good. But, no one would, you know, confuse that with the existing house. And we're just trying to make it a little bit wider, a little bit deeper to make it more, to introduce more living space to the house, but to do it in a very sympathetic way that remains very subservient.

Setback from the front. We're only extending outwards two and a half feet. You know, 30 inches isn't very far. But it's enough to give some living space to the inside and make the mudroom and some of the interior functions work better. So we thought it was a way of, you know, very modestly adding to a non-historic addition in a way that didn't distract from the main house, but was still distinguishable. Just by its size, it's location, and it's scale.

Another thing, you'll see, there is one window. A kitchen window which I wasn't convinced is historic, but maybe you looked at it more carefully than I did. But there are three clearly historic windows, and they are remaining. And the one we're going to kind of put inside the porch so we can maintain it.

MR. KIRWAN: And the foundation materials of your proposal are brick to match the addition?
MR. BRESLIN: It'll be brick. It'll be a brick addition.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. Very good. And painted wood railings, similar stair treatment to what we see in the existing?

MR. BRESLIN: Exactly.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions?

MS. BARNES: I'm sorry. I didn't understand something you just said about the window which you would keep on the inside?

MR. BRESLIN: So, if you see the existing, there's two large windows on the first floor. And when the porch, well, when the mudroom gets extended, one of those windows winds up being inside the porch. And we did that so we could save it, and not disturb the window. And that dictated how far the porch went. It would be nice to have a larger porch in some ways or a larger mudroom in some ways. But we didn't want to disturb that window. It's very important on the outside. It's very important on the inside.

MS. BARNES: And then the smaller window that you think is non-original will become a passway?

MR. BRESLIN: I don't want to say I don't think it's original but, just because of where it's located and the kitchen, the kitchen's been redone a couple of times.
I'm not convinced it's original. It may or may not be.

MS. BARNES: Okay.

MR. BRESLIN: But it's not a large feature window like the other ones are.

MS. BARNES: Thank you.

MR. ARKIN: And that will become what again?

MR. BRESLIN: A pass through.

MR. ARKIN: An interior pass through?

MR. BRESLIN: Turned into a door.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for the applicant? No? Very good. Then let's move into deliberations. Thank you for your testimony. Commissioner Voigt, would you like to start things off?

MS. VOIGT: Hi. I think the addition is a nice addition. I think it's, you know, minimal, compliments very minimal. I don't think it is too -- I think it's differentiated enough, and I think it works. And, as far as the window, I think a six over six replicating the other dormer window is -- that was one of the questions of Staff. I think, you know, is that what you're looking at?

MR. BRESLIN: Well, one thing we can do is, before we come back, we can make sure we understand what the opposite dormer is, because I looked at it, I said, I'm almost sure it's an awning or a hopper, I showed. But we
can take some additional photographs.

MS. DEICHMAN: I think in the first photo that we
saw, it was taken from the yard, if you look really
carefully in that --

MR. BRESLIN: Oh, you can see it.

MS. DEICHMAN: You can see the existing window on
the other side.

MR. BRESLIN: It's not very clear, but there you
go. That's what we're trying to replicate.

MS. VOIGT: So, I think it fulfills the Secretary
of Interior Standards here that are stated under 9, not to
destroy historic materials, features, and differentiate from
the old. So good thinking.

MR. CARROLL: I also think it's a nice improvement
to the house. You know, with the Standards that we're
looking at, the vision for Kensington, thoughts about the
rhythm, the spacing, the scale, the building height, the
directional expression of the house, I think that it's, the
main mass of the house with those three gables around the
sides is, and the roof, is the kind of main point that this
house is making. The addition is so far back, and so small,
that I don't think it disrupts the spacing of the street of
anything, so I don't have a problem with the addition. I
think it's going to make a big improvement.

In terms of the -- replacing the louver there, I
think taking your cues from the other side of the house is the right approach. So, yeah, I'd be interested to see that. I think that the -- I agree with you, the addition is differentiated enough that, you know, you threaded that needle, it's compatible but not, you know, creating a false sense of history. So, I like it. It looks good.

MS. SALISBURY-JONES: I'm in agreement with previous Commissioners' comments. It's a good project. Don't have any concerns. I agree it's different enough and far back. Also, I think taking the cue from the other windows, it being a horizontal window is perfectly fine. And that's all I have.

MS. HEILER: I agree also with the previous comments. Putting in the small horizontal window to match the other side will be actually important improvement to this side.

MS. BARNES: I want to thank you for coming in for a preliminary consultation, and I also want to thank you for your patience when we reversed the order, because one of our Staff people needed to be able to talk to applicants about their results. So thank you very much for your patience. I'm very supportive of your project. I think that the proposed mudroom is differentiated, and it is discreet enough that it doesn't impact the historic structure. I would be supportive of your horizontal window taking its cue
from the other eave. I would not be supportive of the six
over six windows that are on the front, because somehow it
looks slightly off to me. So, thank you.

MR. FIRESTONE: I'm going to try and be as brief
as possible. I think everything that the other
Commissioners have said I agree with. This addition works.
It's compatible, but not giving a false sense of history. I
think the horizontal window would be the way to go. And I
look forward to seeing an approvable application for a work
permit.

MR. ARKIN: I would also like to thank you for
coming in for a preliminary consultation. I think it was a
little less than helpful to you, so you will know if you're
going in the right direction. I think you are going in the
right direction. I'm supportive of your proposal. I also
agree that the horizontal window on the eave matching the
one on the other eave is a good solution.

I also think that with the materials you're using
for the addition are sufficiently -- will sufficiently
differentiate the old from the new. And also are certainly
compatible with it. And I'm really not sure that the six
over six windows on the front are before us tonight. If
they are before us tonight, I think one over one would be
more appropriate. But, I'm not sure they're before us.

MR. BRESLIN: They're existing.
MR. ARKIN: They are before us?

MR. BRESLIN: No, they're existing windows that we're not touching.

MR. ARKIN: So it's not part of the application?

MR. BRESLIN: No, they're just an aberration.

MS. DEICHHAM: Would you like them to be?

MR. KIRWAN: I agree with all the other Commissioners. This project meets our county code, meets our criteria and regulations that we follow. And we do want to thank you for coming in, and we look forward to the HAWP when you come back. Thank you.

The next item on the agenda are meeting minutes.

Do you have for us, Scott, and I do apologize, I am delinquent with mine and I will make sure mine are ready for the next hearing.

MR. WHIPPLE: We have no transcripts for approval. I just want the record to reflect that the October 26th and December 7th transcripts have been previously approved.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay, very good. And September 7th is still outstanding, is that right?

MR. WHIPPLE: September 7th, October 5th, December 16th, they're the only ones that are out. We haven't gotten you the December and on ones.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you. Do we have a volunteer for tonight? Thanks, Commissioner Voigt, appreciate that.
Plan: Option #1
House: 1,600 sq ft
Garage: 204 sq ft
Porch: 184 sq ft
Total: 2,098 sq ft (20%)

Lot Size: 10,498 sq ft.

Plan: Option #2
House: 1,660 sq ft
Garage: 490 sq ft
Total: 2,150 sq ft (20%)