MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 16315 Old River Rd., Poolesville
Resource: Seneca Store
Master Plan Site #17/62
Applicant: Montgomery County Dept. of Parks
(Julie Mueller, Agent)
Review: HAWP
Case Number: 17/62-17A

PROPOSAL: Hardscape and landscape alterations

Meeting Date: 8/16/2017
Report Date: 8/9/2017
Public Notice: 8/2/2017
Tax Credit: N/A
Staff: Michael Kyne

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission approve the HAWP application.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:

SIGNIFICANCE: Master Plan Site
STYLE: Commercial/Greek Revival
DATE: 1901

Excerpt from Places from the Past:

This store is the oldest general store in continuous operation in Montgomery County and one of the few surviving turn-of-the-century-20th-century commercial buildings in the County. The store has a traditional front-gable form with cornice returns and 6/6 sash windows reminiscent of the pre-Civil War Greek Revival era. The front porch posts are stripped whole tree trunks. On the interior, a closed string staircase in the rear east corner is enclosed with triple-beaded paneling.

Seneca was a thriving town supported by the stone-cutting industry, a gristmill, commercial canal traffic, and summering vacationers. The community had several warehouses and shops, a hotel, and several resort homes in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Frederick Allnut, who had been running a store next to the canal for several years, built the frame store facing River Road in 1901. The Allnut family operated the store for over 60 years. Since Raymond Poole began managing the business in 1965, it has been known as Poole's Store. The store is listed on the National Register [of Historic Places] as part of
the Seneca Rural Historic District.

BACKGROUND:

The applicant previously appeared before the Commission at the April 8, 2015 HPC meeting for a preliminary consultation. At that time, the applicant was proposing site work, including the creation of five parking spaces, septic system replacement, construction of concrete paths, regrading, and construction of a storm water retention pond. The Commission did not express any concerns about the applicant’s proposal at the preliminary consultation.

PROPOSAL:

The applicant has returned with a revised proposal for the following work items:

- Creation of six parking spaces, including an ADA accessible space.
- Removal of a small portion of grass from the island at the rear of the property to accommodate the proposed parking spaces and maintain a 20’ drive aisle.
- Gravel installation/driveway alteration.
- Street furniture installation.

Note: At the November 16, 2016 HPC meeting, the Commission approved the applicant’s proposal for work items within the easement area held by the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT). This work included construction of a 260 sf rear addition, construction of a covered stoop on the west elevation, construction of a lean-to shed addition on the west elevation, replacement of a wooden ramp on the east elevation with a concrete ramp with metal railings, replacement and extension of a shed roof on the east elevation, and construction of concrete walkways along the east and rear elevations. The current proposal is only for the work items listed above, which are not within MHT’s easement area.

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. 11-59)

The Secretary of the Interior defines rehabilitation as "the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values." The Standards are as follows:

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

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

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

STAFF DISCUSSION:

Parking Spaces

At the April 8, 2015 preliminary consultation, the Commission had no concerns about the applicant’s proposal to create five gravel parking spaces at the rear of the property. The applicant now proposes six parking spaces at the rear of the property, including the previously proposed five gravel parking spaces and one additional ADA accessible space adjacent the rear of the Seneca Store building. The accessible space will be concrete with access aisles on either side.

Staff fully supports the proposed parking spaces, finding that they are at the rear of the property, where they are less visible from the public right-of-way and that they have minimal potential to detract from the property’s character defining features. The Commission previously expressed support for the five gravel parking spaces, and the additional ADA accessible space will improve access to this historic site and facilitate its continued use and preservation.

Grass Removal/Gravel Installation/Driveway Alteration

The applicant proposes to remove a small portion of grass from the island at the rear of the property to accommodate the proposed parking spaces and maintain a 20’ drive aisle. Gravel will be installed where the grass is removed. While the applicant has not provided the exact dimensions of the grass to be removed and/or gravel to be installed, the submitted site plan indicates that the alteration will be minimal.

Due to the location and nature of the proposed work, the proposal will have a negligible visual impact on the subject property. The existing driveway and associated island are utilitarian features that were created to provide access to the multiple buildings at this public site. Such features are likely to shift over time to accommodate site changes and facilitate the site’s continued use and preservation.

Street Furniture

The proposal also includes a variety of street furniture (bicycle racks, bollards, signs, etc.). The proposed street furniture will serve a functional purpose and have a minimal visual impact on the historic site. The proposed street furniture will not physically impact any historic structures at the subject property and can be relocated or removed in the future without impairing the historic site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b), (1), (2) & (d) having found that the proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features
of the historic resource and is compatible in character with the district and the purposes of Chapter 24A;

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

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

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

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

Julie Mueller
Contact Person: Julie Mueller

Contact Email: montgomery.gov
Daytime Phone No.: 301-495-4390

Tax Account No.: MNCPC-4020, Dept. of Parks

Name of Property Owner: MNCPC-4020, Dept. of Parks

Address: 1000 Broadleaf Ave, Silver Spring 20910

St. Number: 100
City: Silver Spring
State: MD
Zip Code:

Contractor: J. D.

Contractor Registration No.:

Agent for Owner: Julie Mueller
Daytime Phone No.: 301-495-4390

LOCATION OF BUILDING/STRUCTURE

House Number: 10315
Street: Old River Road
Town/City: Poolesville

Nearby Cross Street: Tschiffely Hill Rd.

Lot: Block: Subdivision: ED 3, MAP 222, SUB 1

Parcel:

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT, ACTION AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
- Construct
- Extend
- Alter/Remodel
- Move
- Install
- Wind/Mass
- Revision
- Repair
- Renovate
- Fence/Wall

1B. Construction cost estimate: $7,382.11

1C. If this is a revision of a previously approved active permit, see Permit No. 7-38211

PART TWO: COMPLIANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXISTING ADDITIONS

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

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

PART THREE: COMPLIANCE FOR FENCE/WALL

3A. Height

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/maintenance

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 in be a condition for the issuance of this permit.

JULIE MUeller

Approved:

For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission

Disapproved:

Signature: Date:

Applications/Permit No.: Date Filed: Date Issued:

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS
Addendum to Seneca Store HAWP (Permit #778211)

1. Written Description of Project

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

   The Seneca (Poole's) Store (#17/52) and the adjacent, c. 1855 Upton Darby House (#17/61) are located within the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Seneca Creek State Park and are contributing resources in the National Register of Historic Places-listed Seneca Historic District. Both buildings are also individually listed on the Montgomery County Master Plan for Historic Preservation. Part of the site, including the store but excluding the house, is covered by a historic preservation easement held by the Maryland Historical Trust.

   The site also has a non-contributing, commercial warehouse at the front of property along the driveway and an abandoned frame barn at the back of the driveway.

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

   This project calls for the rehabilitation of the historic store and site to improve access and parking for the store. The plan was approved by MHT and the HPC in September and November 2016, respectively, with minor conditions.

   This addendum addresses the site work which is outside the preservation easement boundaries and which has not yet been reviewed by the HPC. It also provides an update on previously approved items which have been revised.

The following have been revised from the previously approved HAWP:

- The original proposal called for a total of five (5) new parking spaces, including an accessible one. An additional space has been added to meet code. The accessible space will be on concrete with access aisles (Details 4 and 8 on Sheet C-38). The remaining five spaces will be on gravel (Detail 12, Sheet C-38). All are located outside the preservation easement boundary.

- The grassy island in the parking area will be slightly adjusted at west edge to maintain 20-foot wide drive aisle.

- Parks received a Storm Water Management waiver from the Department of Permitting Services (Permit #282364, 12/2/2016). Therefore, the following are no longer required and will not be done:
  - Construction of a storm water management pond
  - Shortening of the warehouse timber retaining wall
  - Reduction in the size of the warehouse loading area
- Relocation of the pedestrian path closer to the warehouse
- Re-grading and removal of trees and vegetation on adjacent State Park and MC-DOT property
- The proposed driveway changes crossing property line at southeast: concrete curb and guardrail

The proposed work will have No Adverse Effect on the historic integrity of the property.

2. Site Plan: See Attached
3. Plans and Evaluations: See Attached
4. Materials Specifications: Noted in plans
5. Photographs: See Attached
6. Tree Survey: unchanged from original HAWP
7. Addresses of Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners:
   - Maryland Department of Natural Resources
     Seneca Creek State Park
     11950 Clopper Road
     Gaithersburg, MD 20878
     301-924-2127
   - Ms. Carolyn Irwin
     14015 Montevideo Road
     Poolesville, MD 20837
Seneca Store Site looking north (store on left, former stable in rear, warehouse on right)

Seneca Store site looking south towards back of store (right)
Back of Seneca Store showing proposed parking area to the right

View of grassy area, former stable, and vehicular circulation from back of store
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - X

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
509 Albany Avenue
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - X

2nd PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
4609 Waverly Avenue
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - X

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
6800 Westmoreland Avenue
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - X

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
7418 Cedar Avenue
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - X

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
16315 Old River Road
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - X

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
4 North Street
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - X

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
April 8, 2015, commencing at 7:31 p.m., in the MRO
Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland
20910, before:

Deposition Services, Inc.
12321 Middlebrook Road, Suite 210
Germantown, MD 20874
Tel: (301) 881-3344 Fax: (301) 881-3338
info@DepositionServices.com www.DepositionServices.com
more consistent with the rest of the resource as opposed to being the gable. But I think you're 90 percent there. So I think we look forward to seeing -- I think, with the comments we've given you, you can come back to us with a HAWP, and we'll look forward to seeing the further development of it. Thank you.

We'll move on to Case II-E at 16315 Old River Road in Poolesville, and do we have a staff report?

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do. This is 16315 Old River Road, Poolesville, also known as the Seneca Store. It's a master plan site. It's commercial, Greek Revival, with Greek Revival influences, circa 1901. The environmental setting is 2.25 acres, and it includes the Seneca Store and Upton Darby House with its related outbuildings. This property was listed in the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Seneca Rural Historic District.

The proposed work items include the creation of five formal gravel parking spaces at the rear of the store in a previously disturbed area, replacement of a septic system between the store and the field behind the barn, construction of a concrete path on the north and east side of the store for ADA access, regrading and replacing existing asphalt driveway between the store and the warehouse to the east, and construction of a stormwater retention pond southeast of the store, which I believe is
what we're going to focus on primarily tonight. There's also something that was submitted to us by the applicants, what we're referring to as the proposed site plan, and you can see here that it includes 24 work items, which is much more than what we've addressed thus far, but we may address this in a bit in a later slide.

So the Seneca Store and Upton Darby House we can see here -- the store, of course, in the foreground and the house barely visible in the background. Also, let me go back. The barn that we referenced earlier is to the right in the background. This is another view of the Seneca Store, and in the background here to the right we can see the warehouse. And this view shows the Seneca Store, the facade, and also Old River Road looking west, and this shows the Seneca Store and Old River Road looking east. And the area which is encircled is the approximate location of the proposed stormwater retention pond but not exactly where we're looking because it's, it will actually be kind of over the embankment there.

This is a better view of the proposed location for the retention pond, and this is directly to the left of that. And this is the pedestrian approach -- that's the way I'm referring to it -- and there's a, some sort of camping outfit that's a little upstream from the store, and they receive a lot of pedestrian traffic via the creek from
kayakers.

This is the warehouse, and this shows the driveway, which is proposed to be regraded. And I'll also address the grading here at this site. A lot of it -- a lot of this is not historic. It was regraded when the River Road was realigned in 1959. This is the proposed gravel parking area and north elevation of the store. As you can see, this area was previously disturbed and actually currently used as a parking area, but the plan is to make it a more formal parking area.

This is the barn north of the store; north elevation and the location of the proposed ADA concrete path; east elevation, again, location of the proposed ADA concrete path; and, also, we can see the canopy here. The applicants may address this later. I'm not sure exactly what type of work is being done with the canopy, but some type of work is.

The applicable guidelines are the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation because this is a master plan site.

Staff discussion: Parks is seeking conceptual approval of the work items presented as well as those depicted in the proposed site plan, which I addressed earlier, 29 items. Staff asked the HPC to provide general guidance with the understanding that more detailed
information will be required when Parks formally submits for a HAWP.

The following information has been provided regarding the proposed retention pond: Only a small portion of the pond is within the environmental setting of the Seneca Store and therefore within the HPC’s purview. Being located at the entrance of the property, the pond will be one of the first things that is seen when approaching the store. Many pedestrians, again, from the creek approach the store via the creek and walk through the proposed pond location. The proposed pond is in the approximate location of the historic River Road that fronted the property before being realigned in 1959, and staff asked the HPC to consider whether the location of the pond will impact the ability of the store to convey its historical significance. And that is actually it, and I will try to answer any questions you might have.

MR. WHIPPLE: Before you ask any questions, let me just jump in for a moment. I just want to remind the Commission that MHT holds an easement on a portion of this property. The Department of Parks will be going to MHT to get easement committee review for the majority of the scope of work but not the entirety of the scope of work. So one significant thing that MHT won’t be reviewing is the location, as I understand it, is the location of the
stormwater pond, and so this is more a briefing. This is sort of getting some conceptual feedback from you on their way to go and visit with MHT, but I'd encourage you to focus on the stormwater facility.

MR. KIRWAN: Any questions for staff?

MS. BARNES: Michael, on one of your very early slides, there was a dotted line overlay on the -- yes, this one. What does the dotted line represent, please? Is that the extent of the environmental area that is --

MR. KYNE: I do not believe so. I believe that the environmental setting, unless I am incorrect, is actually the more solid yet thin black line, which you might see if you look at the monitor in front of you, and -- at least that's what I was assuming and basing my previous comment about only a portion being within the setting. And if you look here and look at your monitor, you can see here where it kind of clips the edge, and then follow that black line. That's what I'm interpreting as the environmental setting, but I may be incorrect on that.

MR. WHIPPLE: I believe the dash lines have to do with various stages of flooding. This is a site that gets inundated from time to time.

MS. BARNES: Yeah. Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for staff?

(No audible response.)
MR. KIRWAN: If not, we invite the applicant to please come forward. We give you seven minutes for your presentation, and then we may have questions for you. As I've stated before, please, before you speak, please turn on your microphone and make sure the red light comes on and state your name for the record.

MS. MULLER: Good evening. I'm Julie Muller. I'm with the Cultural Resources Stewardship section. So I deal primarily with the historic building component of this project.

MS. EMMETT: My name is Eileen Emmett. I'm the Park project manager for this project within the Park Development Division. So we have a presentation for you tonight that just walks you through a little bit more information about the bioretention pond and gives you a little bit of background of the purpose of this.

So on the left here is the site plan that Mike showed and the features. He was correct, the black line is the boundary of the Park property. We're surrounded on the right by Seneca Creek State Park, and on the left edge, mainly where the road is, is the Montgomery County Department of Transportation property. So you see the bioretention there borders the environmental setting, which is our property. On the right, these are just other images of the project.
If there's a pointer here -- yes. So we're not proposing to make any changes to the front of the store. There's a little asphalt pad on the left. We're not going to touch that. We're not going to touch the front steps. This -- what we're going to do here is, this canopy is rather old. We'd like to replace it and extend it for the full length of the building to cover these double doors into the side of the building. This is going to become our handicapped entrance to the store, and we're going to build a new access to those doors from a concrete pad in the back that's our single handicapped-accessible parking spot.

This is hard to see, but there is a hedgerow along here. This is a winter shot. It's very overgrown. There's a wire, metal wire fence here that we propose to replace between the store and the historic house, and this is a view at the lower corner of the wing wall that comes off the warehouse and shows the asphalt and the loading area. This is actually looking straight down to the creek. There's a guardrail and they keep some trash cans here, and that's what you see.

MS. MULLER: I think you should point out the bioretention area on the plan.

MS. EMMETT: So the bioretention area here is that sort of little green-circle area, and we -- so, so just so that you know -- let's go back -- bioretention area is a
place to capture stormwater runoff, and it's a place where
the water is treated through a filtered area that helps
clean the water before it filters into the ground, and micro
basically means that it's a small-size area.

The reason we're providing stormwater management
at the site is because there's currently no treatment of
water that runs off into the adjacent Seneca Creek. The
site work, any time it exceeds 5,000 square feet, you are
requested by the Department of Permitting Services to
provide stormwater management. So installing this
bioretention pond at the low point on the property would
help achieve some of those goals.

Did I skip one? Okay. So why is it located in
this part of the site? If you can see this green area, this
is about 20,000 square feet, and we're trying to capture
that downhill slope from the north side of the property and
from the south side of the property, coming down the
driveway, and this essentially is the low point just where
these property lines cross. So to that -- to us, that's the
ideal place to put this bioretention pond.

There will be a pipe inside the pond. I have a
picture in a minute that shows this. This right here is
called Montgomery County Endwall. It's just adjacent to
where we want to put this bioretention. It's not something
we want to touch. There's a lot of structure. It's
connected to a stormwater drain inlet over here by the sidewalk to the house and that's all underground; so we're trying to avoid that with the location of this pond.

This shows you -- the blue line is the edge of the historic property, and this shows you the dimensions of the pond. It will need a grass berm on its edge, and it will need some planting on the downhill slope, and they're saying that it could be from two to five feet deep.

These are some typical pictures of what you'd see within the pond. This is, this is the inlet that would be in the center of it, where all the water would be collected. Normally it would be screened by lots of plants. This is generally what other bioretention areas look like, and there's usually a grassy edge along the side that helps hold the water.

This is just one other picture about what this might look like. We've been asked, is there a fence? We normally do not put fence around stormwater facilities, but we would probably propose a guardrail between the road and the facility. These are some images. It could be either timber or it could be a rustic guardrail.

What you see here in this image, this dash line is the existing curb edge for the driveway, and only a section of it would protrude into the environmental setting. But we propose to remove this whole section back to this existing
curb point and create a new curb down here, and this is
where we would put the guardrail.

This is an existing inlet that we would rotate.

This is -- it's a little suppressed area in the existing
asphalt driveway. This is an underground pipe that comes
into the bioretention area, actually to this inlet here, and
then there'll be another underground connection to the
county's endwall here.

Is that the last --

MS. MULLER: That's it.

MS. EMMETT: And that's the last slide.

MR. KIRWAN: Any questions for the applicants?

MR. WHIPPLE: For a point of clarification, the
proposed guardrail, it appears to me, would be outside of
the environmental setting and therefore outside of your
purview, as would the majority of this facility, and so I
just want to bring that to your attention.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. Thank you, Scott. Questions?

MR. FIRESTONE: Have you given any consideration
to other means of dealing with the stormwater; for instance,
maybe replacing some of the asphalt with pervious material,
which might negate the need for as much of the stormwater
pond as possible? And I know there are other remediation
solutions that are available. I was just wondering if any
of them have been considered.
MS. EMMETT: The design to this point is just shy of 50 percent. The consultants did a 50 percent submission, and we -- this whole area here was shown as stormwater management. It was too much structure for the back of the site. We really didn't want to make changes to the rustic character of the site; so introducing different materials would not be in character with the site. We looked at alternate locations for the stormwater management, but those are closer to the river, and those would be more likely to flood. Am I answering your question?

MR. FIRESTONE: Well, sort of. I mean, I'm not sure that I would agree that changing asphalt out to something else would necessarily be removing historic material, and if you want rustic character, I think there are other things, including gravel, that might seem more rustic.

MS. EMMETT: Well, this -- the area between the store and the warehouse is very old asphalt that's very broken up. So we're proposing new asphalt there, but this whole area in the back is gravel, and so we would like to take out some of the gravel here. This tenant keeps a trailer here and a lot of -- we would like to take out some of the existing pavement here, but we were going to leave this grass and gravel.

MR. WHIPPLE: And I'm not sure that they get much
credit as impervious surface for gravel because it's compacted, and so there's not a lot of water absorption.

MS. BARNES: You would create a berm, a grass berm of some type which would be along the existing curb line or -- could you help me to understand how much this berm would rise up adjacent to the drive to the store?

MS. EMMETT: It's difficult to see in the photos that you've seen today --

MS. BARNES: Uh-huh.

MS. EMMETT: -- but there's a lot of grade changes --

MS. BARNES: Right.

MS. EMMETT: -- and --

MS. BARNES: I've been at the site. I mean, I know --

MS. EMMETT: Oh, good. Okay. So --

MS. MULLER: Well, the grass berm is on the right side, and the guardrail is on the left side --

MS. BARNES: Okay. That's --

MS. MULLER: -- and the existing guardrail cuts down and --

MS. BARNES: Okay.

MS. MULLER: -- sort of cuts through the middle and that's what would be removed.

MS. BARNES: All right. So, so on the side where
you're driving to the store, you would have no berm; you
would --

MS. MULLER: Right. You'd just have the guardrail there.

MS. BARNES: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: A question, first question is -- or I have two questions -- first question is, can you or staff
tell us, where did River Road used to go and what did it --
was there a bridge that crossed Seneca Creek at a different
location than the current bridge, and is there any remnant
of the old bridge that would make sense out of that
alignment today?

MS. EMMETT: We have some historic, some photos
from newspaper articles that are black and white and very
grainy, and you can't really tell, but we did submit to your
staff an engineer drawing. It looks like the bridge went
across somewhere right here.

MR. KIRWAN: Is there any remnant of the bridge,
old bridge abutment, or is that all gone? There's nothing
that visually would mark that old location of River Road?

MR. WHIPPLE: Yeah, I don't believe so. If you
look at Circle 11 of the staff report, we asked Park staff
that very question, and they were able to devote a little
time to try to answer it. They couldn't pin it down
exactly, but you see Old River Road to the west of this
site, and you have, or north of this site, and so you can
have some idea of, you know, an approximate cone, but
there's --

MR. KIRWAN: Right, but there's nothing there;
there's nothing like the old bridge abutment --

MR. WHIPPLE: I don't, I don't believe so.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. That's fine. And going back
to the images that you had of the structures, if I
understand this correctly, this isn't really going to be a
pond that's going to hold water all the time; this is going
to be a structure that will temporarily hold water in a rain
and then the water percolates into the median?

MS. MULLER: Right, and also, as you're driving
in, I mean, it's depressed. So it's not -- I mean, you're
going to have to really, like, look out your car window and
look over the guardrail to see this. It's not something --

MR. KIRWAN: You're basically going to see a
depressed area with bushes and shrubs in it and --

MS. MULLER: Right.

MR. KIRWAN: -- grasses and things like that.

MS. MULLER: Exactly.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. All right. Any other
questions for the applicant?

(No audible response.)

MR. KIRWAN: If not, I'll ask you to turn off your
microphone. I don't believe we have any testimony for this
matter, right? So let's launch into deliberations, and
again, this is a, as Scott was mentioning, this is just
really a briefing. We should focus our attention tonight, I
think, on the stormwater management structure and if we
believe there's any impact to the historic resource. So
I'll let anybody jump-start us.

MS. BARNES: I'll be happy to do it. We just
recently had this site in front of us, in fact, for some
signage, I'd say within the last three months. Does that,
does that sound about right, because Park --

MR. WHIPPLE: Interpretative signage.

MS. BARNES: Yeah. Yeah. I don't have a problem
with the bioretention facility. I would probably think that
if there were something that would be having a negative
impact on the little historic enclave it would be the
guardrail, and to the extent that, as you've already noted,
the land does fall away bit. To the extent that you could
handle some protection with planting as opposed to with a
guardrail, I think you would do more to preserve the
historic enclave. The guardrail, whether it be metal or
wood, would be a kind of jarring introduction.

MR. KIRWAN: Anybody else have any concerns? I
mean, I think really just concerns at this point. We don't
need to --
(No audible response.)

MR. KIRWAN: No. Okay. Well, I think then that's -- I think what you're hearing from us tonight is that we don't really have any major concerns with the proposal in front of us. The guardrail has been pointed out as something we probably, we might focus on if we have the ability to focus on it. As staff pointed out, that's outside of the environmental setting, so it really technically is outside our purview.

MR. TRESEDER: Mr. Chairman --

MR. KIRWAN: Yeah.

MR. TRESEDER: -- wouldn't you say this sort of falls in the category of so many things that, in order to retain its usage for its historic use, we have to adapt to contemporary conditions? And to the extent that building these things keeps it in compliance allows the historic use to be maintained, and so in a way, these are contributing to its historic use.

MR. KIRWAN: I think that's what we're saying, yeah. All right. Thank you, Commissioner Treseder. All right. Thank you very much for your presentation tonight. We look forward to seeing you come back after your presentation with the MHT and their comments.

The last item on our agenda tonight is II-F at 4 North Street in Brookeville, Maryland. Do we have a staff