# Staff Report

**Address:** 7230 Spruce Ave., Takoma Park  
**Meeting Date:** 5/10/2017

**Resource:** Contributing Resource  
Takoma Park Historic District  
**Report Date:** 5/3/2017

**Applicant:** Aaron Kofner & Anat Shahar  
(Shawn Buehler, Architect)  
**Public Notice:** 4/26/2017

**Review:** HAWP  
**Tax Credit:** N/A

**Case Number:** 37/03-17EE  
**Staff:** Michael Kyne

**Proposal:** Addition and alterations

---

## Staff Recommendation

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

1. Details will be submitted for all proposed windows and doors, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

2. The original window removal/new window installation on the right elevation of the historic house is not approved.

## Architectural Description

**Significance:** Contributing Resource  
**Style:** Bungalow  
**Date:** c. 1915-1925

## Background

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission for two preliminary consultations at the January 11 and February 22, 2017 HPC meetings. At the February 22, 2017 preliminary consultation, the Commission was fully supportive of the applicants’ revisions, and recommended that they return with a HAWP application.

## Proposal

The applicants propose the following work items:

- Remove an existing rear deck
- Remove an existing rear/left side addition
- Remove an existing one-story rear addition
- Construct a new rear/left side addition
Construct a new one-and-a-half-story rear addition
Alter/expand the roof of the historic house
Replace the existing front dormer with a new front dormer
Construct two side shed dormers
Construct a side-projecting mudroom and porch

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.
• Second story additions or expansions should be generally consistent with the predominant architectural style and period of the resource (although structures that have been historically single story can be expanded) and should be appropriate to the surrounding streetscape in terms of scale and massing.
• Original size and shape of window and door openings should be maintained, where feasible.
• 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.
• Alterations to features that are not visible at all from the public right-of-way should be allowed as a matter of course.
• All changes and additions should respect existing environmental settings, landscaping, and patterns of open space.

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

(a) The commission shall instruct the director to deny a permit if it finds, based on the evidence and information presented to or before the commission that the alteration for which the permit is sought would be inappropriate, inconsistent with or detrimental to the preservation, enhancement or ultimate protection of the historic site or historic resource within an historic district, and to the purposes of this chapter.
(b) The commission shall instruct the director to issue a permit, or issue a permit subject to such conditions as are found to be necessary to insure conformity with the purposes and requirements of this chapter, if it finds that:
(1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or
(2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or
(3) The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or
(4) The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or
(5) The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship; [emphasis added] or
(6) In balancing the interests of the public in preserving the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district, with the interests of the public from the use and benefit of the alternative proposal, the general public welfare is better served by granting the permit.
(c) It is not the intent of this chapter to limit new construction, alteration or repairs to any 1 period or architectural style.
(d) In the case of an application for work on an historic resource located within an historic district, the commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historical or design significance or for plans involving new construction, unless such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding historic resources or would impair the character of the historic district. (Ord. No. 9-4, § 1; Ord. No. 11-59)
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, 9, and 10 most directly apply to the application before the commission:

#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.

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

#10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

STAFF DISCUSSION

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission for two preliminary consultations at the January 11 and February 22, 2017 HPC meetings. At the February 22, 2017 preliminary consultation, the Commission was fully supportive of the applicants’ revisions, and recommended that they return with a HAWP application.

New aspects and revisions to the applicants’ current proposal include:

Proposed Left Side Addition

- The applicants previously proposed double-hung windows on the proposed left side addition, while they are currently proposing smaller casement or sliding glass windows.

- In the previous proposal, a door was located on the front elevation of the proposed left side addition. As revised, this door has been relocated to the left elevation of the proposed rear addition.

- A flue pipe is proposed toward the rear of the proposed left side addition’s roof.
Staff is supportive of the proposed revisions to the non-historic left side addition, finding that they are generally compatible with the historic house, with minimal potential to detract from the subject property or surrounding historic district.

Right Elevation – Historic House

- The applicants propose to remove an original two-over-two double-hung window on the right elevation of the historic house and install a new smaller two-over-two double-hung window closer to the front of the house.
The Commission did not previously review the proposed window removal/installation, and, in accordance with the Guidelines – which state “Original size and shape of window and door openings should be maintained, where feasible.” – staff recommends that this aspect of the applicants’ proposal not be approved; however, the proposed work is on a secondary elevation, which is insular and not visible from the public right-of-way, and the Commission may find that it has minimal potential to detract from the subject property or surrounding historic district.

**Proposed Rear Addition**

**Left Elevation**

- The applicants propose an additional double-hung window on the second-floor of the left elevation of the proposed rear addition.
The proposed window is consistent with the other windows proposed for the rear addition and is unlikely to detract from the subject property or surrounding historic district.

Right Elevation

- The fenestration at the basement-level on the right elevation of the proposed rear addition has been slightly reconfigured.
The fenestration to be reconfigured is at the basement-level on a secondary, insular elevation of the proposed rear addition. Due to its location and the property’s rear-sloping lot, the fenestration will not be at all visible from the public right-of-way.

Rear Elevation

- The applicants have responded to staff and the Commission’s suggestion and are proposing Hardie Shakes instead of the previously proposed board and batten in the gable of the proposed rear addition.
Rear Elevation – Current Proposal

Rear Elevation – Previous Proposal

Note: Any discrepancies or missing details (i.e., siding, window muntins, etc.) in the revised elevations are a result of downscaling and printing. The full-size plans and PDFs clearly show this information.

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 Guidelines outlined above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission approve with the conditions specified on Circle 1 the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b), having found that the proposal is consistent with the 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.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301/563-3400
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: SHAWNB@BMARCH.COM  Contact Person: SHAWN BUEHLER
Daytime Phone No.: 301-585-2222

Tax Account No.: 13-0106-64-62

Name of Property Owner: AARON KOHN+KAT SHAW
Daytime Phone No.: 310-980-7136
Address: 7415 BIRCH AVE TAKOMA PARK MD 20912

Contractor: TBD
Contractor Registration No.: 
Agent for Owner: SHAWN BUEHLER
Daytime Phone No.: 301-585-2222

LOCATION OF BUILDING PREMISE
House Number: 7230 SPRUCE AVE  Street: 
Town/City: TAKOMA PARK  Nearest Cross Street: PARK AVE
Lot #: 1911-197  Block: 8  Subdivision: LIPSCOMB & TRUSTEES ADDITION TO TAKOMA PARK
Lot: 14768  Front: 450  Parcels: TAKOMA PARK

PART I: TYPE OF PERMIT, ACTION, AND USE
1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
   - Construct [x] Extend [ ] Alter/Remodel [ ]
   - Move [ ] Install [ ] Remove [ ]
   - Revision [ ] Repair [ ] Add [ ]
   - AC [ ] Slab [ ] Room Addition [ ] Porch [ ] Deck [ ] Shed [ ]
   - Solar [ ] Fireplace [ ] Woodburning Stove [ ] Single Family [ ]
   - Fence/Wall [ ] Other [ ]

1B. Construction cost estimate: $ 900,000

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

PART II: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTENSION ADDITIONS
2A. Type of sewer disposal: [ ] WSSC 02 [ ] Septic 03 [ ] Other: 
2B. Type of water supply: [ ] WSSC 02 [ ] Well 03 [ ] Other: 

PART III: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCE/RETAINING WALL
3A. Height ______ feet ______ inches

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

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

Signature of owner or authorized agent: 

Date: 4.24.17

Approved: 
Disapproved: 

Applications/Permit No.: # 797059

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

1. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

a. Description of existing structural(s) and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance:

   **THE EXISTING HOME IS A TRADITIONAL BUNGALOW WITH A
ONE STORY ADDITION. THE BILL ROOF SLOPE IS SHALLOWER
THAN MANY OF BUNGALOWS UPLIFTING SECOND FLOOR TO A SINGLE
BEDROOM. THE FRONT DOOR APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN ALTERED.
WINDOWS DO NOT APPEAR TO BE HISTORIC. THE LOT IS IRREGULAR
IT DOES NOT FRONT THE STREET DIRECTLY AND THE SUBJECT
HOME FACES THE BACK OF HOMES ON PARK AVE. THE LOT IS
INCORRECTLY LARGE WHILE THE HOME IS UNDERSTATED. THE ADJACENT
NEIGHBOR HAS A LARGE REAR ADDITION ALREADY.**

b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resources, the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district:

   **THE PROPOSED ADDITION INCLUDES A STEEPER ROOF AND NEW FRONT
DOOR TO ACCOMODATE A LARGER SECOND FLOOR + MORE HISTORICALLY
CONFORMAL ROOFER. NEW ADDITION WITH 1 STORY FIRE+ SHED ROOFS AT 2ND FLOOR AND NEW SIDE MUDROOM + PORCH
INCLUSION. STEEPED ROOF ENABLES US TO BROADEN SIZE OF SECOND FLOOR
WHILE PRESERVING BUNGALOW MASSING. SIDE ADDITION CONCEALS**

2. SITE PLAN

   Site and environmental setting, drawn to scale. You may use your plot. Your site plan must include:

   a. the scale, north arrow, and date;
   b. dimensions of all existing and proposed structures; and
   c. site features such as walkways, driveways, fences, ponds, streams, trash dumpsters, mechanical equipment, and landscaping.

3. PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

   You must submit 2 copies of plans and elevations in a format no larger than 11" x 17". Plans on 8 1/2" x 11" paper are preferred.

   a. Schematic construction plans, with marked dimensions, indicating location, size and general type of walls, window and door openings, and other fixed features of both the existing resources 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 PHOTOCOPED DIRECTLY INTO MAILING LABELS.
EXISTING FRONT ELEVATION
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

EXISTING SIDE ELEVATION
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY EAST (FRONT) ELEVATION
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY NORTH ELEVATION
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY WEST (REAR) ELEVATION
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY SOUTH ELEVATION
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY AS VIEWED FROM STREET
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY W/ NON-TRADITIONAL DORMER WINDOWS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's mailing address</th>
<th>Owner's Agent's mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Kofner &amp; Anat-Shahar</td>
<td>Shawn Buschel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7415 Birch Avenue</td>
<td>Bennett-Frank McCarthy Arch, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
<td>1400 Spring St., Suite 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Spring, MD 20910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia A. Sharpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7228 Spruce Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Ai Wen Knowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slater McClean Knowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Park Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara &amp; Kenneth Firestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 Park Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s mailing address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Kofner &amp; Anat Shabar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7415 Birch Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Lampert &amp; Patrizia Ricci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7313 Willow Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Alfred E. Pinkney & Pamela H. Sommers                     | Frederico S. Azcarate & Maria A. Roeppe                |
| 7301 Willow Ave.                                          | 7305 Willow St.                                        |
| Takoma Park, MD 20912                                     | Takoma Park, MD 20912                                   |
Previous Proposal & Transcript

- Second Preliminary Consultation
PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on February 22, 2017, commencing at 7:33 p.m., in the MRO Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910, before:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Kirwan, Chair
Marsha Barnes
Kenneth Firestone
Richard Arkin
Eliza Voigt
MR. KIRAWN: Thank you very much.

Next on our agenda is preliminary consultation II.C at 7230 Spruce Avenue in Takoma Park. A second preliminary consultation. Do we have a Staff Report?

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do have a Staff Report. As you noted, this is a second preliminary consultation for 7230 Spruce Avenue in Takoma Park, a contributing resource within the Takoma Park Historic District. A bungalow, circa 1915-'25. The current proposal is to remove an existing rear deck, remove an existing rear/left side addition, remove an existing one-story rear addition, construct a new rear/left side addition, construct a new one and a half story rear addition, alter/expand the roof of the historic house, replace the existing front dormer with a new front dormer, construct two side shed dormers at the rear, construct a side projecting mudroom and porch, and that's it.

So, I will orient you to the site now with some photographs. And you may think that these look familiar, and that's because you've seen them before, fairly recently. And I will ask you to pay particular attention to this photograph, because I believe we will have some testimony or questions later regarding the orientation of the stairs and railing there on the side addition. So the plans, just as before, if we need to reference them.

And the applicable guidelines in this case, the
Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines, and the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Staff discussion. Again, this is the second prelim. So the applicants previously appeared before you on January 11, 2017. And at that time you expressed the following concerns: the roof of the previously proposed addition on the left side was too steep; the projecting bay on the left side of the historic house should be preserved and not covered by the previously proposed covered porch on the left side. The previously proposed attached garage was inconsistent with the Standards and Guidelines. The second floor of the previously proposed right side projecting mudroom addition should be pushed back.

The applicants have revised the proposal consistent with your comments and concerns, and now I ask for your guidance regarding the following revisions. For the left side addition and projecting bay, the applicants have reduced the slope of the roof of the proposed left side addition, and as revised, the addition will not engage the windows of the proposed shed dormer above, which was part of your previous concern. The proposed left side addition no longer includes a covered porch, allowing the projecting bay on the left side to remain unobscured. The proposed left side addition also retains the approximate distance to the historic house as the existing left side addition, further
reducing any impact that the addition might have on the projecting bay or left elevation of the historic house. Staff is generally supportive of the proposed revisions, finding that they are consistent with the Guidelines. Although the proposed left side addition will be visible from the public right-of-way, and is not entirely at the rear, it will replace an existing addition in the same location and by ensuring that the projecting bay is not impacted, will preserve the predominant architectural features of the resource. For the attached garage, as revised, the applicants actually are not proposing an attached garage. And the side projecting mudroom with the attached garage removed from the proposal, the applicants are no longer proposing a second floor for the proposed right side projecting mudroom.

And, as revised, the proposed mudroom will include a screen porch will slightly wraps around and returns to the proposed rear addition. Regarding the shed dormers, the applicants propose to construct two new shed dormers, one on each side of the proposed new rear addition, which will return to the rear roof plane of the historic house. The shed dormer on the right, as viewed from the front, will be larger than that on the left, providing some of the interior space that would have been provided by the mudroom, the second floor and the mudroom. The ridge of each dormer as
well as that of the proposed rear addition will converge at
the same approximate height as the historic ridgeline.

Staff is generally supportive of the proposed shed
dormer additions, finding that in accordance with the
Guidelines they are at the rear of the property and
generally consistent with the predominant architectural
style of the property. To the rear addition. Although the
proposed rear addition is fairly consistent with what you
previously saw. The architectural detailing has changed
slightly with board and batten being proposed in the gable
end of the addition, instead of the previously proposed
Hardie Shakes. The proposed gable and materials are at the
rear where they will not be at all visible from the public
right-of-way.

But, Staff does prefer the previously proposed
Hardie Shakes, finding them more compatible with the
predominant architectural style and features of the house in
accordance with the Guidelines. And, with that, I recommend
that the applicants make any revisions based upon your
comments, and return with a HAWP. And I'll take any
questions you might have for me.

MR. KIRWAN: I have a quick question. Michael,
can you, and again, I apologize if this is in the Staff
Report but, what is the history of what is happening with
the existing siding on the original, on the historic
resource? Are we removing existing siding and replacing it
with hardiplank, and do we know -- it appears in Circle 18
that the gable sides of the historic resource are new
hardiplank shakes.

MR. KYNE: Bear with me for a moment.

MR. KIRWAN: I'm trying to understand what's the
extent of the replacement of the siding on the historic
resource.

MR. KYNE: Which circle did you refer to again?

MR. KIRWAN: Circle 18.

MR. KYNE: So, if we look at the photograph before
us, I believe that we currently have shakes in the gable
ends. Now, as you may recall from the previous prelim, part
of that proposal was to change the pitch of the roof, which
you, the Commission, were supportive of. And also as part
of that proposal, I believe, they had proposed to replace
the existing shakes with hardie shakes, and from what I
recall, you were also supportive of that at the previous
prelim.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. And then the siding below that
ban board at the eave line, gutter line is existing with
sidings to remain?

MR. KYNE: That's right. Yes.

MR. KIRWAN: All right, very good, thank you.

MR. ARKIN: I have a question. It's actually a
question for Staff. Did we already -- help me refresh my
memory. Did we already deal with the issue of the ridgeline
on the addition?

MR. KYNE: So, when we looked at the addition
previously, the rear addition did not include the two shed
dormers on either side. But the height of the rear addition
was approximately the same as is in the current proposal.
And actually, if you have your Staff Report with you, I have
the previous proposal attached. And you will see on Circle
19 of the previous proposal, which is marked out, that the
ridgeline was the same approximate height.

MR. ARKIN: And we did not make any comments on
that last time?

MR. KYNE: There were no concerns expressed, no.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff? All
right, very good. I invite the applicant to please come
forward. And I think you know the drill. Just before you
speak, please state your name for the record.

MR. BUEHLER: My name is Shawn Buehler from
Bennett Frank McCarthy Architects. I'll aim for brevity. I
don't know that I have a whole lot to add beyond the Staff
Report, other than to say, as Michael has noted, all of the
revisions we made are based directly on the comments we got
last time. The attached garage, as I recall it, was left as
a coin flip. We thought long and hard about that, and then
ultimately decided to remove that from this application. I
can't say that we won't be back looking for a detached
garage at some time, but we've decided not to include that
as part of this application, just to keep things moving.
And so, we're hopeful that the changes we made will be well
received and we look forward to taking additional comments
and moving forward with the project.

MR. KIRWAN: Any questions for the applicant?

MS. BARNES: Could you bring up the slide that had
the steps by the bay that we had been concerned about?
Because when you had first come, thank you, there had been a
proposal, as I recall, to essentially obscure part of the
bay with the porch? Is that --

MR. BUEHLER: That's correct.

MS. BARNES: And so, what is now planned, if
you'll just help me a little bit, because I'm not always
very good at understanding these plans. You will have the
existing steps that we're seeing in this picture. The bay
will be untouched, and the new addition will start --

MR. BUEHLER: So the steps are accessing what is a
current addition. They're not part of the original house.

MS. BARNES: Right.

MR. BUEHLER: And in our proposal, we're basically
replacing that addition with a new addition.
MS. BARNES: Right.

MR. BUEHLER: They're largely the same size.

Actually, our proposed addition starts further from the bay than the current addition. So, in light of that, I would anticipate that that entire stoop and stairs would be replaced rather than trying to keep those and extend them.

MS. BARNES: Okay.

MR. BUEHLER: The existing stairs do flair as they work down to the yard. The ones we've drawn don't. I don't know if it's a critical issue to us. If there are preference from you, we would follow that just fine.

MS. BARNES: No. I just wanted to understand. So the new addition will be actually farther back than where the existing door is that we were seeing in that picture, it starts just a little farther back?

MR. BUEHLER: That's correct.

MS. BARNES: Okay. Thank you so much.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for the applicant? If not, then we can move into our deliberations. Again, it's a preliminary matter. With only five of us here, I think the applicant should hear from all of us. I'll go ahead and kick things off. I really don't have any concerns -- I'm sorry, yes, I do apologize. We do have testimony. So before we move into deliberations, Ms. Piersall, again, I apologize. I had this right in front of
me, I remembered it minutes ago, but I got caught up in the
weight of things. We do look forward to hearing your
testimony.

MS. PIERSALL: Well, I think it's a fabulous,
fabulous improvement from what we saw, and I wanted to go on
record just saying how happy I am to see it, and how happy
Historic Takoma is --

MR. FIRESTONE: Excuse me. Is your microphone on?

MS. PIERSALL: Oh, it isn't. There we go. Did
you hear what I said?

MR. KIRWAN: We did, but it might be helpful for
the record if you would just start from the beginning.

MS. PIERSALL: We're very, very pleased with the
large number of very positive changes that were made to this
project. In particular, the garage, moving the garage. But
in general, everything. I do have a couple of, because I'm
very detailed oriented, I have a few questions for Shawn,
actually. And, that is, going to that staircase, that we
were just talking about on the side, which is the very
visible side, and that's shown in your A-4 slide. My
concern, and this is not a big concern, but I just want to
share this with you, and just see what you all think, is
that because we made the roof kind of spread out more, it
doesn't, we changed the dimension of the roofline on the
dormer, and it comes now right in, smack into the dormer,
which is fine. But, on the bottom of it, the staircase is also, you know, coming up there, and it's not pushed away from the dormer. So it just looks busy there. And my question, I guess, was to Staff, are they doing what Michael showed us, like pulling the railing away to have it not look so cluttered at the dormer, for the dormer? But it's not a big issue. I just thought it might look better. But there's also a grade issue, so I don't know whether that's a problem for you as well. And, I just wanted to point that out. And it's, if you can't do it or you think it looks best that way, I'm fine with it. But, being a detailed oriented person, I just thought, would it look a little better if it was either -- I guess my initial reaction was, can you push this back further, but you have this grade here, and that might be a problem for you.

MR. BUEHLER: Candidly, I wouldn't be bothered pulling the steps back a little bit. The challenge becomes that as they pull back, we'd start to trap a corner to the rear of the window bay, and I what I don't want to end up with is a railing on both sides of the stair that further complicates what is, admittedly, an already complicated part of the house.

MS. PIERSALL: Right. I get it. It's fine. I'm fine with that. The other question I had for you related to the window styles, and it's hard sometimes to read these
but, when you look at the side facades and the front
facades, it looks like we have a lot of different window
styles or maybe not. So, I know the main house has 2-over-2
windows in the old house, and 6-over-1 in the dormer. And
it looks like --

MR. KIRWAN: Just so we call it the right -- it's
a bay, not a dormer.

MS. PIERSALL: I'm sorry, bay. Sorry. I'm sorry,
I know the difference. I'm tired. So, I was concerned that
the upper windows, are some of them 1-over-1 and right next
to it is 2-over-2, and it was almost, when I'm looking, for
example, at A-4, I was seeing a lot of different styles, and
I thought it might benefit from having just window
configurations of 2-over-2 and 6-over-1 and I didn't know if
that was what you intended, because I saw fuzziness in the
drawing, or what are your thoughts on that?

MR. BUEHLER: I'm the victim of bad printing here.
The intention is 2-over-2's, basically everywhere where I
see windows.

MS. PIERSALL: Okay, great.

MR. BUEHLER: And there are a few cases on the
existing house where we do have either 6-over-1's or, I
think, there's a bay on the other side of the house that has
1-over-1's. Those are existing windows. We're not touching
those windows. And so we're going to -- unless somebody
wants them to be 2-over-2's, in which case we'll get new windows but it's generally my understanding that anywhere we have existing windows, we should leave them. But, the intention is that all of the proposed windows would be 2-over-2. And we would seek to pick window proportions that try to maintain like consistency as best we can.

MS. PIERSALL: Yeah, super. So the dormer is going to have 2-over-2. So, okay great. Yeah, super, that'll look great.

MR. KIRWAN: Very good. Thank you, Ms. Piersall.

Do we have any questions for the witness? All right. Thank you for your testimony. I appreciate you coming out tonight and sticking with us for the long haul.

MR. BUEHLER: Thank you.

MS. PIERSALL: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: All right. So, back to where I was. I'll go ahead and get things started. I think the proposal, as Ms. Piersall said, is a great improvement on what we saw last time. I really don't have any concerns with the proposal. I will pose to the rest of the Commissioners, I don't particularly have an issue with this. We had a very highly respected commissioner on this Commission before who was an ardent supporter of spread mulls between grouped windows. You know, I would not be against the proposal if all the mulls become spread mulls. But I think in some of
these groupings where there is, for instance, on the rear facade where there's four windows grouped together, I think spread mulls might almost become a little bit too much of an impact and would, you don't get the benefit of the glazing to the window being closer together than with a spread mull. I'll just throw that out there for others who might have opinions on that, and might want to speak to that.

But again, I think the proposal is a great improvement, and I really don't have any issues. So, I think I would be supportive of moving forward with a HAWP.

MS. BARNES: I support the proposal as its presented.

MR. FIRESTONE: Unfortunately, I was not here for the last preliminary, but I did review the earlier proposal, and this one, I think, getting away from the attached garage and the consideration of the mudroom is a great addition. Moving the addition back away from the bay on the historic portion of the house is also a good addition. As far as the garage goes, if you do come forward at some point with a detached garage, I would be in support of that. I understand there might be some other zoning concerns with it. And, I would also like to say for the record that this particular house is basically in my backyard. So, I think the changes you made will be something that will be greatly appreciated in the neighborhood, and I think this will be a
great project going forward.

    MS. VOIGT: I also agree with the commissioners. You did a great job with incorporating the comments from the last preliminary and to these drawings. It looks great, and I look forward to seeing your HAWP.

    MR. ARKIN: I have nothing much to add. I also think it's greatly improved, and look forward to seeing you move this along. And thank you for coming in again for a second prelim. I think that makes things much easier in the end.

    MR. WHIPPLE: Commissioners, at the risk of dragging this out longer than we have to, Staff did raise one question about the rear elevation --

    MS. BARNES: The board and batten?

    MR. WHIPPLE: Yeah. Are there any really strong views on that?

    MR. ARKIN: Well, I prefer -- I agree with Staff. I prefer the shingles that's in the back. It's really beyond our purview, so I think it's just a recommendation at this point, a suggestion.

    MS. BARNES: I think I would also prefer the shingles. But once again, because it is at the rear, I would be willing to go with the board and batten, but I think the shingles would be preferable. And it doesn't add a whole other element. And you've already heard about the
desire perhaps not to complicate certain things.

MR. FIRESTONE: I would go with the shingles also.

MR. KIRWAN: I'm fine with the board and batten.

All right. Very good. We thank you for your work on this, and I look forward to seeing you come back with a HAWP.

MR. BUEHLER: Thank you all, I appreciate it.

MR. KIRWAN: All right. Moving on to the third item on our agenda. I know we at least have the October 5th meeting minutes to approve this evening. Do we have others?

MR. WHIPPLE: Yes. You also have the September 7th.

MR. KIRWAN: Very good. Do we have motion for those minutes?

MR. ARKIN: I move we approve the minutes for September 7, 2016 and October 5, 2016.

MR. KIRWAN: Very good. Do we have a second?

MS. BARNES: I second the motion.

MR. KIRWAN: Any discussion? I don't suppose there is. All in favor, please raise your right hand.

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: The minutes are unanimously approved for September 7th and October 5th, 2016. Do we have any Commission items?

MR. WHIPPLE: Before you do that, could we get a volunteer for tonight?
Previous Proposal & Transcript

First Preliminary Consultation
1. **PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION**
   - Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

   - PROPOSED FRONT DOOR WITH WOOD DOUBLE-HUNG WINDOWS
   - EXISTING WOOD SIDINGS TO REMAIN
   - PAINTED WOOD RAILING & STEPS AT SIDE PORCH
   - EXISTING PORCH RAILINGS & COLUMNS TO REMAIN
   - HARDI PLANK SIDING & SHAKES AT ADDITION & STEEPER ROOF GABLE
   - PAINTED WOOD BRACKETS TO MATCH EXISTING
   - CLAD WOOD WINDOWS AT REAR ADDITION
   - BORAL SYNTHETIC TRIM
   - PAINTED BORAL TRIM PLANK SCREEN BELOW PORCH
   - EXISTING WOOD WINDOWS TO REMAIN
   - PAINTED WOOD PORCH RAILING & STEPS

2. **PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION**
   - Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

   - PROPOSED A-4 KOFNER-SHARAH RENOVATION
   - PROPOSED FRONT & SIDE ELEVATIONS
   - 20 Dec 2016
   - Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
   - #1528

BENNETT FRANK McCARTHY
7230 Spruce Avenue, Takoma Park, MD 20912
1400 Spring Street, Suite 320, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2755
(301) 565-6917 www.bfmarch.com
A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on January 11, 2017, commencing at 7:32 p.m., in the MRO Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910, before:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

William Kirwan, Chair
Sandra Heiler
Brian Carroll
Marsha Barnes
Richard Arkin
Eliza Voigt
35/13-17A at 12 Hesketh Street, Chevy Chase; Case 37/03-17E
at 7101 Sycamore Avenue, Takoma Park; Case 18/8-17A at 19900
White Ground Road, Boyds; and Case 35/54-17A at 8810 Hawkins
Lane, Chevy Chase.

MR. KIRWAN: Is there a second?

MS. BARNES: I second the motion.

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

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: The motion passes unanimously. Those
historic area work permits are all approved this evening by
the Commission. I want to thank the applicants for their
good work to make those easily approvable. And, for next
steps, contact Staff during regular business hours.

The first case we're going to hear this evening is
Case 1.F at 6801 Westmoreland Avenue in Takoma Park. Do we
have a Staff Report?

MR. WHIPPLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. KIRWAN: I'd like to recommend that since I
don't believe that the applicants are here, that we defer
consideration of this until later in the meeting, and we
move on to the preliminary consultation and work with the
applicants of that project.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay, so be it. We will now jump to
the preliminary consultation for 7230 Spruce Avenue in
Takoma Park. And, I see a Staff Report on the screen. So, please go ahead.

MR. KYNE: All right. As you mentioned, this is 7230 Spruce Avenue, Takoma Park, a Contributing Resource in the Takoma Park Historic District, bungalow, circa 1915 to '25. A proposal to remove an existing rear deck, remove an existing rear left side addition, remove an existing one-story rear addition, construct a new rear left side addition with covered porch, construct a new one and a half story rear addition, alter/expand the roof of the historic house, replace the existing front dormer with a new front dormer, and construct a side-projecting mudroom and attached garage.

And, I have quite a bit of photographs for you to look at tonight. So, I'll start with this, the front of the house, and then moving around toward the right side. And then looking at the existing bay, the gable end with the brackets, which will be replicated. The approximate location of the attached garage and mudroom. Looking back toward the front from the rear corner. And looking at the rear. Opposite side. This is the porch to be removed and replaced with a porch in the approximate same location. And, at the far right side of the photograph is an existing bay, which we believe is historic, that will be covered by the new covered porch.

That bay again. Looking at the dormer to be
altered from the opposite side. These properties are what's confronting the subject property, and what we're looking at is the rear of properties primarily on Park Avenue. And this is standing in the intersection of Park, Spruce and, I believe, Holt Place. And then also, walking down, and you can see the subject property between the brick house and the other sort of bungalow looking house closer to the left. Then moving, we can still see the subject property from the sidewalk. And this is approaching from the opposite direction on Spruce and, as you can see, as we move along Spruce in the public right-of-way we can see that left hand side of the subject property.

And then this, the next series of photographs I'm going to show you are all taken from Park Avenue. And, in the Staff Report I will tell you that I believe the subject property will be visible in the absence of vegetation from Park Avenue. And, I just circled the subject property in each photograph. As we move along you can see. And then this photograph is the perhaps the most telling, you can see pretty much the entirety of the location where the proposed attached garage and mudroom will be.

And in this photograph we don't see the subject property, but again, I believe we see the approximate location where the garage may -- we may see portions of that garage. And then I have the plans where, and I will go
through slowly, but we can refer back to these if we need
to. Existing, proposed. And existing and proposed. And
the applicable guidelines in this case are the Takoma Park
Historic District Guidelines, and the Secretary of Interior
Standards for Rehabilitation.

Staff Discussion. Removal of the deck and
additions. The applicants propose, again, to remove an
existing rear deck, existing rear/left side addition, an
existing one-story rear addition. HPC deems these are non-
historic, and do not contribute to the historic character of
the property, or historic district.

The Staff finds that the proposal to remove these
features has no potential to detract from the subject
property or historic district. The new/I mean rear/left
side addition with covered porch, the applicants propose to
construct a new rear/left side addition with covered porch
in the approximate location of the existing rear/left side
addition, which will be removed. They propose a new
rear/left side addition takes cues from the historic
bungalow with two-over-three windows, paper column, and
wooden railing on the covered porch to match that on the
front porch of the historic house.

As proposed, the roof of the covered porch extends
to the main roof and covers an existing projecting bay on
the left elevation, which appears to be historic. And we
did focus on that a bit earlier. The Commission may find that it is inappropriate to extend the covered porch to the main roof, as it could impact the ability to discern the main roof form and the bay window from the public right-of-way. Due to its height and slope, the roof proposed on the rear/left side addition will engage two new windows that are proposed in the shed dormer, as the proposed a new one and a half story rear addition.

Staff suggests that lowering the height and slope of the proposed new rear/left-side addition roof may result in a simpler appearance on the left elevation, with less potential to detract from the historic house and surrounding district. The proposed materials from the new rear/left side addition include Hardie plank siding, Boral trim, laminated architectural shingles and clad wood beams. And the proposed materials are typical of what you would approve for new construction and additions.

Staff asks the Commission to provide any guidance that will make the proposed new rear and left side addition more compatible with the historic house and surrounding district. And on to the new one and a half story rear addition. The applicants propose to construct a new one and a half story gable and rear addition in the same approximate location of the one story addition. A shed dormer will extend along the left side as viewed from the front. The
proposed new addition to the roof of the main house. Much
like the previous side addition, the proposed materials
include Hardie plank, Boral trim, laminated architectural
shingles, wooden brackets and clad wood beams and Hardie
shakes are propose on the gable end.

The proposed materials are typical of what you
would approve for new construction and additions, and I ask
you to provide any guidance that would make the proposed new
rear addition more compatible with the district and -- I'm
sorry -- historic house and surrounding district.

The roof alteration extension. The proposal here
is to alter and expand the roof of the historic house,
increasing the slope to add interior space while retaining
the existing footprint. The roof will go from a 7:12 slope
to, what is, I believe, a 9:12 slope. The existing two-over-
two windows and the gables will be retained. The wood
shakes and the gables will be replaced with Hardie shakes,
and the existing wooden brackets will be replaced with new
wooden brackets to match.

The Guidelines for second story additions and
expansion say that they should be generally consistent with
the predominant architectural style and period of the
resource. And they say, in parentheses although structures
that have been historically single story and been expanded.
And should be appropriate to the surrounding streetscape in
terms of scale and massing. And Staff does suggest that the
proposed alteration expansion is consistent with the
architectural style and period of the resource, as the
historic house will retain its overall form and bungalow
characteristics. And the applicant has provided
photographic examples of other bungalows in the district
demonstrating the proposed 912 roof slope is compatible with
this style. And I ask you to provide any guidance that
would make the roof alteration more compatible with the
district or the house and the surrounding district.

Front dormer. The proposal is to replace the
existing dormer at the front with a new dormer in the same
approximate location. The proposed new dormer will be the
same width of the existing dormer but will be taller to
increase interior headroom. And the applicants have stated,
which is demonstrated by the photographs that I showed you,
that the existing dormer has been altered over the years,
and the original dormer windows have been replaced. The
existing two horizontal sliding glass windows will be
replaced with two paired two-over-two double-hung wood
windows, which take cues from the historic house. The Staff
is generally supportive of the proposed dormer replacement
as the existing dormer appears to have been altered and is
no longer compatible with the historic house. But, I do ask
you to provide any guidance that would make this aspect of
the proposal better.

And finally, the side-projecting mudroom and attached garage. The proposal here is to construct a one and a half story side-projecting mudroom addition and attached garage at the right side of the historic house. The materials include Hardie plank siding, Boral trim, laminated architectural shingles, wooden brackets, clad wood windows and Hardie shakes and gables. The Commission does not typically approve side-projecting additions or attached garages, and these features are not common in the district.

The applicants have stated that the proposed mudroom and attached garage will not be at all visible from the public right-of-way due to the house's location. However, Staff suggests that the mudroom addition and attached garaged will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way and have the potential to detract from the subject property and surrounding historic district. And, since I've written the Staff Report, I visited the site and I think that those features will certainly be visible, highly visible, in my opinion, from the public right-of-way, as seen in the photographs.

The subject property is located on an insulated lot. Again, I sort of reassessed that statement but, the lot is accessed via a private driveway off of Spruce Avenue. When approaching the subject property from the southwest on
Spruce Avenue, the proposed mudroom addition and attached
garage will not be at all visible, and that's probably still
true. When approaching the subject property from the
northeast, the proposed side-projecting addition and garage
will be visible, and the mudroom addition and garage will
also be visible when looking between the houses on Park
Avenue.

The applicants have stated that they are proposing
an attached garage due to the current zoning regulations
which require a detached garage to be entirely in the rear
yard. This requirement would result in a detached garage in
the middle of the rear/side yard with what the applicants
have characterized as an inconvenient relationship to the
main house. If the Commission will not approve an attached
garage, the applicants have indicated that they will seek a
variance to allow the construction of a detached garage in
the approximate same location. And given the potential
visibility and incompatibility with the subject property and
surrounding district, Staff would recommend that the
Commission not approve the proposed mudroom addition and
attached garage. However, I do seek your guidance on this
matter.

And, with all of that, I will finally conclude
and ask the applicants to make any revisions based upon your
recommendations and return for a HAWP, or in this case,
probably a second prelim. And I would be happy to take any
questions that the Commission might have for me.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. Any Commissioner questions?

MS. BARNES: I have a question, Michael, which
relates to the front dormer. The windows are clearly not
original but, would you be able to offer an opinion as to
whether the dormer, in terms of its size and pitch, is
original?

MR. KYNE: I'd be hesitant to venture a guess on
that one. But, it appears that it probably is, in my
estimation.

MS. BARNES: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff?

MS. HELSER: Yes, I have a question. If a side
attached garage is not allowed, I think you said that it
would require the detached garage to be partly in the side
yard as well as the backyard. Looking at Circle 9, in the
plat, it looks to me as if there is, you know, this extends
onto two lots, and that there would be room on that right
most lot, to put a detached garage entirely behind the rear
plane of the house. Is that your understanding?

MR. KYNE: That's my understanding. I think that,
as I mentioned in the Staff Report, it would be an
inconvenient relationship, and that may have to do with the
current configuration of the driveway which, as you can see
in this slide, is parallel to the front of the lot. And also, other features that exist on the lot currently, such as the fencing that we saw in the photograph. But, we can ask the applicant to clarify that.

MS. HEILER: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff? All right. If not, we invite the applicant to please come forward. We can give you seven minutes for your testimony. And I'm sure we'll have some follow up questions after that. And, before you speak, please make sure you state your name for the record.

MR. BUEHLER: My name is Shawn Buehler. I'm from Bennett Frank McCarthy Architects. First, I would like to say, thank you, Michael, it's a fairly comprehensive description of what is, admittedly, a large project. And, his description strikes me as a pretty reasonable account of the dialogue he and I have had. The fact that the project is presented in about six different additions is representative of a general strategy of ours, which is to take what is relatively a small, as an existing house, and find ways to make it more compatible with the size house that's realistic for the neighborhood that it sits in, without putting too much bulk in any one location. And so, our goal was not to just add straight back, which we can do more of based on the zoning limitations of the lot. But
rather, put some of the bulk on the side of the house which,
I can appreciate is generally not an acceptable solution
given that the house is approached in a non-traditional
manner, in that it does not front the street.

It struck us that placing some bulk next to the
house was, perhaps, less of an inconvenience to the
immediate neighbors as creating a house that was
unrealistically long. So that's to speak to the general
strategy of adding a little bit up, a little bit back, a
little bit over. With respect to the garage, again, I would
say that Michael's characteristic description of the project
is accurate. We -- I would like to clarify that the -- with
respect to the variance, it's certainly something we would
entertain. I would not like that to be characterized as a,
if we don't get it, this is what we're going to do kind of
thing. It's more a matter of, it's a peculiar lot. The lot
is very wide relative to its depth. It's twice the size of
a typical lot. And so, placing the garage in the backyard
really takes away what makes the lot so valuable, and what
made it so expensive for the owners.

And so, while we certainly agree that an attached
garage is not typical in the historic district, and the
comments recommending it not be approved were largely
anticipated, that's language that might help us if we do
proceed with a detached garage to potentially get into a
dialogue with zoning about where on this lot it makes the most sense. And so, I don't know that we need to spend a lot of time talking about the garage, because I think we concede that that's a very difficult task.

The mudroom addition between the garage and the house is a place where I would seek some guidance from the Commission. The functions associated with that portion of the addition, if not allowed on the side of the house as a modest six or seven foot projection, again, away from the street side of the house, if not allowed there, those would more realistically end up behind the house making it even longer. I'm personally not of the impression that making this house more than twice its original length is ideal. And so, my thought was, a modest amount of bulk away from the street side of the house was a reasonable ask. But, I'll be curious to hear your thoughts on that.

Michael's comments on the dormer. The slope of the porch roof, the porch roof engaging with the bay on the side of the house, all strikes me as fair and reasonable comments. I'm sure as we hammer out the larger details about the rest of the bulk, we can find ways to massage these elements and make them -- address those concerns. So these, again, strike me as pretty reasonable comments.

The other big piece of this I wanted to address before taking in your feedback was, the steeper roof for the
existing house. I know that traditionally asking to alter
the roofline as visible from the street is not a traditional
request. Again, in this case, having worked on several
bungalows in the historic district, some have steeper roofs,
some have shallower roofs. This is a house type that has as
many as three or four bedrooms upstairs, and as few as one.
In our case, we have one existing bedroom. Trying to get
meaningful second floor space and stay under the existing
roof ridge is going to be a tortured exercise. And so, it
seemed to us that there are bungalows with 912 roofs. And
so we're certainly not asking to put ourselves outside of
the parameters of what you would see in the historic
district, and it allows us to better subordinate the
addition behind to the house in front. Which, I'm sure is
an appreciated goal.

The dormer on the front is exactly as Michael
described. I do believe it's an existing element in some
form. I do not believe the windows are original. The house
was added to and renovated, I think, about 20 or so years
ago. And the windows, from the interior hardware and so
forth, they are clearly of that era. So, we believe that in
the course of getting a steeper roof, it's going to force us
to reconfigure that dormer, and our reconfigurations would
be looking to make the house look more like an original
Takoma Park bungalow.
If we don't do the steeper roof, then I assume that we'll focus all our attention behind the house, which leaves the dormer as is. Which, I think, personally, is a good trade to get that dormer looking more like it's supposed to. I think that's the only thing else I wanted to add. Otherwise, again, thank you, Michael, for getting us to this point. And finally, I would say, this is definitely a work in progress. We didn't want to get all the details worked out and come to you. We know we're asking to do a lot to this house, and so, we're interested in getting your feedback and doing everything we can to incorporate and get a project that, that incorporates those things.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you, Mr. Buehler. Do we have any questions for the applicant?

MR. CARROLL: Shawn, do you have any idea of where the original historic house ends? I'm assuming that the stuff that's on the rear now is addition? Do you have any idea where that stopped?

MR. BUEHLER: I do agree that the piece on the back is an addition. My impression is that the gable that you see toward to the -- if you look at drawing 2 that's on the screen, the gable to the left half of that drawing, I believe, represents the depth of the existing house.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. And one other question. It's a very unusual lot. It's big. You guys are not -- I'm
assuming, not anywhere close to the lot coverage, even if
you had a detached garage that you were still willing to do
that?

MR. BUEHLER: That's correct. There's an
interesting history on this lot. The previous owner has
made several attempts to subdivide the lot. In fact, we had
been approached by previous potential buyers of this lot,
and have gone through planning exercises that have
demonstrated that it was never going to get subdivided in a
way that would let a second house be built. And so, the
homeowners that I'm working for came to the property when he
was looking to sale the second lot, and he offered to buy
the entire lot. But it does kind of demonstrate that a
house of this size, in its current condition on a lot of
this size, is really just an unsustainable configuration.
To have a double size lot, the house needs to be -- it needs
to be more than a two bedroom house.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions? No. If not,
then we will deliberate this matter and give you our
thoughts on the proposal. It's always helpful on a
preliminary if the applicant hears from all of us, I think.
Especially, when we have some Commissioners missing, as that
will be helpful in a follow up preliminary or a HAWP
scenario. So, anybody want to kick things off with their
thoughts?
MR. CARROLL: If nobody, I'll go.

MR. KIRWAN: Sure. Thank you, Commissioner Carroll.

MR. KYNE: Mr. Chairman, can I interject for a second? I just wanted to note that we did receive late in the day, public comments from Historic Takoma, which they have been transmitted to the Commission. But just to summarize, I think that the comments are fairly consistent with Staff's comments in the Staff Report. Although Historic Takoma was more concerned about the alteration of the roof slope. Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: All right, thank you. Yes, we did receive those, and have taken those under consideration. So, with that, Commissioner, Carroll, please continue.

MR. CARROLL: I do appreciate the fact that you've tried to minimize the bulk, and that this is a very unusual lot. You know, I think going back to Michael's comments, a few things like the elevation to the south where the new porch roof is up at a pretty steep angle and climbing up the wall. That's going to be pretty visible from the public right-of-way. I wonder if there's a way to pull that roof down a little bit to sort of minimize that, that new porch that runs along the south wall? I think that the, you know, whether or not the front dormer is original, whatever somebody did to it in the past was very unfortunate. So I
think that, you know, the windows are a great improvement.
In terms of picking the roof up, I understand the impetus to
do that, the need for the head room up there.

I'm wondering if you have any examples around here
that -- essentially we're going from 20 foot four up to
about 23 feet. So, yeah. Are there any other buildings in
the immediate vicinity that have that, you know, that that
would be a strong argument, in my opinion, to allow that. I
understand the impetus, being there's a need to do it, but
I'm looking for some kind of precedent.

MR. BUEHLER: As a matter of fact, there is a
house at 7336 Carroll Avenue. I forgot if it's Lee. It's a
corner lot. And so it's actually very visible. As a corner
lot, you definitely see the front and side. It's a very
similar bungalow type house with a one-story eave and a
ridge that's parallel to the front of the house. And that
house did get a steeper roof slope so that it would limit
the size of any other addition put on the house. I believe
that work was done sometime in the last three to five years.
But I can find out more about that, if that's helpful. The
address is 7336 Carroll Avenue.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. I'll take a look at that. I
think, you know, the Historic Takoma objection to the
attached garage at the side of the house -- I think I fought
this fight before where, you know, as soon as it becomes
detached it has to go all the way behind the house, and
given that the driveway runs across the front of the house,
and then down the side, it starts to become a little
tortured. I wonder if there might be some sort of
compromise. It looks like there's nothing above the garage,
and I wonder if even some sort gesture, you know, as you
look at the front elevation, I think it's Circle, I can't
remember the number, 17. As you look at the front
elevation, even if there's some gesture towards, you know,
having it detached, but giving it some sort of separation so
that it's attached by a porch or something, anything. Just
so that it's a nod to the desire from the Historic Takoma to
have that detached but maybe, maybe that's a compromise. It
stays physically attached, but kind of has some sort of
visual cue that says it's a separate structure.

I don't have any problem with the rear additions.
I think what's primarily going to be visible is that porch
on the south side. Raising the roof on the front, and I
think the dormer on the front is going to be a big
improvement. I think the garage is minimally visible from
the right-of-way but, you know, if there's an objection from
Historic Takoma, if we can make such a gesture towards that.
And I think the mudroom is also -- I take your point the six
foot bump and it's substantially behind the house and really
not impacting -- I think that the defining feature to this
house are that front porch and elevation, and really a
little bit of the side porch, because that's, it's visible
from the public right-of-way. So, those are my comments for
what they're worth.

MR. KIRWAN: I'll just jump in. I have a lot of
similar feelings about this that Commissioner Carroll had.
I just had a couple of more minor comments first. I think
the roof over the side entry should be, have a lower pitch
or lower slope. I think it's just a little too dominant
right now. It should emulate what had been there before a
little bit closer. I think it is worth trying to explore
preserving the feeling of that projected bay. So, I would
lean toward trying to take the roof off of that portion of
it and set the roof a little further back.

The roof pitch on the front and the dormer
changes, I'm okay with. I think, again, there is precedent
for this, and I think Staff has made a good point about
there is language in the Guidelines that can make this
permissible. So I'm comfortable with the front elements,
and generally the side and rear elements as well. So,
again, it comes back to the garage. I think the garage is
problematic as it's been presented. I had similar thoughts
to what Commissioner Carroll just expressed about, maybe
there is a way that the garage could be rendered as more of
an attached pavilion to the main house so it's not -- I
mean, right now the dominance of that second story roof just
continuing out over across the garage as well, really makes
it feel large and bulky. I think if the garage really read
as an independent piece with a little connecting link back
to the house, that would help quite a bit. So I think
that's worth exploring. I'd be willing to entertain that as
a possible solution to allow the garage to remain attached,
but look like a free standing element.

Whether the garage is there or not, the mudroom
addition -- I think the mudroom addition is fine and
probably provides that opportunity for that link to the
garage that I just described. I'm a little bit more
troubled by -- when that roof goes up to the second story
and grabs that bedroom in the back. You know, maybe there's
a way to reconfigure the bedroom in the second floor so the
bedroom swings around toward the rear and doesn't have to --
the second story doesn't have to project off the side. But
maybe the first story can to make that link to the garage.
So, I would take a look at that, if possible. Or maybe the
bedroom is somehow rendered more like a dormer, you know,
one-story roof, as opposed to being such a dominant large
roof right now.

So anyway, I would encourage you to explore ways
to get the bedroom back off of the side plane while allowing
these things on the first floor to project out. So, again,
I think generally this is in a good direction, and I appreciate the moves you're making to try to take these program elements and do them in an additive way to this bungalow. But I think the garage has to, at the very least, be some sort of pavilion attached to the house if we're going to pursue that as a direction.

MR. CARROLL: Can I just interject?

MR. KIRWAN: Sure.

MR. CARROLL: Shawn, can you bring us back a roof plan for this? I'm sure it's in the set, but it's just, you have a second floor and a roof plan. That'd be great.

MR. KIRWAN: And, just in closing, I would encourage you to come back for a second preliminary just so we can see the development of it. I think jumping right to a HAWP might be a little too premature, but we'll know a little bit better as we hear from the rest of the Commissioners. Anybody else?

MS. HEILER: Yes. I generally agree with the comments of the previous two Commissioners. I have more problem with the whole notion of the second story over the mudroom. I think the mudroom as a one-story addition of jutting off to the side is fine. If it formed a hyphen to the garage, then I think it might be okay to continue to attach the garage. A simpler solution though, of course, from my point of view, is to detach the garage. But an
attached garage it seems really foreign to the style of
these bungalows in Takoma Park.

I think it makes perfect sense to increase the
roof pitch on the main house to accommodate greater head
height, and the improvements to the dormer are improvements.
And I think, it came up before that the roof pitch of the
side porch on the south side. I think it's important to
save that bay on the south side. That whole corner of the
original house and the bay is such an important part of the
style of this house. That finding a way to save it seems
important. I have no problem with extending the roof to the
rear at the same ridge height as the newly increased height
of the main house. And I think you can accommodate that. I
don't think there's a problem with the rear, and the rear
facade. It's the problem with that south side. It needs to
preserve a little more of the historic house.

Overall, I think you're improving this house
enormously. Not only in making it more livable, but the
change to the front and that dormer makes a huge difference.

MS. VOIGT: Hi. So I also, I agree with the other
Commissioners. And I just wanted to commend you on the
presentation first of all of your drawings. I find it very
helpful, and we rarely get it, in my experience, of the
existing and the proposed. Because it's really easy to
understand what you're doing. I agree that I think that the
attached garage is something that is just not representative of this neighborhood, or of the era. So, setting it back further, detaching it. Well, maybe there's something you can work out. But somehow, it's really very visible right now. And, in terms of the roof pitch, I think that bungalows are generally low slung. And again, because of your great drawings, you can really see a difference. But I understand that you do need to gather some height in the second floor. So, if there's some way to do that more gently than you've already tried to do, I don't know if that's possible?

And, again, as the other Commissioners have said, there's a lot going on here. And it will reduce the bulk overall. But I think if there's some way you can look at simplifying it, in the next go round, that would be great.

Thank you.

MR. ARKIN: I'm generally in agreement with many of the comments made by the previous Commissioners, but I find myself staring at the drawing on Circle 17 at the top. And not really understanding how the roof over the mudroom and the garage will work. I do agree with the comment that was made by the prior speaker, or one of the prior speakers, that I think a better solution would be to detach the garage. And one advantage to that is that we would probably look at a detached garage with less intensity than we look
at it while it's attached. If you did that, and if you
could somehow move the bedroom that's partially over the
garage back some, I think you'd have more of a
differentiation between the old and the new, if I'm seeing,
if I'm understanding this drawing correctly.

And, you would retain more of the original house,
the feel of the original house so that a person walking by
who sees the house will appreciate the original bungalow
effect, and the proposed dormer really improves that. The
existing dormer really sticks out like a sore thumb. And
then, you would have a bunch of additions. You could -- if
a mudroom was necessary, you could probably do that with a
much lower roof, a shed roof of some kind. And possibly,
preserve the bay, as was suggested. But, I am looking
forward to seeing a roof plan at the next prelim. Thank
you.

MS. BARNES: I have a problem with the concept of
the attached garage because I think it is incompatible with
the bungalow style and the period that this bungalow
represents. I am supportive of the plan to increase the
roof height to enable you to have greater use of the second
floor, and also to do something about the very awkward front
dormer. I had asked the question because I also wondered if
that front dormer had at some point been enlarged. Looking
at other bungalows, it seemed to be quite massive.
I would support the idea of a side addition for a mudroom. I was very much persuaded by your presentation on the breadth of the lot, and the fact that it is towards the rear of the existing bungalow. And I echo the comments of other Commissioners about the need to preserve the bay on the south side, and to do some work on the roofline there.

MR. KIRWAN: So, in summary, if I've captured this correctly, I think we have at least two Commissioners who are pretty opposed to any idea of an attached garage on the side. Two other Commissioners who expressed, I think, preference for a detached garage, but could possibly see an alternative solution, and two Commissioners who were supportive of an opportunity to redesign it to create a compatible attached garage. And, I think there was general agreement on all the other points regarding the shed dormers and the scale of the second story addition in the back, and support of a mudroom on the side, and things like that.

So, you know, I would, best confer with Staff, and talk about what's the best direction to go from here. I mean, it appears that there's the opportunity to possibly sway the majority, at least of the Commissioners who are here today, with a solution of an attached garage. But, I think right now it's probably a 50/50 gamble. So, consult with your clients and Staff, and come back to us at another prelim with your next proposal. Any questions for us?
MR. BUEHLER: No, thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. Great, thank you very much.

Are we prepared to hear --

MR. WHIPPLE: We are. The applicant's not here, but I think that you have an application before you, and you should go ahead and hear the Staff presentation.

MR. KIRWAN: Very good. Then, we will hear Case I.F now, and let's hear the Staff Report for 5801 Westmoreland Avenue in Takoma Park.

MR. BRUCHERT: Good evening. This is Case No. 37/03-17A, 6801 Westmoreland Avenue in Takoma Park. You see on your screen, this is an image of the house. It's constructed circa 1915 to 1925, and it is listed as Contributing to the Takoma Park Historic District. And it's reviewed under County Code Chapter 28A, and the Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines.

Again, sort of as a general concept, the District stresses the importance of assuring that additions and other changes to the existing structures act to reinforce and continue existing streetscapes, rather than to impair the character of the District. And the design review for each project should emphasize the importance of the resource with the overall streetscape and its compatibility with the existing patterns, rather than focusing on any close scrutiny of the architectural details.