MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 7110 Sycamore Ave., Takoma Park
Resource: Contributing Resource
(Takoma Park Historic District)
Applicant: Joan Marsh
(Owen Philbin, Agent)
Review: HAWP
Case Number: 37/03-17II

Meeting Date: 5/24/2017
Report Date: 5/17/2017
Public Notice: 5/10/2017
Tax Credit: Partial
Staff: Michael Kyne

PROPOSAL: Roof reconfiguration, non-historic window replacement, and other alterations

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource within the Takoma Park Historic District
STYLE: Bungalow
DATE: c. 1910-1925

BACKGROUND:

The applicant previously appeared before the Commission for preliminary consultations at the March 22, 2017 and April 19, 2017 HPC meetings. At the second preliminary consultation, the Commission was supportive of the applicant’s revisions, but expressed the following:

- There was unanimous preference for Option 1.
- The windows in the proposed rear addition should have some consistency (i.e., size, location, height).
- The proposed deck should be at the rear of the proposed rear addition, not at the left side.
- Accurate existing and proposed floorplans and elevations are required for the Commission to make an informed finding.

PROPOSAL:

The applicant is proposing the following work items at the subject property:

- Replace the existing asphalt shingle roofing.
- Remove existing rear structures.
- Construct new rear addition.
• Rebuild existing front porch.
• Convert an existing basement-level window to a door.
• Replace all existing non-historic windows.
• Construct a new deck at the rear of the proposed rear addition.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

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

Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines

There are two very general, broad planning and design concepts which apply to all categories. These are:

• The design review emphasis will be restricted to changes that are all visible from the public right-of-way, irrespective of landscaping or vegetation (it is expected that the majority of new additions will be reviewed for their impact on the overall district), and

• The importance of assuring that additions and other changes to existing structures act to reinforce and continue existing streetscape, landscape, and building patterns rather than to impair the character of the historic district.

A majority of structures in the Takoma Park Historic District have been assessed as being “Contributing Resources.” While these structures may not have the same level of architectural or historical significance as Outstanding Resources or may have lost some degree of integrity, collectively, they are the basic building blocks of the Takoma Park district. However, they are more important to the overall character of the district and the streetscape due to their size, scale, and architectural character, rather than for their particular architectural features.

Contributing Resources should receive a more lenient level of design review than those structures that have been classified as Outstanding. This design review should emphasize the importance of the resource to the overall streetscape and its compatibility with existing patterns rather than focusing on a close scrutiny of architectural detailing. In general, however, changes to Contributing Resources should respect the predominant architectural style of the resource.

The Guidelines that pertain to this project are as follows:

• All exterior alterations, including those to architectural features and details, should be generally consistent with the predominant architectural style and period of the resource and should preserve the predominant architectural features of the resource; exact replication of existing details and features is, however, not required.

• Major additions should, where feasible, be placed to the rear of existing structures so that they are less visible from the public right-of-way; additions and alterations to the first floor at the front of a structure are discouraged but not automatically prohibited.
• While additions should be compatible, they are not required to be replicative of earlier architectural styles.

• Some non-original building materials may be acceptable on a case-by-case basis; artificial siding on areas visible from the public right-of-way is discouraged where such materials would replace or damage original building materials that are in good condition.

• All changes and additions should respect existing environmental settings, hardscaping, and patterns of open space.

Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8

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

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

(1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or

(2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or

(3) The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or

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

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

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

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

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

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:
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 for two preliminary consultations. At the last preliminary consultation (April 19, 2107), the Commission was generally supportive of the revisions that the applicant had made to their proposal since the first preliminary consultation (March 22, 2017), but provided comments and suggestions to make the proposal approvable when submitting for a HAWP.

At the second preliminary consultation, the applicant provided two options for the design of the proposed rear addition. Both options were generally consistent, but Option 2 included a gesture to the rear roof forms that are proposed to be removed. The Commission unanimously preferred Option 1 without the gesture.

The Commission suggested that the windows in the proposed rear addition be consistent, finding that, as proposed, the windows had no order, with random sizes and placement on each elevation.
The applicant proposed a new wooden deck on the left side of the proposed rear addition, which had not been included in their submission for the first preliminary consultation. The applicant indicated that the deck was being proposed at the left side because it would replace an existing wooden deck in the same approximate location. The Commission suggested that the applicant explore constructing the new deck at the rear of the proposed rear addition, where it will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way and less likely to detract from the historic house.

The Commission also pointed out several inconsistencies between the existing and proposed drawings and stated the importance of accurate existing and proposed floorplans and elevations when submitting for a HAWP.

The applicant has revised their proposal in accordance with the Commission’s comments and suggestions. Specifically, the applicant has made the following revisions to their HAWP application:

- The applicant proposes Option 1.
- The windows in the proposed rear addition are generally consistent in size and height, and the windows have a stacked appearance.
- The proposed deck has been moved to the rear of the proposed rear addition.
- The applicant has provided accurate existing and proposed floorplans and elevations.

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 Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines outlined above.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Commission **approve with the condition specified on Circle 1** the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b), having found that the proposal is consistent with the *Takoma Park 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 Name: O PHILBIN @ YAHOO.COM
Contact Phone: 301-946-9790

Name of Property Owner: JOAN MARSH
Daytime Phone No: 202-262-7499

Address: 328 LINCOLN AVE TAKOMA PK MD 20912

Contractor: ________________________________
Contractor Registration No.: __________________
Agency for Owner: ____________________________
Daytime Phone No.: __________________________

LOCATION OF WORK TO BE PERFORMED
House Number: 7110 SYCAMORE
Street: ____________________________
Town/City: TAKOMA PARK
Nearest Cross Street: COLUMBIA
Lot: 12, Block: 21, Subdivision: BF GILBERTS

PARTICULARS OFhoot the WORK TO BE PERFORMED

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE
☐ Construct ☐ Extend ☐ Alter/Remove
☐ Add.: ☐ Scratch ☐ Room: Addition ☐ Porch ☐ Deck ☐ Shed
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Wind/Rain
☐ Solar ☐ Fence ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Single Family
☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☐ Removable
☐ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☐ Other:

1B. Construction cost/estimate: $ __________

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

PART II: PERMITTED CONSTRUCTION AND EXTERMINATION

2A. Type of sewage disposal: ☐ 01 SEWAGE ☐ 02 Septic ☐ 03 Other:

2B. Type of water supply: ☐ 01 CITY WATER ☐ 02 WELL ☐ 03 Other:

PART III: COMMISSIONER OF VITAL RECORDS

3A. Height: ________________ feet above

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

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

Signature of owner or authorized agent: ________________

Date: 3-1-17

Approved: ____________________________
For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission

Disapproved: ____________________________
Signature: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________

Application/Permit No.: ____________________________
DateFiled: ____________________________
Date Issued: ____________________________

-- SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS --
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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:
   
   **Home Bought out of Foreclosure. Partially gutted by previous Owner. Revealed many good base additions and some Structural Defects. Original Roof Framing is 2x4 on 2 ft Centers with 20# Plus Span Nails. Poured and needs to be replaced. Existing Windows are All Replacements (Wood and Aluminum). Front Roof is Batted and Falling Away From Home.**
   
   b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district:
   
   **Replace Roof changing the Peak from Side to Side to Front to Back. This will help with the Control of Rain water to Ease Pressure on Existing Foundation. Replace All Windows with Historically Accurate Windows. Change Gate Window in driveway to a door.**

2. SITE PLAN
   Site and environmental setting, drawn to scale. You may use your plat. Your site plan must include:
   a. Scale, north arrow, and date;
   b. Dimensions of all existing and proposed structures; and
   c. Features such as walkways, driveways, fences, pools, ponds, streams, trees, etc., 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 representation plan, with marked dimensions, including locations, size and general type of walls, windows, and door openings, and other fixed features of both the existing structure 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 features proposed for the facades must be noted on the elevations drawings. An existing and a proposed elevation drawing of each facade affected by the proposed work is required.

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

5. PHOTOGRAPHY
   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 at the adjoining property. All labels should be placed on the front of photograph.

6. TREE SURVEY
   If you are proposing construction adjacent to or within the skyline of any tree 6" or larger in diameter (at approximately 4 feet above the ground), you must fill an accurate tree survey identifying the size, location, and species of each tree of interest that is affected.

7. ADDRESSES OF ADJACENT AND CONFLICTING PROPERTY OWNERS
   For all projects, provide an accurate list of adjacent and conflicting property owners (not tenants), including names, addresses, and zip codes. This list should include the owners of all lots or parcels which abut the parcel in question, as well as all owners of all lots or parcels which lie directly across the street or highway from the parcel in question.

PLEASE PRINT IN BLACK OR BLUE INK OR TYPE THIS INFORMATION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE.
PLEASE STAY WITHIN THE GUIDES OF THE TEMPLATE, AS THIS WILL BE PHOTOGRAPHED DIRECTLY INTO MAILING LABELS.
16033571
LOCATION DRAWING
LOT 12, BLOCK 21
B.F. GILBERT'S SUBDIVISION OF TAKOMA PARK,
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
09-30-2016 SCALE 1"=50'

PLEASE NOTE
This House Location Drawing is for informational purposes only. For Maryland State Code it may not be relied upon to determine property boundaries and may not be used for building permits or construction.

EXPIRES 10-28-16

GRAPHIC SCALE (In Feet)
1 inch = 50' ft.
ACCURACY=3'

SYCAMORE AVENUE
NEW ARCHITECTURAL ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOFING

REPLACE SQUARE WOOD COLUMNS - PAINTED

KEEP EXISTING SIDING

REBUILD/REPAIR WOOD STAIR TO MATCH EXISTING

PROPOSED FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION
WOOD TOP RAIL - WM-8840 SCREW TO 6X6 POSTS WITH (2) SIMPSON SDS SCREWS

1 1/4" WOOD BALUSTER - WM 2375 @ 4" O.C.

WOOD BOTTOM RAIL - WM-8841 SCREW TO 6X6 POSTS WITH (2) SIMPSON SDS SCREWS

RAILING DETAIL
Existing Property Condition Photographs (duplicate as needed)
Site Plan

Shade portion to Indicate North

Applicant: ___________________________
## 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><strong>Joan Marsh</strong></td>
<td><strong>Owen Phillips</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328 Lincoln Ave</td>
<td>328 Lincoln Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Pk, Md</td>
<td>Takoma Pk, Md</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20912</td>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Shofar</td>
<td>7108 Sycamore Ave, Takoma Pk, Md</td>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Franchot &amp; Anne Maher</td>
<td>7111 Sycamore Ave, Takoma Pk, Md</td>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Lalonde &amp; Julia Zito</td>
<td>7112 Sycamore Ave, Takoma Pk, Md</td>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary L Jordan</td>
<td>1711 Poplar, Takoma Pk, Md</td>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia J Hallberlin</td>
<td>1713 Poplar, Takoma Pk, Md</td>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Kenney &amp; Sue Immerman</td>
<td>7107 Poplar, Takoma Pk, Md</td>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous Proposal
(April 19, 2017)
NEW ARCHITECTURAL ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOFING

REPLACE SQUARE WOOD COLUMNS - PAINTED

KEEP EXISTING SIDING

REBUILD/REPAIR WOOD STAIR TO MATCH EXISTING

PROPOSED FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION

OPTION 1
PROPOSED FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION

- REBUILD / REPAIR WOOD STAIR TO MATCH EXISTING
- NEW ARCHITECTURAL ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOFING
- EXISTING SQUARE WOOD COLUMN PAINTED
EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION
PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION

OPTION 2
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

---

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
7110 Sycamore Avenue
---

---

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
April 19, 2017, commencing at 7:32 p.m., in the MRO
Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland
20910, before:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Kirwan, Chair
Sandra Heiler
Marsha Barnes
Kenneth Firestone
Kathleen Legg
Richard Arkin
Eliza Voigt
MR. KYNE: Thank you. Yes, we do have a Staff Report. Again, 7110 Sycamore Avenue, Takoma Park. It's a Contributing Resource within the Takoma Park Historic District. Bungalow style, circa 1910 to 1925. And this is a second preliminary consultation. And the applicant previously appeared before you at the March 22nd hearing, and you expressed the following concerns. The original siding appears to be in good condition, and should not be removed/replaced. The 1927 Sanborn map indicates the central front porch is original to the house, and it should not be replaced with a full-width front porch. The design of the historic house is rather simple, and it would be inappropriate to add ornamentation to the historic house and/or rear addition. The windows of the proposed rear addition should be consistent in size. And, there was also some discussion or a question as to whether which sections of the existing house should be preserved, and which could be removed.

So the revised proposal is to replace the existing asphalt shingle roofing, remove existing rear structures, construct new rear additions, rebuild the existing front porch, convert an existing basement level window to a door, replace all existing non-historic windows, construct a new deck on the left side of the proposed new rear addition. And, I believe that reconfiguration of the historic roof and
pitch should be added to this list.

So we've seen these photographs before, but I'll walk you around the property. Front, right side, rear, left side, and take note of the existing deck, here. And the garage at the rear. Nothing being proposed for this.

Again, the garage.

So, I do have the elevations, the existing and proposed here for reference. And, I'll go through them slowly. And also, please take note to the differences in the porch in Option 1, which is before you now, and Option 2. And again, how they relate to the existing front porch. And also, the previously referenced roof reconfiguration. This is the existing roof and the existing pitch; and this is the proposed. And in this slide, please take note of the proposed rear deck, which is shown in Option 1, and based upon the location of the door in Option 2, I believe that it is proposed for both.

Ad the main difference -- let me backtrack for a second -- the main difference between Option 1 and Option 2, in my opinion, unless the applicant can say otherwise, is that Option 2 has a sort of gesture to the existing roof form at the rear.

And the applicable guidelines are the Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines, and the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. And we only have a
few things to discuss tonight. Again, this is a second
prelim so, first Option 1 versus Option 2. I'm just asking
for your guidance regarding these two options. I want you
to determine if either option fully addresses your previous
concerns regarding the retention and/or removal of the
existing rear structures. And if both options address your
concerns, some guidance regarding the preferred option,
which would be the one with the least potential to detract
from the property in the district?

And the front porch. Again, as I showed you in
the existing of the two proposals, the applicant proposes to
rebuild the central front porch. However, in Option 1, the
front porch is depicted as being wider. This might be an
error in the drawing. Maybe the intention is to have it
wider in both Option 1 and 2, or maybe it's not to have it
be wider at all. But maybe we can address that with the
applicant and get some feedback. And, Staff would suggest
that the central front porch should be rebuilt the same
approximate dimensions and design as the existing since we
do have documentation that it is original to the house, and
it's highly visible at the front. And, I ask for your
guidance on this matter.

And, I'll share with you the existing deck on the
left side. And, again, it's not depicted in the existing
elevations, but it is there. And per the elevations for
Option 1, we see that they're proposing a new deck at the left side, which appears to project somewhat beyond the left side elevation of the historic house. Although we do not have dimensions for that deck at this time. So, I ask your guidance regarding the appropriateness of the proposed deck? And that is all.

I will add that when I wrote the Staff Report, I did not notice that the roof was changing, that the pitch was changing, so if the Commission could please provide guidance as to whether that's appropriate? I know that we previously heard from the applicant that the roof is not code compliant and it needs to be rebuilt. But maybe they can address whether it can be rebuilt, you know, similar to its existing condition or if there's a reason for the change. And, with that, I would be happy to take any questions you might have for me.

MR. KIRWAN: Michael, could you pull up the slide that shows the north elevation? I think it's the same slide on Circle 23. It's the photograph, I'm sorry. There you go, that's it. Okay, thanks. Any questions for Staff? Any other questions?

MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This may be a question that's more appropriate to pose to the applicant. Can you explain exactly what is happening on the south elevation in Option 2, on Circle 17? There seems to be a
change in the dimension of the addition. Though it's really not clear what the dimension is, or whether there was a smaller shed structure, or whether that is just a decorative gesture with the roof trim? Should I pose that to the applicant?

MR. KYNE: I can try to answer that. My understanding, having had discussions with the applicant, is that this is just a decorative feature. So this is an attempt to make a gesture towards the existing rear addition, which we've pretty much determined is actually original to the house, so we were trying to make a gesture to that structure. That was done at Staff's suggestion after the last prelim. This is sort of what the applicant came up with. I don't know if there are other ways to achieve this but, my understanding is, to answer your question, this is only a decorative feature.

MR. ARKIN: Then does that mean that the addition in Option 2 is wider than the addition in Option 1? Presumably, there is some depth to the deck that's shown there?

MR. KYNE: Again, and I did get a nod in confirmation from the applicant when I was going over this in the presentation, the intention is to have the deck in both options which, sort of the way you can tell that is the fact that when you show the door there at the second level
in the same approximate place, so again, I believe that the applicant did give me the confirmation that the intention is to have the deck in both options.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Michael, could you pull up the photograph of the front porch? Because I think there's some drafting issues on the drawings. So, is the front porch roof coplanar with the main roof?

MR. KYNE: As I recall from my site visit, I believe that it is. You may be able to see some relief.

MR. KIRWAN: There's a slight angle shot that you have in here of the front facade, it's in the Staff packet, maybe you don't have it up on the slide. It's not as dramatic as -- if you pull up the existing front facade drawing --

MR. KYNE: Actually, I have, just as before, I have quite a few photographs here, and maybe this helps?

MR. KIRWAN: Well, it is, but it's not nearly as dramatic as the front elevation and the side -- existing elevations are drawn. So at the most it breaks off from the gutter board a few inches. But, it shows as a much pronounced shed in the existing drawing. So, I think in the proposed front facades, we're getting something closer to what actually exists, than what we're seeing in the existing.
MR. KYNE: Right. I think so. I would agree with that.

MR. KIRWAN: So I think there's some drafting issues on the drawings that we need to have the applicant address. Okay. Any other questions for Staff? If not, invite the applicant please come forward. You're welcome to provide any testimony, or just take our questions. Whatever you prefer. And before you speak, just state your name for the record.

MR. PHILBIN: My name is Owen Philbin.

MR. KIRWAN: Do you want to just take questions?

MR. PHILBIN: I'm ready. Yes.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. Very good. Can you -- why don't I just start off. Can you -- a couple things we're noticing, as we just mentioned, was the front porch. It seems much less dramatic as a shed than your existing drawings make it look like. So your proposed drawings make it look much more different than the existing drawings do, yet the proposed drawings look closer to --

MR. PHILBIN: My proposed drawing must be wrong.

MR. KIRWAN: What's that?

MR. PHILBIN: I mean, my existing drawing must be wrong.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay, that's helpful. The other question is, you're lowering the roof ridge by about a foot
it looks like from existing to proposed. And, we're
wondering why you're doing that? You're making the roof
angle shallower, at least on your drawings, that's the way
it reads. So, if you look at -- why don't you just flip
back and forth between these two, Michael and you'll that
window, the gable end window is much closer to the ridge and
dimensions say 8 foot 1 on the existing drawing, and it says
7 foot 1 on the proposed drawings. Is there a reason to --

MR. PHILBIN: Well, I had him lower the rear roof
one foot, and he may have lowered both roofs.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. Because actually this, the
proposed roof of the main body of the house looks more
accurate to me based on the photographs, than the existing
drawing makes it look?

MR. PHILBIN: Yeah.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. So, I think it'll be helpful
when you --

MR. PHILBIN: I was trying to bring the addition
roof down, and he must have --

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. And that we see.

MR. PHILBIN: -- lowered both roofs down at the
same time.

MR. KIRWAN: Well, but I guess the question is, is
the roof we're seeing in this drawing actually correct?

Because it looks more correct compared to the photographs.
MR. PHILBIN: And that's the seven foot?

MR. KIRWAN: Yeah. And you probably have a field dimension you can verify?

MR. PHILBIN: Yes, I believe that it is seven foot, yeah, 7 foot 1 inside from the subfloor to the bottom of the rafter.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. Well, this is saying to the top of the top of the ridge, so, okay. Because what that drawing does is it gets us closer to the geometry that's needed at the front porch to have it look like what's in the photographs. So, I think you need to go back and verify the accuracy of your drawings, and when we see an existing drawing and a proposed drawing, there shouldn't be any changes that you're not proposing to do in other words. Because it confuses us, and it gets us fixated on something that's really not, may not be an issue. So we were concerned coming down here that you had made a complete change to the historic rooftop.

MR. PHILBIN: No. Yeah, my intention is to leave the main box of the house as it is. But, repair it.

MR. KIRWAN: Right.

MR. PHILBIN: Because the current roof rafters are inadequate, and the front porch is just rotting away.

MR. KIRWAN: Right.

MR. PHILBIN: And then, everything from the rear
back I want to just remove and replace.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. The only other, and this was actually a comment I made to Staff, and I think you understood the comment and can provide it next time but, we had asked for floor plans, proposed and existing floor plans so we can understand in plan as well as in elevation the changes you're making. One such change that will probably come up a little later is whether there really is a need to have the deck on the side, or could the deck be on the rear of your addition. So having floor plans in the packet you present, existing and proposed, will help us, you know, evaluate those criteria.

MR. PHILBIN: Well, we don't have any current -- I mean, we keep changing them, because like we've brought our rear addition in a foot on each side, so we had to scrap the plans we had.

MR. KIRWAN: Right. But there should be a floor plan that corresponds to these elevations. And that's what we need to see.

MR. PHILBIN: It's just a rough sketch at this point because we don't know where we're going.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. We need to see those. Those are part of the application requirement. So we need to see floor plans when we're evaluating these things. We need to understand, for instance, how much you're setting your
addition back in plan. We need to see it dimensioned.

MR. PHILBIN: All right.

MR. KIRWAN: So we understand how much you're setting those sides of your addition back from the corners of the existing house. We need to understand what is happening in the first floor of that addition that requires you to put the deck on the side of the house, or is there flexibility in putting the deck on the rear, which is what we would typically prefer to see in an additional deck.

MR. PHILBIN: Well, there's totally a deck there.

MR. KIRWAN: Yeah, but you're taking it down?

MR. PHILBIN: Yeah, because it was built with some 

MR. KIRWAN: Understood, understood. But, you're going back in with a new deck, and we're going to evaluate whether that new deck is appropriate in that location, or whether it's appropriate in another location. So to make your argument, what I'm saying is, the floor plan might help you make your argument when you bring those to us, because if there really is a need for that deck to be on the side of the house, then you can make that argument, and you can make that argument using your floor plans. When you just show us elevations, we don't see any need for the deck to be on that side, and where we might likely prefer it on the rear of the house. So, that's why those drawings are very important for
us to have. A full package of drawings.

MR. PHILBIN: All right.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for the applicant?

MS. BARNES: Mr. Philbin, I have two questions. One, when you were here the first time and you were describing the challenges you faced with the rafters and everything, I also recall your talking about the amount of space. So, if it's 7 foot 1 from the subfloor to the rafters, you're good? This is going to work?

MR. PHILBIN: Well, it's not going to be, I mean, we're going to condition the space. It's not going to be a bedroom, and it's not going to, you know, it'll be bonus space. Dry, full storage, with stairs that go up to it, is our plan. But it will not be a bedroom. It doesn't have egress windows. It doesn't have the ceiling height. But we do plan on putting lights, electric.

MS. BARNES: Storage space.

MR. PHILBIN: Clean bonus space, yeah.

MS. BARNES: And the second question, and the Chair has touched on this, and it may just reflect my difficulty understanding things, but what we have in our packets, Circles 10 and 11, which show the slight variations on the front porch. And what wasn't clear to me was whether this was all intentional, or whether it was just sort of a
little slip of the pen, because the one seems to create a
larger roof for the front porch, a longer one, or a broader
one than the other. And I didn't know --

MR. PHILBIN: My intention is to keep it as it is, without any changes.

MS. BARNES: Okay.

MR. PHILBIN: I do not have an answer for why it got extended to --

MS. BARNES: Maybe it just was the slip of the pen. Okay. But the intention is to have it very much the same dimension of the existing porch?

MR. PHILBIN: Correct.

MS. BARNES: And your intention also is to try and follow the same roof?

MR. PHILBIN: Pitch lines will be the same as existing, yes.

MS. BARNES: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Philbin.

MR. PHILBIN: Yep.

MS. LEGG: If I may piggyback off of the porch question just slightly? I notice in the photo on the, when you're facing the building on the right side there is a railing, and on the left there is not. In the drawings I'm not seeing railings.

MR. PHILBIN: That is not a railing, it's a bench.

MS. LEGG: Oh.
MR. PHILBIN: And there was no railings. It's less than 30 inches from the floor.

MS. LEGG: Okay.

MR. PHILBIN: Well, there may have been railings a long time ago, but currently there's a bench.

MS. LEGG: Great. Thank you.

MS. HEILER: So, I'm assuming that the addition that you're putting on the back is inset from the sides of the main house.

MR. PHILBIN: One foot on each side, yes.

MS. HEILER: One foot, thank you.

MS. VOIGT: And, on this north elevation, on the existing house is remaining the same because it looks like in the drawings the openings, we look at the photo, and it could, again, just be, it looks like the window openings have, are a different shape. Some of them are -- if you look at the photo. Here, it looks like the first, the window closest to the front of the house is a little lower?

MR. PHILBIN: Lower.

MS. VOIGT: Yeah?

MR. PHILBIN: We'll maintain that.

MS. VOIGT: The existing house is the existing house, it was repairing it and rebuilding the front porch.

MR. PHILBIN: I'm replacing the windows with wood windows, taking the vinyl ones out.
MS. VOIGT: And you're keeping the siding?

MR. PHILBIN: Keeping the siding.

MS. VOIGT: And you're putting addition in the front footage, and we'll talk about the porch.

MR. PHILBIN: Exactly.

MR. ARKIN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. KIRWAN: Yes?

MR. ARKIN: I have a question. If I'm understanding your drawings correctly, you're proposing approximately a foot inset on each side for the rear addition, is that correct?

MR. PHILBIN: That is correct.

MR. ARKIN: So, I don't quite understand how the drawing in 17 works. Are you planning to simply extend the roof, or are you just --

MR. PHILBIN: Are you talking about the shed roof detail?

MR. ARKIN: The shed roof detail.

MR. PHILBIN: That'll be just that. It'll just be a nod to the original. It won't be the original roof. It'll be a new rafter that will follow the -- it'll be as wide as the original roof on the original structure, and the other roof is -- doesn't come out as far -- so it'll just give it a nod that there was a shed roof.

MR. ARKIN: So it'll get some dimensionality?
MR. PHILBIN: Yeah. I'm really not liking it though. I like Option 1 better, myself. I think it's distracting, and it messes with my door. So, I'm really towards Option 1, myself. I think it's a detail, I mean, we went to great strides to remove any extra details in our -- from our previous plan, like vertical band boards, or any band boards. And so, this detail to me just, it's distracting.

MR. ARKIN: Well, I'm glad to -- I'm sympathetic to what you're saying. Do you intend to replicate the existing overhangs? They're pretty --

MR. PHILBIN: On the existing?

MR. ARKIN: On either option?

MR. PHILBIN: Well, on the original structure, the shed roof that comes off the back and covers number two, the shed roof picks up, it's not a very good picture, but the shed roof that comes off of the original house, covering two, comes right to the original structure of the house.

MR. ARKIN: It didn't look like that in the picture.

ME. PHILBIN: So, I mean, I was trying to keep that look so it would go back to the box of the original house.

MR. ARKIN: I'm not sure I'm following what you're saying.
MR. PHILBIN: May I give him this picture?

MR. KIRWAN: Questions about the applied shed?

MR. ARKIN: Yeah. The shed on the, the existing shed, which is on the screen right now.

MR. KIRWAN: He's going to recreate that, and just attach it to the side of the addition.

MR. ARKIN: Well, but there is a significant overhang which matches the overhang on the front.

MR. KIRWAN: Yes. Yes. He's not showing that in the rear elevation. We're not seeing that in the rear elevation.

MR. PHILBIN: Yeah. It would look like that.

MR. ARKIN: It would like that.

MR. PHILBIN: It would come out the two foot -- same as the overhang on the original structure, and just come down and then end where, and end.

MR. ARKIN: So, the roof then, the roof will basically have a two foot overhang on each side, once the renovations are complete as it does now?

MR. PHILBIN: Yeah.

MR. ARKIN: Approximately two feet?

MR. PHILBIN: Two, yeah.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: This is -- I have a question. And again, this is why floor plans are helpful for us to see.
If you look at our Circle 17, which is, and 16, which is the south elevation of Option 1 and Option 2, the window under the deck is moving around between the two options. And, it also has a higher head and a higher sill than the smaller windows that are further out on the addition. Is there some level change happening on the lower level?

MR. PHILBIN: No.

MR. KIRWAN: So, I think bringing some consistency to the heights of those windows would be helpful. The other comment I have, and again, this might be drifting into deliberation a little bit but, I'm a little concerned about on Circle 14 and 13, the lower level windows are different sizes and kind of scattered around. We normally like to see things stacked like they do on the main body of the house. So, you know, maybe the two windows that are furthest out on the rear addition, maybe those should stack underneath the grouped windows up above. And then this, the window further back on the lower level, maybe that should be positioned right underneath the window above it. And so, those are just some comments. We'll get into that in deliberations a little bit more. But, those are just things that I think, you know, just need to be cleaned up in the drafting.

MR. PHILBIN: All right.

MR. KIRWAN: That would help us out quite a bit. And again, the floor plans would be helpful to see.
I also just want to point out, on Circle 19 where you've lowered the roof of the addition in Option 1, compared to Option 2 on Circle 20, I foresee you're going to run into an issue where the rafter of your roof and the header over your pared double-hung windows on, near the corners of that addition, go back to the other, Option 1, Michael, that one, the rafter supporting that roof and the header over that window, you're either going to have to lower the windows, or raise the roof higher. So, again, that's just sort of a --

MR. PHILBIN: I think in an effort, because we were trying to meet a deadline to get the drawing in.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. That's fine.

MR. PHILBIN: I asked him to lower the roof, and he just lowered the roof enough.

MR. KIRWAN: That's fine. I think more I'm pointing out that when you come back, if you want to try to come back for a HAWP, you got to work all those things out, so we don't have those kinds of questions and concerns. Because it changes -- if you then had to make the window smaller, in a fourth go round, we'd have to see it again, potentially. So, we want to try to help you get through this, you know, possibly in one more meeting. One more application. So, we're just pointing these things out to try and help. Any other questions for the applicant? All
right, if not, then let's all -- if you can turn off your
microphone, we'll give your our thoughts on the matter. I
think it's important that the applicant hears from all of
us, since this is a preliminary matter, and we're only
missing one Commissioner tonight. So, it will be good to go
around the horn here, and give our thoughts. I don't mind
starting off.

I think if we just jump right to the question of
Option 1 versus Option 2, I think I am in preference for
Option 1. I don't think the applied rake board really helps
me be more comfortable with the rear addition. I'm
comfortable with it as it's proposed. I have already
pointed out sort of in the questions that I think there
needs to be some order brought to the windows on the sides
of the -- both the north and the south side of the addition.
The stacking of windows, as I mentioned, like we see on the
addition, and like we see on the proposed rear elevation of
the house, that would be very helpful.

I think we're now clear on the issue of there are
no changes to the roof. There really are not going to be
any changes to the proposed front porch. So, those are okay
as is. And we just need to see those very clearly drafted
in the final drawings we receive. I think my biggest issue
is with the positioning of the deck. And again, I've
already pointed out that that's why it's going to be very
helpful for us to see floor plans ultimately. I think in
most cases we would prefer to see new additions like decks,
and particularly decks off of additions be towards the rear
of the house. It seems to be a deep lot. And since there
is no attempt to have a stair come down from the deck to
grade, the deck's just going to be up there in the air, so
it seems like, you know, without a plan to look at, it seem
like the deck could very easily be on the rear of the house,
and that way, not very visible from the street, which I
think would be a preferred location for the deck.

I think I captured everything. Michael, if I
didn't, please say so. Those are my thoughts.

MS. HEILER: I'd like to agree with the comments
of the Chairman. You've come a long way to really making
this approvable. And I think most of the issues really are
in the drawings. I'm probably the person who suggested
trying to preserve that shed roof over section two, and I
think the gesture really ends up being awkward. So, in that
case, Option 1 is certainly better. And, as the Chairman
has suggested, floor plans would help us to understand why
that deck needs to be on the side, or as he said, it's
certainly preferable if the deck can go on the back. If
there's no reason that your layout and your program requires
it on the side. It's more easily approved with it on the
back. So, clean, nice drawings that reflect what you're
really intending to do will come a long way to making this approachable.

    MS. BARNES: Michael, could you bring up the photograph that shows the side view of the house where we have the longer window in the front? Thank you. Mr. Philbin, once again, I applaud you for tackling this project, and I'm sure that there are times when you think we're being, we're nitpickers or something. But, we want this to be very successful. And I think you have, unfortunately, not been well served this evening by the drawings which have sown confusion. One of the Chairman's comments related to the placement of the windows and the fact that there were different sizes, I think you have an argument when you see this side view of the differing sizes of the window, for that use of different size windows on your addition. But I agree with the Chairman that perhaps more strategic placing of the windows is better.

    I find that Option 1 is preferable to Option 2. I appreciate that there was an effort to try and make a gesture towards the existing rooflines, and I think it creates a false sense that is not useful. And, I'm delighted to hear what you had to say about the front porch, because obviously that is a very visible element of the house, and I appreciate that you're going to be keeping that the same size, the same line. And then the other question
will be, the columns. Thank you.

MR. FIRESTONE: I'm going to agree with what the previous Commissioners have said. And Option 1 looks like probably the better of the two. I am concerned about the positioning of the deck and would like to see more reason why it has to be on the side versus the back. And, most importantly, I would like to see more accurate drawings so that I have a better idea of what's going on because things just seem too confusing with the drawings that don't seem to really reflect the reality of the existing house, and may not reflect what is really going to happen. So, when you come back, good drawings.

MS. VOIGT: Thank you very much for coming in the second time, and we'll look forward to coming back and probably being approved, and moving forward with this really nice rehabilitation of a house that needs some TLC. So, thank you, I'm sure we all appreciate it. And, I agree with the other Commissioners. Preference for No. 1, no need to extend that roofline. And, some consistency. And, also some dimensions. I think we can have a better understanding of that side deck if we understood how far out it actually is. So, if we could see some dimensions on that would be helpful. Thank you.

MR. ARKIN: I think I was among the Commissioners that asked you to try to make the gesture toward the
existing shed roof. And I appreciate your trying, but I
agree with what you said earlier, I think Option 1 works
better. I really don't think Option 2 works at all on that.
I think it looks clumsy, as I believe was the word you used.
The drawing of the existing north elevation on Circle 12,
the front window as shown is not, it does not reflect the
actual conditions as was shown in the picture that was up on
the screen a moment ago. It is longer, and I think that is
actually, in my mind, one of the character defining features
of the existing house, the first box of the existing house
which is the one that's really the most intact. And, I
would be interested in seeing if you could replicate that?
I may be alone on -- if you could have a longer window to
replicate the existing window so that the three windows on
the side would not be of equal length on the first floor.

MR. KIRWAN: I think that's what you're proposing.

It's not changing.

MR. PHILBIN: I'm not, I'm not, yeah.

MR. ARKIN: If you go back to the --

MR. KIRWAN: It's just an error in the drawing.

MR. PHILBIN: It's a drawing error. I apologize.

MR. ARKIN: So that will happen?

MR. PHILBIN: Yeah, the main box is going to stay
the main box.

MR. ARKIN: Okay, good. I would be willing to
look at the side deck, and as was stated by other
Commissioners, the floor plan would make it much easier to
understand why you're suggesting that. And, on the porch, I
think it's important that you replicate the existing porch
as much as possible in shape, mass, details. And that kind
of unique, kind of peculiar roof that is close to the same
angle, but slightly different. I think, too, that that is
character defining for this particular house. And, if it's
-- in the context of a, the new roof on a greatly spruced-up
house really might be a quite attractive point too, and it
would be more honest in terms of the preservation.

I agree with the other comments. I think this is,
you've made some pretty good steps heading forward and I'm
looking forward to seeing the next iteration.

MS. LEGG: Thank you for coming in again. I will
be quick. I align myself with the Chairman's comments
except on one section, which is the deck. I'm willing to
consider it on that side the way it is in the existing
house, as it's below the street level. It's not visible and
it looks like there are stairs that go down to it. I think
if that were incorporated, I think you would have my support
on having a side deck. And Option 1 as we see it.

MR. KIRWAN: I think you heard -- you have a
comment?

MS. HEILER: One more comment. The columns on the
front, the big square columns with the very short lengths
that you have, is there any reason that you believe that
those are original to the house or that's what they looked
like? They're unusual in that style of house, the short
lengths of the long columns.

MR. PHILBIN: I do not think they're original. I
have no evidence one way or the other, and I was just going
to replicate what was there. If the Commission, I mean,
I've looked around and I've talked to Michael about it, and
the other houses of the similar build, had bigger front
porches and much broader columns, and the tapers, but it
would just fill that -- I just, we both agree that it just
didn't look right. So, but I'm willing to do any column.

MS. HEILER: You don't have to fluff it up for us.

Thank you.

MR. FIRESTONE: One more comment on the front
elevation, on the porch, columns, etcetera. I wasn't at the
first preliminary, so I don't know all the details. But my
understanding is there was a Sanborn map that showed the
narrow porch, but is there any evidence that maybe that
narrow porch was not original, that it was originally built
to something else and then by the time of the Sanborn map it
had changed?

MR. PHILBIN: Hmm.

MR. ARKIN: Okay. And the other question
concerning the columns, is have you checked with Historic
Takoma to see if perhaps they have an early picture of the
house? There's an outside chance they might, and that might
give you a better idea of what the columns are or were.

MR. PHILBIN: The evidence I have that they're not
original is the lumber, and one of them actually has a mail
shoot that goes down to a lower apartment. So they've all
been, I mean --

MR. ARKIN: Yeah. I just thought maybe you could
get a better idea of what was there previous to these non-
original columns?

MR. PHILBIN: Right. I've been driving around and
just about everything I've seen is either a taper with a big
base, and it's just too heavy for that space.

MR. ARKIN: Okay.

MS. BARNES: I had been looking at some of the
earlier drawings when you had proposed extending the porch,
and it strikes me that it should be possible to do a taper
with a smaller base that would fit the smaller porch. And,
because that seems to be so much in the style of this kind
of a house. And, I grant you, you don't want a big heavy
base and that pretty substantial taper, but a more modified
version of that might work on this porch.

MR. KIRWAN: Well, I think you've gotten some good
comments.
MR. KYNE: Mr. Chairman, could I chime in for a minute? Could I get everyone to sort of weigh in on that just quickly because generally, Staff's position on something like that would be without documentation, it would be conjectural but, because what's here is clearly not historic, maybe that is an approach to take because it is compatible with the style as the Commission said. So, if everyone could sort of weigh in whether they would like the applicant to pursue that option just so Staff has some clear guidance when they come back. Please.

MR. KIRWAN: I mean, I think for me, lacking the evidence that something different was there does being conjectural and, I mean, I think the, as Commissioner Firestone pointed out, a trip over to Historic Takoma might be very valuable, because they might either have a photograph of this house or know of photographs of this style of house that maybe will give you some evidence, or something to develop an argument that there should be some sort of different column here. So, I think that would -- yes?

MR. ARKIN: The mail shoot that you mentioned, while you indicate that's not an original feature, do you have any sense of whether that was added during the period of historic importance? For Takoma Park it is unusual, certainly a very unusual feature. And I didn't see it in
any of the details.

MR. PHILBIN: Well, it was made out of duct work.

MR. ARKIN: Out of duct work?

MR. PHILBIN: Duct work. I don't know how historic duct work is, but I don't think it --

MR. ARKIN: So it's certainly unique?

MR. PHILBIN: Yeah, there's a lot of unique things in this house.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Commissioner Arkin, can you respond to Staff's question?

MR. ARKIN: I'm not sure what we're -- in terms of what are the alternatives?

MR. KIRWAN: Well, do we want the applicant to pursue a different column, or Staff pointed out that the typical standard is unless there's some evidence, it should be reconstructed the way we see it today. And I suggested that I agree with that, but that a visit to Historic Takoma might provide some evidence that there is a type of column on these types of houses that would be more appropriate than what we see today.

MR. ARKIN: I think it might be worth making the trip to Historic Takoma to see what's there. And you can perhaps present that as an option at the next stage, particularly if we're in the HAWP stage. I wouldn't be
opposed to that at this point.

MS. VOIGT: But if there's, and if nothing is
found at Historic Takoma, I'd go with the Chairman.

MR. FIRESTONE: I will agree, if you can document
that some reasonable step that there was something
different, I will be comfortable with trying to recreate it.
But in the absence of any evidence, I'd say stick with what
is there. And as far as the mail shoot goes, I believe a
lot of these houses may have been subdivided into apartments
probably around the time of -- my understanding from
neighbors, that happened around the time of World War II
when there was an influx of people coming to the D.C. area
to work. They started subdividing these houses into
apartments.

MS. BARNES: I continue to believe that these are
probably not appropriate for this house. I understand that
I'm -- this is conjecture on my part, but I don't find that
this fits with what I know of this style.

MS. HEILER: I think if you want to pursue a
better style of these and want to make the trip to Historic
Takoma and find something different, I would be certainly
open to looking at it if you prefer to just put it in the
way it is, I think this is approvable as it is.

MS. LEGG: I think I could be swayed if you found
similar houses with different columns to also support
different columns.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. So I think we can bring this to a conclusion. I think you've heard broad level support for what you presented. I think there's just a lot of -- some details in the drafting that we need to clean up, and we need to see floor plans when you come back. I think you've heard from a few Commissioners that they might be okay with the side deck. The floor plans will help. And that might sway the others of us who maybe aren't quite there yet. But, I think at least exploring that as an option, an optional deck on the back versus the side, would be helpful for us to see.

I suspect if you really work closely with Staff, you very well might be able to come back with a historic area work permit. So, but I'll leave that between you and Staff to discuss, and they'll guide you the best process to go from here.

MR. PHILBIN: On the deck, I would put it on the side because the existing deck was on the side.

MR. KIRWAN: Typically decks, typically communities prefer decks on the rear, mainly to keep the noise and the riff raff on the back.

MR. PHILBIN: Well, and that's why I reduced the size because --

MR. KIRWAN: And we tend to prefer that too
because that also doesn't put new structures on the side
elevation.

MR. PHILBIN: I will --

MR. KIRWAN: If you want to make an argument for
the deck really needs to be on the side then --

MR. PHILBIN: I want to get through this as
smoothly as possible. I am moving the deck to the back.
But as I do that, then I'm going to have to change the
windows in the back.

MR. KIRWAN: Well, if you take the center two
windows and make them French doors, done. Right? And the
rear elevation is not something that I think we're going to
have a lot of hang-ups about. You've already got a nice
very ordered balance back there. I think it's fine. All
right. Thank you very much for your good work on this, and
we look forward to seeing you come back.

The next item on our agenda are tax credits. We
have tax credit applications to consider tonight and make a
recommendation.

MR. KYNE: Yes. We presented 14 tax credits for
the calendar year 2016 for you to recommend approval that we
transmit those to the Department of Finance. And I believe
in the worksession that all of the Commissioners agreed that
we could transmit those tax credits?

MR. KIRWAN: Yes, that's correct. Very good,