MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 9 West Irving St., Chevy Chase  Meeting Date: 7/12/2017

Resource: Contributing Resource  Report Date: 7/5/2017
Chevy Chase Village Historic District

Applicant: John Fitzgerald and Chain Bridge Partners LLC  Public Notice: 6/28/2017
(Luke Olson, Architect)

Review: HAWP  Tax Credit: N/A

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

PROPOSAL: Rear addition and garage

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. The original siding and trim on the historic house will not be replaced. If the applicants
determine that the siding and trim must be replaced, they shall provide documentation and
return to the Commission for review and approval.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District
STYLE: Colonial Revival
DATE: c. 1892-1916

BACKGROUND

The applicants appeared before the Commission at the June 14, 2017 HPC meeting for a preliminary
consultation. At that time, the Commission expressed the following concerns regarding the applicants’
proposal, which included a garage in the right side yard that was attached to the main house via a
trellis/breezeway.

- The left elevation of the proposed rear addition appeared too massive and overwhelmed the
  historic house and neighboring properties.
- The proposed trellis/breezeway from the proposed right side garage to the house resulted in
crowding and detracted from the historic house.
- The proposed garage was too far forward and should be as far back as possible.
- The proposed garage should take more visual cues from the historic house.
- The front and rear dormers on the proposed garage made the garage appear too massive, with a
  potential to detract from the historic house.
- There was some discussion about attaching a projecting garage at the rear/right side of the house
  and proposed addition.
- If the proposed garage is detached, the Commission generally preferred a side-loaded garage.
If the proposed garage was an attached projection, the preference was for a front-loaded garage.

The Commission suggested that a second preliminary consultation would be beneficial, allowing them to comment on any revisions and allowing those Commissioners not present at the June 14, 2017 HPC meeting to express their concerns. A neighbor (11 West Irving Street) provided testimony in opposition, expressing concerns that the proposed rear addition was too massive, especially on the left side, and that the addition had the potential to overwhelm neighboring properties.

The applicants have returned with a HAWP application.

**PROPOSAL:**

- Remove an existing one-story rear addition/attached garage
- Construct a two-story rear addition
- Construct an attached garage at the rear/right side.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

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

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

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

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

1. The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or
2. The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or
3. The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or
4. The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or
5. The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship; [emphasis added] or
(6) In balancing the interests of the public in preserving the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district, with the interests of the public from the use and benefit of the alternative proposal, the general public welfare is better served by granting the permit.

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

(d) In the case of an application for work on an historic resource located within an historic district, the commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historical or design significance or for plans involving new construction, unless such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding historic resources or would impair the character of the historic district. (Ord No. 9-4, § 1; Ord No. 11-39)

Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

The Secretary of the Interior defines rehabilitation as “the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.” Standards 2, 5, and 6 most directly apply to the application before the commission:

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. 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.

7. 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.

Chevy Chase Historic District Guidelines

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Guidelines that pertain to this project are as follows:

**Garages and accessory buildings** which are detached from the main house should be subject to lenient scrutiny but should be compatible with the main building. If an existing garage or accessory building has any common wall with, or attachment to, the main residence, then any addition to the garage or accessory building should be subject to review in accordance with the Guidelines applicable to "major additions." Any proposed garage or accessory building which is to have a common wall with or attachment to the main residence should also be reviewed in accordance with the Guidelines applicable to "major additions."

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

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

**STAFF DISCUSSION**

The subject property is a Colonial Revival-style Contributing Resource, which was constructed c. 1892-1916. The property has a large side lot to the right (as viewed from West Irving Street) as well as a right-side driveway, which leads to an attached side loaded garage at the rear of the property. The attached garage is part of an existing one-story rear addition, which may pre-date the historic district’s 1998 designation.

As noted above, the applicants previously appeared before the Commission at the June 14, 2017 HPC meeting for a preliminary consultation. The applicants have attempted to address the Commission’s concerns, as expressed at the preliminary consultation, and have returned with a HAWP application. Specifically, the applicants have made the following revisions:
Addition

The entire rear addition has been inset approximately 10" from its previous location, and the proposed hyphen has been inset by an additional 18" to provide further differentiation. A previously proposed bay window has also been removed from the left elevation of the proposed addition to further reduce the perceived massing. To avoid encroaching the rear setback line (as the existing addition does), the depth of the addition has also been reduced by 18".

Staff remains concerned about the overall massing of the addition, finding that, combined with the proposed attached garage on the right side, the footprint and lot coverage of the house will increase significantly; however, the Commission may find that the applicants have successfully addressed their previous concerns and that the potential for the addition to detract from or overwhelm the historic house has been diminished.

Garage

The applicants propose an attached one-story, two-car garage at the rear/right side of the house and proposed rear addition. The previously proposed trellis/breezeway has been removed from the proposal, and the garage is no longer proposed in the side yard. The revisions have effectively reduced the perceived crowding on the right side of the property, and the property retains more perceivable open space. The proposed attached garage is front-loaded, the dormers have been removed, and, with a hipped roof, the overall shape and form of the garage takes more visual cues from the historic house.

Staff remains concerned that the proposed attached garage is inconsistent with the surrounding streetscape, as staff knows of no other instances of attached garages on West Irving Street or within the immediate vicinity. As noted at the June 14, 2017 preliminary consultation, the Commission has approved compatibly designed attached garages before, where the specific circumstances preclude the construction of a compatible detached garage. The Commission may consider the circumstances in this case and review the proposed garage with greater leniency. If so, the Commission might find that the compatibly designed attached garage has minimal potential to detract from the subject property and surrounding historic district.

Other

The submitted elevations note that the original siding and trim on the historic house will be investigated and replaced in-kind, where necessary. At this time, the applicants have not provided sufficient information regarding the condition of the original siding and trim or successfully demonstrated that it should be replaced. Staff recommends a condition of approval, stipulating that the original siding and trim on the historic house will not be replaced. If the applicants determine that the siding and trim must be replaced, they shall provide documentation and return to the Commission for review and approval.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission approve with the 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 Chevy Chase Village Historic District Guidelines identified above, and therefore will not
substantially alter the exterior features of the historic resource and is compatible in character with the district and the purposes of Chapter 24A;

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: LOLSON@GTMARCHITECTS.COM
Contact Person: LUKE OLSON
Daytime Phone No.: 240-333-2021

Name of Property Owner: CHAIN BRIDGE PROPERTIES LLC
Daytime Phone No.: 703-517-7757

Address: 3803 RAYMOND STREET CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815

Contractor: 
Contractor Registration No.: 
Agent for Owner: LUKE OLSON
Daytime Phone No.: 240-333-2021

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISES
House Number: 9
Street: WEST IRVING STREET
Town/City: CHEVY CHASE
Nearest Cross Street: MAGNOLIA PARKWAY
Lot: 6
Block: 33
Subdivision: CHEVY CHASE VILLAGE

PART ONE: TYPE OF PROJECT, ACTION, AND USE
1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
☐ Construct ☑ Extend ☑ Alter/Remodel ☑ A/C ☑ Slab ☑ Room Addition ☑ Porch ☑ Deck ☑ Shed
☐ Move ☑ Install ☑ Add/Remove ☑ Solar ☑ Fireplace ☑ Woodburning Stove ☑ Single Family
☐ Revision ☑ Repair ☑ Revocable ☑ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☑ Other: GARAGE

1B. Construction cost estimate: $ 800,000

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

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTENSIONS
2A. Type of sewage disposal: 01 ☑ WSSC 02 ☑ Septic 03 ☑ Other:

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

PART THREE: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCE/RETAINING WALL
3A. Height 4 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 accept this to be a condition for the issuance of this permit.

Signature of owner or authorized agent: ________________ Date: 06/21/17

Approved: ____________________ For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission
Disapproved: ____________________ Signature: ____________________ Date: ______________
Application/permit No.: ____________________ Date Filed: ______________ Date Issued: ______________
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9 ER EVERSE SIDEFO RIN STROCTIONS
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:
      

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

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

3. PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
   You must submit 2 copies of plans and elevations in a format no larger than 11" x 17". Plans on 8 1/2" x 11" paper are preferred.
   a. Schematic construction plans, with marked dimensions, indicating location, size and general type of walls, window and door openings, and other fixed features of both the existing resource(s) and the proposed work.
   b. Elevations (facades), with marked dimensions, clearly indicating proposed work in relation to existing construction and, when appropriate, context. All materials and fixtures proposed for the exterior must be noted on the elevations drawings. An existing and a proposed elevation drawing of each facade affected by the proposed work is required.

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

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

7. ADDRESSES OF ADJACENT AND CONFRONTING PROPERTY OWNERS
   For ALL projects, provide an accurate list of adjacent and confronting property owners (not tenants), including names, addresses, and zip codes. This list should include the owners of all lots or parcels which adjoin the parcel in question, as well as the owner(s) of lot(s) or parcel(s) which 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 INTO MAILING LABELS.
b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district.

The scope of work includes removal of the existing rear one-story garage and laundry room mass to make room for a rear two-story addition entirely to the rear of the existing historic mass. In addition, a one-story addition consisting of a 2-car detached garage and mudroom entry will project out to the right from the main addition. The existing curb-cut and a majority of the existing driveway will be reused. Behind the main addition in the rear yard will be a patio at grade accessible from the addition as well as a stoop on the rear of the mudroom addition. There will also be an entry on the front of the mudroom to provide access from the driveway. The proposed addition also comprises a new brick fireplace and chimney on the right side of the main addition, as well as a privacy fence around the air handling units on the right side of the existing house and an areaway on the right side of the garage leading down to the basement. We are proposing a garden fence of no more than 4’ in height running from the areaway over to the right side lot line to enclose a rear yard. There is a large tree directly adjacent to the driveway that will be affected by the site work. Given the current condition of the tree the client has received permission from the Village to remove it.

Based on comments include in the staff report for our preliminary review on June 14th, the testimony of the neighbor to the left of the property (David Bralove) and feedback received from the Commissioners in attendance at the meeting we have made the following changes to our original proposal:

a.) As both the Commissioners and Mr. Bralove had expressed concern over the design/massing of the left side of the addition and its relative proximity to the left side lot line. In response we have pulled the entire left side of the addition back by .8’ so no part of it extends beyond the left side of the existing historic mass. In addition, we have pulled the left side on the one-story kitchen mass in by 1.5’ to accentuate the ‘hyphen’ between the existing house and the main mass of the addition and provide some relief to the massing of the left side elevation. We have also removed the bay window from the left side of the Dining Room that projected further into the left side yard so as to minimize the impact our addition has on the neighboring property.

b.) Based on unanimous feedback from the Commissioners in attendance, we have eliminated the breezeway connection to the garage and have revised the garage massing to be less imposing and more in character with the architecture of the existing house. Per the recommendation of Commissioner Kirwan, we have also pushed the garage back on the lot and attached it directly to the rear addition to minimize its impact on the streetscape and the rhythm of houses and open spaces in the neighborhood. The new location roughly corresponds with the location of two historic accessory structures shown in photographs provided by the Chevy Chase Historical Society and included in our submission package.

c.) Based on a topographical survey received after our preliminary submission, it was determined that the current one-story rear addition projects into the required rear setback by 1.5’. In response to this we have reduced the depth of the proposed rear addition by 1.5’ to conform to the required zoning setbacks.
The sum total of these changes is a marked reduction in both the massing and the lot coverage of the proposed addition as well as the impact of the proposed addition to the streetscape and the neighboring property. The proposed addition is subordinate in scale and massing to the existing historic resource and resolves an existing non-conforming condition. The location of the garage has historic precedence as evidenced by the historic photos provided. The materials specified on the addition are compatible with the existing historic resource (parged concrete foundation, fibercement lap siding with matching reveal, asphalt shingle roof, clad-wood simulated divided light windows and doors, and ptd. pvc trim & details.)
PHOTO CIRCA 1918 PROVIDED BY CHEVY CHASE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

DESCRIPTION ON THE BACK OF THE PHOTO (PROBABLY WRITTEN BY MIRIAM RICHARD HOFFMAN PER CHEVY CHASE HISTORICAL SOCIETY):

"THE RICHARDS HOUSE AT 9 W. IRVING ST., SHOWN ABOUT 1918, AFTER ADDITION OF THE GARAGE AT THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY. THE GARAGE WAS BUILT TO HOUSE THE FAMILY'S FIRST AUTOMOBILE."
EXG. CHIMNEY TO REMAIN
EXG. ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOFING TO REMAIN
EXG. PTD. WOOD LAP SIDING TO REMAIN

FOR ENTIRE HOUSE:
INVESTIGATE & REHABILITATE HISTORIC SIDING AND TRIM DETAILS AS NECESSARY, IF EXISTING TRIM/SIDING CANNOT BE PRESERVED AND REHABILITED, REPLACE "IN KIND" WITH NEW TRIM/SIDING MATCHING IN SCALE, TEXTURE, MATERIAL, SIZE AND DETAILS. NEW PTD. PVC TRIM DETAILS TO MATCH EXISTING HISTORIC DETAILS ON ADDITION.

EXG. CHIMNEY TO REMAIN
EXG. ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOFING TO REMAIN
EXG. PTD. WOOD LAP SIDING TO REMAIN

EXG. REAR 1-STORY ADDITION TO BE REMOVED

NEW ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOFING TO MATCH EXG.
NEW BRICK CHIMNEY TO MATCH EXG.
PTD. PVC TRIM, AZEK OR EQ.
NEW HARDIEPLANK LAP SIDING, MATCH EXG. REVEAL

EXG. COMPOSITE CARRIAGE-STYLE GARAGE DOORS

NEW CLAD-WOOD SDL Windows/Doors in addition - Poured Conc. Base at addition, Paint to complement EXG. Stone Base
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COPYRIGHT 2017, GTM ARCHITECTS, INC.
7735 OLD GEORGETOWN ROAD, SUITE 700, BETHESDA, MD 20814 - TEL: (240) 333-2000 - FAX: (240) 333-2001
FOR ENTIRE HOUSE: INVESTIGATE & REHABILITATE HISTORIC SIDING AND TRIM DETAILS AS NEEDED. IF EXISTING TRIM/SIDING CANNOT BE PRESERVED AND REHABILITATED, REPLACE "IN KIND" WITH NEW TRIM/SIDING MATCHING IN SCALE, TEXTURE, MATERIAL, SIZE AND DETAIL. NEW PTD. PVC TRIM DETAILS TO MATCH EXISTING HISTORIC DETAILS ON ADDITION.
FOR ENTIRE HOUSE:
INVESTIGATE & REHABILITATE HISTORIC SIDING
AND TRIM DETAILS AS NECESSARY. IF EXISTING
TRIM/SIDING CANNOT BE PRESERVED AND
REHABILITED, REPLACE "IN KIND" WITH NEW
TRIM/SIDING MATCHING IN SCALE, TEXTURE,
MATERIAL, EGS & DETAILS. NEW PT/ PVC
TRIM DETAILS TO MATCH EXISTING HISTORIC
DETAILS ON ADDITION.
# 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>JOHN FITZGERALD</td>
<td>LUKE OLSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3803 RAYMOND STREET</td>
<td>7735 OLD GEORGETOWN ROAD STE 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</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>ASHK &amp; KATHLEEN ADAMIYATT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 WEST IRVING STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS O’DONNELL &amp; CAROLINE FAWCETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 WEST KIRKE STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BRALOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 WEST IRVING STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES VAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 WEST KIRKE STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL FISTERE &amp; NANCY ORVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 WEST IRVING STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REID THOMPSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 WEST KIRKE STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER &amp; PATRICIA ABEll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 WEST IRVING STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS PROPOSAL
(Reviewed at the June 14, 2017 Preliminary Consultation)
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT -  HPC Case No. 37/03-17MM
7207 Spruce Avenue

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
9 West Irving Street

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
5710 Surrey Street

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
15021 Dufief Mill Road

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
June 14, 2017, commencing at 7:30 p.m., in the MRO
Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland
20910, before:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Bill Kirwan, Chair
Brian Carroll
Marsha Barnes
Kenneth Firestone
Kathleen Legg
MR. KIRWAN: So, just to clarify, we're basically just recommending approval of the HAWP with the Staff conditions?

MS. BARNES: Yes.

MR. FIRESTONE: I'll second that.

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

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: The HAWP is approved unanimously by the Commission. We're sorry we couldn't give you everything you asked for tonight, but you do have an approved HAWP. We wish you luck with your project.

MR. HENNING: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Moving on. We are going to jump over Case II.A tonight, because the applicant has postponed to the June 28th meeting. So we're now going to hear the case for II.B, a preliminary for a rear addition and garage at 9 West Irving Street in Chevy Chase. Do we have a Staff Report?

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do have a Staff Report. Again, 9 West Irving Street, Chevy Chase, a Contributing Resource, colonial revival style, circa 1892 to 1916. And the proposal before us tonight is to remove an existing one-story rear addition and attached garage, construct a two-story rear addition and construct a side yard garage with
breezeway to historic house.

And, I have quite a few photos of the house and property here, so we can just go through these. So, looking directly at the front, this is looking from the left side toward the front. Right side toward the front. Moving up the driveway looking at the right side of the house. Looking at the rear addition and attached garage to be removed. And, looking back toward the house. And then, the following photographs are more the streetscape view. So, looking again at the house from the street. A different angle. Opposite side. And then, now I'm going to show you the driveway itself. The side yard where the garage is proposed. Moving up the drive. Just walking around the property. Looking back toward the street. Again, a little wider. The existing curb cut which, per this proposal will be retained. A shot of the side yard and the trellis. And the applicant proposes to sort of take visual cues from this trellis for the breezeway. And the area behind the trellis. And again, looking toward the street.

So, I do have all the plans here, should we need to reference them. And the applicable guidelines are the Chevy Chase Village Historic District Guidelines and the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. And, Staff discussion. For the rear addition, the existing addition to be removed is non-historic and does not
contribute to the character of the resource. The proposed addition will be largely within the footprint of the existing addition, including a slight projection at the left side. And the ridgeline of the proposed addition will be slightly lower than that of the historic house.

Staff does express the following concerns about the proposed rear addition, and I seek your guidance. Regarding the projection, in accordance with the Guidelines and preservation best practices, major additions should be entirely at the rear of the historic house to provide differentiation and allow the historic house to retain its prominence. And scale and massing. The proposed addition will be clearly visible from the public right-of-way, and due to its size, it has the potential to detract from the surrounding streetscape as it would be incompatible with the perceived scale and massing of the surrounding properties. And, due to its size, the proposed addition might compete with or overwhelm the historic house.

The garage and breezeway. The proposed side-loaded garage will be in the right side yard. County code requires all detached garages to be located behind the house. Due to the depth of the proposed rear addition, a garage cannot be constructed behind the house. The applicant proposes to attach the proposed attached garage to the house via a breezeway allowing it to be in the side
yard. As previously mentioned, the breezeway will take visual cues from the existing trellis, which will be removed to accommodate the garage. And, in accordance with the Guidelines, any proposed garage that is attached to the house should be reviewed as a major addition. So, Staff's concerns regarding the garage and breezeway, compatibility. Most garages in the historic district are in the rear and front-loaded, while the proposed garage would be at the side and side-loaded. Due to its location and high degree of visibility, the proposed garage's incompatibility has the potential to detract from the streetscape. Again, this is a major addition so, the proposed attached garage should be reviewed as a major addition. The Guidelines state that major additions should be at the rear when feasible. The proposed garage cannot be placed at the rear due to the proposed rear addition.

Since the rear addition is not yet built, the applicants should pursue a more compatible alternative or incorporate the garage into the proposed rear addition. And finally, lot coverage. In accordance with the Guidelines, lot coverage should be subject to strict scrutiny to preserve the Village's open park-like character. The subject property has a large open space to the right of the house. And, open side yards are a common feature in the district. The proposed side yard garage would be
incompatible with the character-defining features of the
historic district and detract from the open park-like
streetscape.

And we did receive LAP comments regarding this
project. And, I apologize if the Commission had not received
those previously. But, the Chevy Chase Village LAP did
review the proposal, and they were in general agreement with
Staff. They did state that the first floor of the proposed
rear addition would be significantly compromised if the
existing attached rear garage is not relocated. The LAP
also noted that if a side garage is allowed, it should be
set back as much as possible. And they stressed the
importance of providing street elevations for the proposed
garage if the project moves forward.

And, with that, I conclude, and I'll take any
questions you might have for me.

MR. KIRWAN: All right. Any questions for Staff?

MS. BARNES: Yes.

MR. KIRWAN: Commissioner Barnes?

MS. BARNES: I have two questions. Would you be
good enough to bring up the slide you had which showed the
trellis as you were looking back? And also, there is a very
large tree on the edge of the driveway that -- thank you --
and the slide you just went past had a good, this very large
tree, there are no plans to remove this tree? This is going
to be removed?

MR. KYNE: Yes.

MS. BARNES: And the proposed garage would be in about the place of the trellis, is that?

MR. KYNE: I characterized it as the approximate location. I wouldn't say exact location by any means. I think it's actually forward of the current trellis location but, I would say, again, approximate location.

MR. KIRWAN: Based on the drawings, the front face of the trellis looks to be behind the proposed garage. The garage is forward from the, completely forward from the existing trellis.

MS. LEGG: Do you know if the applicant has gotten permission to remove the tree already or are we the first stop?

MR. KYNE: I believe you're the first stop.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff? If not, then we invite the applicant to please come forward. We'll give you seven minutes for your testimony and I think you know the drill well. So, just make sure you turn on the microphone and state your name for the record before you speak.

MR. OLSON: Luke Olson, GTM Architects.

MR. FITZGERALD: John Fitzgerald with Chain Bridge Properties.
MR. OLSON: I guess to start off with, we have received approval to remove that tree. It's in very rough shape. It's a very large tree.

MR. FITZGERALD: The top half of the tree was removed, and so it's sickly and received a permit from the Chevy Chase Village to remove the tree.

MR. OLSON: Aside from that, we have a very nice colonial house here with an existing one-story rear addition and attached garage that just aren't really working well with the rest of the house. And, we're using a strategy that we feel like we've executed very successfully in previous historic projects where we're adding on with a small hyphen off of the existing mass that steps in a little bit, and then further back it steps out to no more than the width of the existing house, going up two stories to get the space needed to meet the requirements, and maintaining a massing and footprint that is less than that of the existing house, subordinate in scale, height, and everything else.

In addition to that, we're trying to locate a garage in a place that allows for some privacy in the rear yard since the addition stretches all the way back to basically the rear yard setback of the buildable lot. There's no real privacy to the yard in this house.

Understanding that Chevy Chase Village has this requirement for a rhythm of houses and open space, it's always nice for
people living in a house to have a secluded area of their
own within their yard to enjoy their property away from
their neighbors. A fence can only go so far.

And, with that in mind, we've been trying to
locate this garage roughly in a place where it would have
been historically if there was not an addition to this
house, while staying within the regulations of Montgomery
County to avoid the option of having to phase construction
so that we were demoing off this addition that exists,
closing out a permit, building a garage in the rear yard,
closing out a permit, and then building our proposed
addition. Which is an option, but it's not preferable, it
drags out construction. The neighbors don't like it so
much.

So, we were just looking for a way to get
everything that we want, retain the historic character, and
kind of match what we've seen from some of the historic
photos of this property pulled up at the Chevy Chase Village
Historical Society, which I believe I included in our
package, that showed that there were structures in that
general location in the past. One more to the rear, and
then one up in front of where this trellis was. One of the
photos in fact shows I think some variation of the trellis
in the back as well. So there have historically been
structures in that area of the property. And we're
returning to something along those lines that would be
appropriate had they never been an option.

MR. KIRWAN: Is that slide available?

MR. KYNE: That slide is not available but, the
Circle is 10. If you turn to Circle 10 in your packets,
you'll see the photographs that Luke is referring to.

MR. OLSON: Also, we're trying to find a solution
that retains the curb cut. And we know that's usually
important to keep that existing curb cut but, if you so
choose, we could relocate that to have a more direct path to
a front-load garage. I believe the Staff Report mentioned
that front-load garages are more suitable for the
neighborhood than the side-load that we're currently
proposing. We'd be willing to explore that option but, what
we're proposing right now we thought the best blend of
retaining the historic nature of the property and providing
a garage.

MR. FITZGERALD: And one thing I might add on that
point too is, I think having a facade that has windows to it
and, would be, I think, a little bit more pleasant from a
streetscape standpoint than say a garage door, was one of
the thoughts on it as well too. Why we would prefer a side-
loaded garage as opposed to a front-loaded one.

MR. KIRWAN: Does that conclude your testimony?

MR. OLSON: It does, yes.
MR. KIRWAN: Great. All right, very good. Any questions for the applicant?

MS. BARNES: I have two questions. Did you give any thought when you -- you currently have an attached garage, and you're going below ground now to create a basement for this addition. Did you give any thought to having a garage which is below grade, so remains attached to the house? And secondly, in the pictures that we have, we have a dormer, shed dormer on the garage, so talk a little bit about what you have in mind?

MR. OLSON: Okay, sure. We did not think about putting the garage below grade. Unfortunately, there's not enough clearance there that we wouldn't have to dig a pretty significant hole in the rear yard of this property to be able to do that and put in a rather impactful driveway that would be difficult to navigate, and it'd really just tear up that side yard. I really don't think that that would be appropriate for this property. In terms of the actual garage design, since it is an attached structured, it's considered a portion of the house, so while we were doing that, we were thinking of capturing some space above that, provided it met your approval.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions? Commissioner Carroll?

MR. CARROLL: The breezeway is really just a way
of getting the garage to be attached in a sense, because it can't be behind the house, correct?

MR. OLSON: Yeah. There's a couple of different ways we can do it. We've received zoning confirmation from Montgomery County that we can attach it below grade with essentially a basement tunnel, and then finish space below the garage, and that can be with or without this breezeway. We're still awaiting confirmation from zoning to see if the breezeway itself constitutes a connection. We thought it was nice to take that trellis that was back there that historically has been back there and reference it as an element of our design. And that would provide a little additional screening for this part of the yard that we've been discussing.

MR. CARROLL: Thanks.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for the applicant? All right, if not, we have testimony from a neighbor, Mr. David Bralove. And how many minutes does Mr. Bralove get, three? Three minutes. We can give you three minutes for your testimony and just make sure your microphone is turned on, and state your name for the record before you speak.

MR. BRALOVE: My name is David Bralove. I'm the neighbor for this applicant at 11 West Irving Street. First of all, I would like to thank the Staff for their review of
this. I did not have the benefit of your review before I came here tonight but, it's -- I share some of your concerns and that's why I came. I didn't know they were going to be raised. But I think you did a very good job. And my essential, I am to the west of this house, and what was interesting is that your presentation did not have any photos of that facade to the west. And obviously, you couldn't get onto my property to take that photo. I would welcome you to come in and take additional photos if you like.

My concern about this, which mirrors the Staff's concern, was that this is not a small hyphen as the architect here would have you believe. I believe it to be a significant, you know, addition and mass for this property. And it's not something -- and excuse me if I'm not using the right references here but, I looked at some things that were on the website, and the standards that I got appear to be from Montgomery County, I don't know if they're applicable but, you know, it says that the addition must be subordinate to the main structure. And when you take into account the entirety of this development with the, you know, with the addition to the rear and the garage, it is by no means subordinate to the main structure. It's almost equal to.

The other concern I had with the rear addition, because I'm, and that what abuts up against me, is that I'm
now going to a chasm here with this mass going up. It seems
to be a straight line in terms of the design of that
addition without any scaling back or stepping back in the
roof lines or anything like that. Yes, there is a slightly
lower elevation in the roofline according to these plans,
but it's not significant. It's not enough to, in my view,
to qualify or to meet the guidelines that I'm referring to
by the county. That's in Chapter 4. So, I would urge the
Commission here to consider the opinions of the Staff, and
my concerns as a neighbor and member of the Chevy Chase
community, to make sure that this addition is in keeping
with the historic nature of our homes there, and of the area
in general. And, thank you for this time.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you for coming out tonight and
providing us with your testimony. We appreciate that.

MR. WHIPPLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. KIRWAN: Yes?

MR. WHIPPLE: Just for the record, well, first of
all, I'd like to thank the neighbor for his testimony. The
document that he's referring to are the general design
guidelines that the Commission has prepared for work in the
county. It represents general best practices, but it
recognizes that Chevy Chase Village has its own district
specific guidelines that supercede it. So while the
materials that the neighbor is referencing are absolutely
the best practices, they have to be put into context with Chevy Chase Village Guidelines.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you, appreciate that. Does anybody have any questions for the speaker?

MS. LEGG: I was wondering, how did you hear about this preliminary tonight as a neighbor?

MR. BRALOVE: Oh, thank you. I received a notice from the Commission, I guess. It's a -- yeah, I received a notice, Montgomery Historic Commission with the date and the time and so forth. I don't know about the other neighbors, because when I was going across the street today just before leaving, I said, do you know of the development here? Immediately across the street, they said they had not received a notice. I don't know if the notice just goes to the adjoining property owners or?

MR. WHIPPLE: As the Commission knows, the mailings went to all of the adjacent and confronting property owners, so that would be the neighbors immediately across the street, and then all of the neighbors whose properties touch on the property. I guess yours is to the rear.

MR. BRALOVE: Okay. Mine touches. No, it's to the west.

MR. WHIPPLE: Oh, pardon me, okay. So, but it would be to all of the neighbors whose properties touch,
plus the neighbors immediately across the street.

     MR. BRALOVE: Well, I can tell you the neighbor
across the street told me he didn't get anything. And he
     told me as well that he would, and this is Michael Basteer
(phonic sp.), that he would not be in support of this.
     But he's not here tonight, so.

     MS. LEGG: That's fine. And thank you for
     entering that. And just so you're aware, this is a prelim,
     so we will have a HAWP at a later time on this. So if your
     neighbors are concerned, there will be an opportunity for
     them to talk to us and write letters.

     MR. BRALOVE: Okay. So you can receive written
     submissions as well?

     MR. KIRWAN: Yes, that's correct. Any other
     questions for the speaker before we let him go? We don't
     have anymore questions, so we thank you very much for your
     testimony this evening. Appreciate you coming out. We
     should then move into deliberations. Does anybody want to
     kick things off? Commissioner Carroll? Thank you.

     MR. CARROLL: I, in looking at this, it's
     obviously quite a large lot, which provides you with some
     opportunities here. I think that the way you've broken up
     the mass, you know when I looked at your 3D renderings,
     looking at the right side of the house, you know, while it
     is a very large addition, I think that you've done a good
job. I'm finding, if you look on, I think it's Circle 20
that we have, in drawing number three, which is the proposed
left addition from the rear, I really feel like, you know,
there could be some more development in that. There's just
a large planar wall coming back from that bay, and if there
was a way to define that rear piece as more of a pavilion
and that, you know, from the octagonal bay back to that rear
pavilion, there's a little differentiation there. I think
it would serve you well, but it does look kind of like a big
flat mass from that side. I think on the right side, you've
done a good job of stepping it back in an attempt to not
subordinate the main mass of the house.

I understand once you get this much, you know,
once you're that far back there's nowhere to put the garage.
I'm not a big fan of the breezeway. I mean it's, I
understand that there is, that there was a trellis at the
back, but I think it's, in a sense, sort of cluttering up
the view, and, you know, in the historic photos that you've
provided, it looks like there are freestanding buildings out
there to that side. And I think that you would achieve more
of that open park-like feel that people are looking for
without attaching it. So I'd be interested to know if
there's a way to get that garage out there without having to
run the trellis across to touch the house. Digging a tunnel
seems like a big lift just to make an attached garage. I'm
wondering if there's anything else? And with the privacy in
the backyard, I think that could be achieved with
landscaping.

And then the, you know, I agree that the side-
loaded garage while not typical, is probably preferable to
looking at a garage door facing the street. I'd just like
to see a little bit more development of that shed dormer on
the side. You know, if you could take some cues from the
house, just a little bit more development. I guess I'm
looking at Circle 18. Door No. 3, again, you know,
something that could pick up some cues from the house, some
more detail there. Maybe two dormers, something like that,
just to give a little more character to that. And then the
other question I have is, if there's anyway to move it back
even a little bit? Because I think that's going to improve
the relationship. But the trellis is, I get why you've done
it. You know, I've been in the same position trying to
attach things in order to make things work. But, I just
don't think it's doing you a lot of service in terms of, you
know, this is a very big lot. And I think that it's going
to appear more open and probably more palatable to the
people around here if it's, you know, without that piece in
the middle there. So, those are my thoughts.

MR. OLSON: Can I ask for a clarification, please?

MR. CARROLL: Of course, yeah.
MR. OLSON: Would you be open to staging construction to locate a detached garage as I have described in the location that you're suggesting, if you're against attaching a garage in some fashion?

MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry?

MR. OLSON: So, if we're not attaching the garage, the only real way to get it in that location, given the mass of the house, would be to permit demolition of the existing first floor addition to the historic mass. To close out that permit, then to permit the garage in the rear yard, build it, close out that permit, and then build our addition onto the main mass as we're proposing. And we've received approval from zoning, or not approval, but confirmation from zoning that they would approve that method in that it would make the garage an existing structure in the rear yard. And that would be a way of not having to go in for essentially a zoning amendment.

MR. WHIPPLE: Procedurally, before you answer that question, procedurally are you telling that you're going to submit three HAWPS, or are you able to submit --

MR. OLSON: We're asking it as part of one HAWP would be able to stage construction in that method?

MR. WHIPPLE: I believe that that's a question for DPS. The HPC is going to look at what you submit, how you, you know, the order in which you do the construction is, I
believe, outside of their purview.

MR. OLSON: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: Right, yeah. I guess that's essentially my response to that as well. Is that if DPS can, zoning will allow you to get there, you know, by that method. For me it's the same thing. You know, I understand why you want the garage there. It is a very big lot. Anything you can do to push it back a little bit further, and I just, I think attaching it is bringing too much attention to it. It's a subordinate building. There are these historic photos of, you know, it looks like and two small buildings are there on the side, so I think there's an argument for having it out there. But I just don't think you need to call so much attention to it. And, you know, these hipped roof buildings that are here, you know, I think on Circle 18, just that shed dormer on the side, you know, put a little more detail with, you know six over one windows or whatever is in the house, give a little more style, show something to the street, but I like the side-loaded garage, I don't think there's any reason to point a garage door to the street if it has to be out there, so that's my thoughts. Thanks.

MS. LEGG: First, thank you for coming in for a preliminary. I think that's really helpful with a HAWP process. So, I appreciate you guys coming in. A few
things. I find that the breezeway in this design makes the mass of the house sort of just feel kind of overwhelming. I know it's a big lot, but I think, is it in character with the other houses on the street? It's hard for me to tell from the photos from the historical society, so if there is another prelim, perhaps we could have those photos larger and put it on the screen. But from what I can see that the garage was a bit further back, and when I look at the streetscape on the street, I think that most of the garages are much further to the back of the yard. So I would encourage you guys to try to move that back.

I also believe, like I understand that you want some privacy in the yard, but I think that could be achieved with some trees and some hedges. I also, I can see what fellow Commissioner Carroll believes in the back of the left side of the property kind of feeling massive. I think there, I'm not sure what you can do to fix it, but I'm sure that there's something you can come up with to make it sort of blend in a bit more seamlessly with the background and not stick out as much.

And I also feel that the dormer on the garage makes that structure seem a bit more massive than it needs to. I think if the windows were to the sides, I think you could still have light there, but also make that sort of disappear in the background a little bit more. I think my
general thoughts on this is it's just a little overwhelming of a house. So if there's some design tricks that you can do to kind of reign that in, I think it could be a HAWP that I support. That's it.

MR. KIRWAN: I'll go ahead. We'll just go down the line here. I agree with some of the points that Commissioner Carroll and Commissioner Legg have mentioned. To sort of step back a second, what I'm sort of seeing tonight is a project that's asking for a lot of things. It's asking for a very large addition, and it's asking for a garage in the middle of the, or close to the middle of the side yard, it's connecting that garage to the house, so that it can be built as really part of the main structure, and it's forward on the lot. The garage is forward on the lot so that you can capture backyard space to the rear. So you're asking for this house to do a lot of things.

In addition, you've got a second story to this garage, you've got some habitable space up there, I assume, so that makes these dormers even more prominent on those garage roofs. So, I think there's several different ways to sort of peel this back a little bit. I think the addition to the house, I think, is one that we, if it was just brought to us as a preliminary tonight, I think we would be in general agreement that it's probably okay. It needs some additional work. I think Commissioner Carroll brought up
the issues of this rear left elevation, and I think, you
know, it should respond to the main resource the way you're
doing it much more successfully on the opposite side, you
know, with the hyphen reading very clearing and then this
main massing in the back.

I think in general the detailing of it, the roof
forms of it, are very much in keeping with the main
resource, so I think that's all sort of working for you. I
think then we start connecting this to a trellis, and then
we've got a garage, and the stylistic representation of the
garage makes it look like it belongs to another house. I
mean, it really should look like it belongs to this house,
especially when it's connected to it with the trellis. I
think the garage is being almost in the middle of that side
lot is too far forward. When I look a the historic
photographs, what it appears to me is that a garage or
garages were pretty much at the rear of the driveway, all
the way back at the end of the driveway, going straight
back. I think that's something to look at. I think it's
something to look at where the garage is attached to the
house more literally, as opposed to throwing it out into the
side yard and connecting it with this trellis.

I think if it is going to be out there in the side
yard and look like a garden structure, I think it needs to
be further back on the lot. I think it needs to have a more
sensitive roof form, maybe not have the second story. Not
try to get that, have a little space up there, and just let
it be a garage or a really small scale structure in the back
of the lot. You know, I think the side load versus front
load aspect of it, I think, I'm not sure yet. I think we
would need to see the garage more detailed and developed
before we can make that decision. For instance, I think if
the garage is at the end of the driveway and attached more
directly to the house it could be front-loaded. If it is
thrown back, and further back into the rear yard, it
probably is more appropriate to side-load it so that you can
just make that right turn into the garage from the driveway.

So again, I think we have an addition that is
probably pretty close to something -- the main house is
pretty close to something that we can approve, we would
approve of normally. Just needs some tweaks and details.
But I think the garage is the more problematic piece. I
think I'm not really settled yet on, at least what I've seen
tonight. I definitely don't think this is the right
proposal. I think we need to see some other options at
another preliminary for that.

MR. OLSON: Could I ask for one clarification on
that?

MR. KIRWAN: Sure.

MR. OLSON: You mentioned putting the garage
further in the back and maybe attaching it literally, are
you saying that you would be okay with it projecting beyond
the right side of the existing house?

MR. KIRWAN: I mean you already are.

MR. OLSON: If it was an attached one-story
garage?

MR. KIRWAN: You're projecting beyond the right
side of the house with this trellis attached to a garage
already.

MR. OLSON: But directly attached?

MR. KIRWAN: Yes.

MR. OLSON: Okay.

MR. KIRWAN: Yeah, I mean we've done that on other
projects. There's precedent for that, and in Chevy Chase,
where we've allowed, especially on these deep wide lots,
these double wide lots, we've allowed things to go out
beyond the side plane of the house. I mean, that's not
something that this current Commission has taken a
particular issue with. You know, generally we like to see
things kept within the side planes of the existing resource,
but on these really big lots, I think there's a little room
to relax that a little bit. I think that is something to
explore as a way to get this mass of this garage, you know,
closer to the main body of the house and open up that side
yard and preserve that garden park-like structure that Chevy
Chase really advocates.

MR. FIRESTONE: I don't have all that much to add to what the previous Commissioners said. But looking at the historic photos that you presented, they were kind of difficult to see what was going on, but it appears to me that the garage in that, that was historically there at some point in the past was a lot more modest, single story, plain garage, further back, not as prominent, and I think something like that with appropriate doors would be fine front-loaded or do something with it so if it was side-loaded so it wouldn't look just like a blank wall. But that would be one option to explore. The other options that were presented by previous Commissioners I would also like to see. But the way it is right now, it just doesn't seem to work.

MS. BARNES: I would like to second Commissioner Legg in thanking you for coming in for a preliminary. And I also would like to thank you for finding the photos from the historic society. For me, those were very telling in terms of feeling more comfortable with a garage to the side in the side yard. I have a problem with the garage as proposed. Two-fold. One is the trellis. I think your idea that you would mimic an existing trellis, which I think would probably disappear in this constellation, is sort of ridiculous. I think that by trying to attach the garage to
the house with a trellis you draw attention to the sheer size. I have a problem with the garage which is one and a half story. Once again, if you look at the photos that you kindly produced from the historic society, we're talking about a single story structure.

You're proposing a very large addition to the back, but it is to the back and it is not really extending much beyond the historic mass of the house, which gives me comfort in terms of thinking about approving it. I've also heard from a neighbor, and I think that brings us back to the comments that Commissioner Carroll made about the left rear side and whether there are ways that you could deal with that, which would be a little more sympathetic and cause it to feel less massive. And, I think I have one other comment. I've very hopeful that you'll be replacing some trees, since you have to take some out.

MR. KIRWAN: I think you've heard some generally consistent recommendations on what to explore next. I think the prudent thing to do would be to come back for another preliminary with a revision, just so, because we did hear some differences, and you're also going to hear from four more commissioners.

MR. WHIPPLE: And actually, if I could expand on that point. We have four Commissioners who aren't here, who didn't have the benefit of hearing this testimony, but three
of them, when they mentioned that they were going to be unable to be here, expressed quite strongly significant reservations about this project. And so, the applicants didn't get the benefit of those comments tonight. I'm sure those Commissioners will be willing to share those at the second prelim.

MR. KIRWAN: Very good. So, I think we'll leave you with that and look forward to seeing you come back.

MR. OLSON: As a procedural question, is there a way for us to get on the prelim for the next agenda as an extension of this, or is that not possible?

MR. WHIPPLE: That is not possible because of the timing. I don't think that we have the time to grant.

MR. OLSON: Okay.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you. The next case this evening is Case II.C at 5710 Surrey Street in Chevy Chase. And Mr. Olson, you can either stay up or go back to the seat.

MR. OLSON: I'll get my binder, I'll come right back.

MR. KYNE: Okay, this is 5710 Surrey Street, Chevy Chase, a primary pre-1915 resource in the Somerset Historic District. This is a shingle/Craftsman style house with a colonial revival addition. The historic house dates to circa 1903, and the front/right side colonial revival