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MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT

Address: 7110 Sycamore Ave., Takoma Park  
Meeting Date: 4/19/2017

Resource: Contributing Resource  
(Takoma Park Historic District)  
Report Date: 4/12/2017

Applicant: Joan Marsh  
(Owen Philbin, Agent)  
Public Notice: 4/5/2017

Review: Second Preliminary Consultation  
Tax Credit: Partial

Case Number: N/A  
Staff: Michael Kyne

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the applicants make any revisions based on the HPC’s recommendations and return for a HAWP application.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

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

BACKGROUND:

The applicant previously appeared before the Commission at the March 22, 2017 HPC meeting for a preliminary consultation. At that time, the Commission was supportive of the applicant’s efforts to preserve the historic house, but expressed the following concerns:

- The original siding appears to be in good condition and should not be removed/replaced.
- The 1927 Sanborn map indicates that the central front porch is original to the house and it should not be replaced with a full-width front porch.
- The design of the historic house is rather simple, and it would be inappropriate to add ornamentation (brackets, exposed rafter tails, band boards) to the historic house and/or rear addition.
- The windows in the proposed rear addition should be consistent in size.

There was some discussion about which sections of the existing house should be preserved and which can be removed. The Commission was unanimous in their finding that the rearmost addition (enclosed porch on stilts) is not historic and can be removed, while they were split as to whether the enclosed second-floor sleeping porch and section beneath (referred to as Sections 2 and 3 in staff’s presentation, see Circle 23), which according to the 1927 Sanborn map are original to the house, should be removed.
PROPOSAL:

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

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

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
textures is, however, not required.

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

- While additions should be compatible, they are not required to be replicative of earlier
  architectural styles.

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

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

**Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8**

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

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

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

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

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

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

8. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

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

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

STAFF DISCUSSION:

The applicant has revised their proposal in accordance with the Commission’s comments and, per staff’s suggestion, returned for a second preliminary consultation. Specifically, the applicant has made the following revisions:

- The existing siding will be retained on the historic house.
• The existing central front porch will be rebuilt (see staff's comments below).
• The previously proposed ornamentation has been removed.
• The windows in the proposed rear addition are consistent in size.

Staff spoke with the applicant after the first preliminary consultation, and the idea of creating a gesture to the original rear roof form was discussed. The applicant's current proposal includes two options — Option 1, which proposes the removal of the existing rear structures and construction of a new rear addition, and Option 2, which proposes the same, but includes the gesture to the original rear roof form.

Staff notes that, when the applicant initially submitted their revisions, the proposed windows and doors in the rear addition were not entirely consistent and/or randomly placed (likely because the proposed left-side deck was not shown). The revisions also did not depict the existing siding on the historic house as being retained. At staff's suggestion, the applicant updated their drawings; however, the drawings for Option 2 do not reflect these updates.

Staff is generally supportive of the applicant's revised proposal, but asks the Commission for guidance regarding the following:

**Option 1 vs. Option 2**

Staff asks for the Commission's guidance regarding the two revised options. Staff asks the Commission to determine if either option fully addresses their previous concerns regarding the retention and/or removal of the existing rear structures. If both options address the Commission's previous concerns, staff asks for guidance regarding the preferred option, with the least potential to detract from the subject property and surrounding historic district.

**Front Porch**

The applicant has indicated that the central front porch will be rebuilt, in accordance with the Commission's previous comments; however, the proposed front elevation for Option 1 depicts a wider central porch, and the proposed side elevations for both options depict a shallower front porch. In order to preserve the original front porch form, staff suggests that the central front porch be rebuilt with the same approximate dimensions and design. Staff asks for the Commission's guidance on this matter.

**New Deck**

Although it is not depicted in the existing elevations, there is currently a wooden deck on the left side of the historic house. Per the left side elevations for Option 1, the applicant proposes to remove the existing deck and construct a new deck on the left side of the proposed new rear addition. At this time, the dimensions (and, specifically, the projection) of the proposed new deck have not been provided. Staff asks for the Commission's guidance regarding the appropriateness of the proposed new deck.

**Note:** When the applicant returns for a HAWP application, existing and proposed floor plans, material specifications (windows and doors, deck railings and balusters, roofing, addition siding and trim) must be provided, and the proposed elevations should accurately reflect all proposed alterations (i.e., deck location and dimensions).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
Staff recommends that the applicants make any revisions based on the HPC's recommendations and return for a HAWP application.
APPLICATION FOR HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: O PHILBIN @ YAHOO.COM
Contact Person: Owens Philbin
Daytime Phone No.: 202-346-9790

Tax Account No.: 

Name of Property Owner: JOHN MARSH
Daytime Phone No.: 202-262-7479

Address: 328 LINCOLN AVE TAKOMA PK MD 20912

Contrator: 
Phone No.: 
Contractor Registration No.: 
Agent for Owner: 
Daytime Phone No.: 

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISES

House Number: 7110
Street: Sycamore
Town/City: Takoma Park
Nearest Cross Street: Columbia
Lot: 12
Block: 21
Subdivision: B.F. Gilbergs

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT ACTION AND USE

1A. Check all applicable:
- [ ] Construct
- [ ] Erect
- [ ] Alter/Reconstruct
- [ ] Add
- [ ] Addition
- [ ] Room
- [ ] Add
- [ ] Deck
- [ ] Shed
- [ ] Move
- [ ] Install
- [ ] Wreck/Alter
- [ ] Solar
- [ ] Fireplace
- [ ] Woodburning Stove
- [ ] Single Family
- [ ] Revision
- [ ] Repair
- [ ] Irrevocable
- [ ] Fence/Wall
- [ ] (complete Section 4)
- [ ] Other:

1B. Construction cost estimate: $ 

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

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTENSIONS

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

2B. Type of water supply:
- [ ] 01 Septic
- [ ] 02 WSSC
- [ ] 03 Other:

PART THREE: COMPLETE IF FENCE/RETAINING WALL

3A. Height feet inches

1B. Indicate whether the fence or retaining wall is to be constructed on one of the following locations:
- [ ] On party line/property line
- [ ] Entirely on land of owner
- [ ] On public right of way/assessment

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

Signature of owner or authorized agent: 
Date: 3-1-17

Approved: 
For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission
Disapproved: 
Signature: 
Date: 

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

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS

791089

(0)
THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MUST BE COMPLETED AND THE REQUIRED DOCUMENTS MUST ACCOMPANY THIS APPLICATION.

1. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
   a. Description of existing structure(s) and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance:
      "Home Bought out of Foreclosure, Partially gutted by previous owner. Revealed many party walls, additions and some structural defects. Original raft framing is 2x4 on 2ft centers with a 20ft plus span (this was replaced and needs to be replaced). Existing windows are all replacements (vinyl and aluminum). Front porch is rotted and falling away from house."
   b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district:
      "Replace roof changing the peak from side to side to front to back. This will help with the control of rainwater to ease pressure on existing foundation. Replace all windows with historically accurate windows. Change one window in driveway to a door."

2. SITEPLAN
   Site and environmental setting, drawn to scale. You may use your plat. Your site plan must include:
   a. the scale, north arrow, and data;
   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 plan, with marked dimensions, indicating location, size and general type of walls, window and door openings, and other fixed features of both the existing resource(s) and the proposed work.
   b. Elevations (facades), with marked dimensions, clearly indicating proposed work in relation to existing construction and, when appropriate, context. All materials and fixtures proposed for the exterior must be noted on the elevations drawings. An existing and a proposed elevation drawing of each facade affected by the proposed work is required.

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

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

6. TREE SURVEY
   If you are preparing construction adjacent to or within the drip lines 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 at least that dimension.

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

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

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

GRAPHIC SCALE (In Feet)
1 inch = 50' ft.
ACCURACY=±2'
EXISTING FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION
PROPOSED REAR (WEST) ELEVATION

OPTION 1
PROPOSED REAR (WEST) ELEVATION

OPTION Z
Existing Property Condition Photographs (duplicate as needed)
Site Plan

Shade portion to indicate North

Applicant: ___________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's mailing address</th>
<th>Owner's Agent's mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joan Marsh</td>
<td>Owen Phillip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328 Lincoln Ave</td>
<td>328 Lincoln Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Pk Md</td>
<td>Takoma Pk Md</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20912</td>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Shofar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7108 Sycamore Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Pk, Md</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary L Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711 Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Pk, Md</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Franchot &amp; Anne Maher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711 Sycamore Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Pk, Md</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia J Hallberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713 Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Pk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Lalande &amp; Julia D Zito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7112 Sycamore Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Pk Md</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Kenny &amp; Sue Immerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7107 Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Pk Md</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLEASE NOTE
This House Location Drawing is for informational purposes only. Per Maryland State Code it may not be relied upon to determine property boundaries and may not be used for building permits or construction.

Previous Proposal
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

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

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
7304 Willow Avenue
--- X --- X --- X --- X --- X

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
7110 Sycamore Avenue
--- X --- X --- X --- X --- X

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
March 22, 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
Kathleen Legg
Richard Arkin
Eliza Voigt
the topography of the property with the lot going up at the
back, which would complicate matters. I find that the fact
this will be quite far back from the street and you will
have reduced that which is potentially visible from the
street, makes it acceptable.

MR. KIRWAN: Well, I think for those who are here
tonight, we had sort of a unanimous, I mean, not unanimous,
but we have a majority who are supportive of the project.
We had one Commissioner who raised concerns about its
position but, I think from the majority of us, you're in
very good shape to come back for a HAWP. So, we look
forward to seeing you.

MR. MCCARTHY: Thanks for your comments.

MR. KIRWAN: All right, thank you. We'll move on
to Case II.B at 7110 Sycamore Avenue in Takoma Park. Do we
have a Staff Report?

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do have a Staff Report. As you
said, this is 7110 Sycamore Avenue in Takoma Park. A
contributing resource within the Takoma Park Historic
District, a bungalow circa 1910 to 1925. And the proposal
before us is to replace the existing asphalt shingle
roofing, remove existing rear structures, construct new rear
additions, convert an existing basement level window to a
door. Remove the existing central front porch, construct a
new full width front porch, replace the existing wooden
siding with Hardie plank siding and Hardie shingles.
Install brackets in the side gables of the historic house, and replace all existing non-historic windows.

And I'll just walk around the house quickly. And the garage at the rear/right side. And, I have the plans for reference should we need to refer to those. And the applicable guidelines are the Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines, and the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. And, on to discussion.

The rear additions. I ask for the Commission's guidance regarding the removal of the existing two-story structure at the rear. The 1927 Sanborn Map indicates that this structure is historic. The structures at the rear has been altered over the years and the Commission may find that it can be removed without detracting from the subject property or surrounding historic district.

So this is the Sanborn Map that I'm referring to. And, as you can see in the red circle, that's the two-story structure at the rear. And it's kind of hard to make out, but what it notes specifically on the Sanborn Map is that the first level is open. And I ask for the Commission's guidance regarding the exposed rafter tails in the proposed additions. The exposed rafter tails are an ornamental feature that do not exist on the historic house, and they may detract from the simple features of the historic house.
And for reference I have the plans showing the rafter tails that I'm referring to.

And I ask for the Commission's guidance regarding the larger one-over-one window on the right side elevation of the finished face below the second story enclosed porch. This window is inconsistent with the other proposed windows in the new additions, and a paired window may be more appropriate here while still providing the desired natural lighting. Window door alteration. The Commission generally exercises leniency when reviewing alterations to basic level windows, and Staff suggests that the proposal is unlikely to detract from the subject property or surrounding district. And the lot here actually slopes quite a bit, so when you're standing on the street, although this will still be visible, the visibility will be minimal. And this is just showing on the left the existing window, and on the right the proposed door.

The front porch alterations. Again, according to the 1927 Sanborn Map, the subject property had a central front porch in 1927, and portions of the existing deteriorated front porch foundation are consistent with the historic house. And I confirmed this today with a site visit. As evidence suggested, the existing front porch is original. Staff recommends that it not be converted to a full width porch. But as I noted, it is deteriorated so, of
course, it can be rehabilitated. And the 1927 Sanborn Map showing the central front porch. And the photographs before you now show that, again, the porch is definitely deteriorated, but we do have consistent features between the foundation of the historic house and the central porch.

The siding replacement. The applicant has stated that the existing siding is a mix of sizes, with the original having a six inch reveal, and later patches have a five and a half to six inch reveal. And the proposed siding will have a six inch reveal to be consistent with the original siding.

Again, I did visit the site today and, I found that any differences in the siding on the historic massing were mostly indiscernible, and the original wood siding appeared to be in good condition.

As noted, the 1927 Sanborn Map indicates that the first floor of the two-story rear structure was originally open, suggesting that the existing siding on the first floor was added at a later date when the first floor was enclosed. And, what I have in front of you now is just trying to illustrate exactly what I believe is historic and what is not. So, what's labeled one and two, of course, according to the Sanborn Map, were always enclosed. Now, if you look at the photo on the right, you will see that the siding in the upper portion labeled number two, which again, according
to the Sanborn Map has always been enclosed. It is
different than the siding on the main house. Being vertical
siding as opposed to the horizontal siding.

The siding on the section labeled number three,
which the Sanborn Map indicated was originally open, seems
to be more consistent with that on the historic massing.
But, again, judging from the Sanborn Map, it would be my
guess that that was enclosed at a later time. And it may be
slightly different in size than the historic, on the
historic massing. But it's mostly indiscernible and
especially indiscernible from the public right-of-way. And
the applicant has not provided sufficient information
regarding the inconsistent siding and patches. And it is
unclear whether the inconsistent siding is associated with
the later enclosure.

In accordance with the Guidelines, Staff
recommends that the existing siding, which overall, appears
to be in condition, should not be replaced with artificial
siding as it is highly visible from the public right-of-way.
The brackets that are proposed for the gable ends or side
gables of the historic house. As of this writing, or I'm
sorry, as of the writing of the Staff Report, the applicant
has not provided justification for the additional brackets
to the main house. And there is no documentation that such
brackets ever existed at the subject property.
In accordance with the Standards, changes that create a false sense of historical development such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings shall not be undertaken. And with this, Staff recommends that the proposed brackets not be approved absent supporting documentation that the house originally had such brackets.

And, window replacement. The existing windows are all non-historic, being a mix of vinyl and aluminum. And I did confirm that today. And, Staff suggests that replacing the existing non-historic vinyl or aluminum windows with new wood windows would be appropriate, resulting in windows and materials that are more compatible with the historic house and surrounding district. However, Staff finds that the installation of fiberglass windows in these locations would have a potential to detract from the district, and would not recommend approval of that.

So, in summary, for the rear additions, the questions I'm asking you to provide guidance for tonight, can the two-story historic structure at the rear be removed? Are exposed rafter tails appropriate? Is the larger one-over-one window on the right side appropriate? For the window/door conversion, is it appropriate? For the front porch alterations, is it appropriate to convert the historic central porch to a full width porch? Siding replacement.
Is it appropriate to replace the original wood siding with Hardie Plank and Hardie Shingles? Brackets. Are the proposed brackets in the historic gable appropriate? And, window replacement. Is it appropriate to replace all non-historic windows with fiberglass or wood? And, with that, I will take any questions you have for me. And again, for reference, I have the plans and probably 50 plus more photographs of specific features, if you should have any questions about this.

MR. KIRWAN: Michael, I have question. The packet doesn’t have existing drawings, it doesn’t have existing floor plans or proposed floor plans. It doesn’t have existing drawings that always are helpful in going back and forth between the proposed, and so we can understand what the changes are exactly.

MR. KYNE: Yes, that is correct. This application does not have the existing drawings and/or floor plans. And that is something that we definitely do require for a complete application when it comes to a HAWP. At the prelim stage we like to have that information because as you noted, it makes it easier to judge and, you know, compare the existing with the proposed and see what the new changes will be. But unfortunately, we do not have those for this application.

MS. HEILER: Michael, could you put up the picture
1 that you had that showed the different kinds of siding and
2 had the numbers one, two and three on it? And, can you talk
3 about, you know, what you think was enclosed, what was not
4 enclosed, and the area that's to the right of three, what's
5 the status of that? Is that something that's planned to be
6 removed?

7 MR. KYNE: First off, the area to the right of
8 three is definitely proposed to be removed. So for the
9 areas marked one, two and three, if you look at the
10 photographs in front of you, they would indicate that the
11 siding marked number two is certainly later. It's vertical
12 siding, where the rest of the siding is horizontal. And one
13 and three are fairly consistent in size and characteristics.
14 But, if you go to the Sanborn Map, and this is a little,
15 it's zoomed in a little further so we can read it better.
16 You'll see that it notes that that rear portion was two
17 stories with an open first story. So, that is why I've
18 indicated that I believe the sections labeled one and two
19 have always been enclosed, whereas the section labeled
20 number three was enclosed later.

21 Now, the reason why I'm sort of asking these
22 questions is, it's unclear where there are discrepancies in
23 the siding and the dimensions, why that is. Was it because
24 there were patches to the original siding, or is it because
25 certain areas were enclosed at a later date?
MR. WHIPPLE: Although, it occurs to me that I think what the Sanborn might be suggesting is that it was an open first story, first story, that on this it probably was a sleeping porch, and the basement level that I think that you're interpreting is the first story for that back part is actually the basement story. I think given the new information about the siding, that likely one and three were always enclosed, two was probably open as perhaps a sleeping porch of some sort.

MS. HEILER: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff?

MS. BARNES: Michael, the slide on which you had the door, I can see, but I got confused about the window and -- all right, so, we're taking out the window and then closing in the basement window. Or how's this working?

MR. KYNE: So, what the proposal is to remove both windows in the photo on the left.

MS. BARNES: Okay.

MR. KYNE: So the 2-over-1 window in the first level which is below grade actually because of the sloped lot. And also the basement level window. So, if you look at it in this photograph, you might get a better idea for exactly what's happening. Everything within the red circle is being removed converted into a door consistent with that shown in the plan to the right.
MR. WHIPPLE: Let me jump in. I'm sorry.

MS. BARNES: So, it would be a door with a transom to accommodate the slightly greater height?

MR. KYNE: That's right, yeah.

MR. WHIPPLE: Let me just jump in briefly to comment on the drawings. Actually, I want to thank the applicant because they were very willing to work with us. The drawings that you're looking at now were actually not the first scheme. A first scheme came in, and Staff gave some feedback on it, and the applicant was very, very willing to take this in the direction that you're actually seeing.

And so, in an effort not to push this off to another meeting, we worked with the drawings that came in, that may have been rushed a little bit because they were making some significant alterations to try to get it to what's before you. And so, I'm sure that given more time and given your input tonight, that some of these things like, I think, so the elevation, so the ground isn't represented correctly, in relationship to the building in the elevations. I'm sure that those types of things will be corrected when this comes back. But, and I think that they're probably due to responding to us quickly and getting the stuff back in front of us.

MS. HEILER: No, I was just a little confused
because it looked like if you were incorporating both you
were going to end up with an oversized door, although you
can deal with that with the transom, which I think they put
in. That's helpful, thank you.

MR. ARKIN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. KIRWAN: I think we had Brian.

MR. CARROLL: I just wanted to clarify, we've got,
we're moving existing and rear structures. I get there's a
porch on stilts in the back, but there is, it looks like the
Sanborn Map shows a garage as existing. There's no plans to
remove the garage or take the garage out, is there?

MR. KYNE: There is not. So again, the reason why
I referred to that as structures in the report is because
originally it was characterized as removing two rear
additions which would include everything that we discussed
previously, the sections that were labeled two and three,
and the porch on stilts. Once we looked at the Sanborn Map
and realized that that section that was being referred to as
an addition again, and the section labeled two and three
here were likely, or according to the Sanborn, are original
to the house, we just referred to them as structures instead
of additions. But the garage will not be touched.

MR. CARROLL: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Commissioner Arkin?

MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In one of
your slides you had, I think, bullet points of questions that you wanted us to address. Is that in the paper Staff Report?

MR. KYNE: No, that was just a summary that I put on the screen for you tonight, for your benefit, so that we can sort of stay organized and stay on task and address the specific questions that Staff had. At least now, of course, you can provide input on other aspects of the proposal if you'd like, but these are the questions that I was looking for your input on.

MR. ARKIN: So when it's an appropriate time, I would appreciate it if you would put this back up on the screen.

MR. KYNE: Certainly.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Michael, I have a question about the use of sort of flush corner boards that I see on the north elevation versus the south elevation. On the north elevation, corner boards seem to be used, I think there's an existing corner board on the north elevation that defines the cross gable geometry of that main block of the house. Then I see that on the existing -- I think I see that on the existing photo of a north elevation. We don't have a very good photo of the existing south elevation, and I don't see that corner board appearing on the south elevation. Is it
not there, or is it -- does it show up again on the south?

    MR. KYNE: So, on the south elevation you are right, there isn't a good photograph. This is actually the best photograph I was able to get because of the proximity to the fence on the adjacent property line, as you can sort of see at the left side of the photograph. So, if you, I can actually pull up my reference photographs. There is no discernible corner on that side, and it was my understanding the reason that that may, that that condition may carry over to the new design is because I think the applicant is planning to reuse portions of the existing foundation which would put it in the same approximate location. Now we can confirm that with them when they come forward, but that is my understanding.

    MR. KIRWAN: And again, that's why existing elevations would be helpful when they come back so we can better understand some of those conditions.

    MR. KYNE: Exactly. Let me go forward here and see if we have any additional --

    MR. KIRWAN: But presumably, the side walls all the way back to the new addition are coplanar. There's no --

    MR. KYNE: Right.

    MR. KIRWAN: -- there's no stepping, we're not getting the six inch reveal or anything like that?

    MR. KYNE: As proposed, that's right.
MR. KIRWAN: All right. Thank you.

MS. VOIGT: Is the applicant requesting to remove all the windows to replace the windows?

MR. KYNE: That's right. So, all the windows in the house currently are non-historic. They're a mix of aluminum, vinyl and, I believe, even some wood. And the applicant is proposing to replace all the windows. Now, they didn't provide material specifications for what the replacement windows will be. I know that they indicated that in the additions they will be either wood or fiberglass. And for an addition, fiberglass or wood, either one might be appropriate. What I've stated in the Staff Report is that for the historic house, the historic portion, particularly the sides and front elevations, those windows should be wood so they do not detract from the streetscape or the property.

This photograph in front of you actually is standing in the rear looking at that south elevation. Again, it's very close to the adjacent property but, just trying to show you that -- well, there you go. It is, in fact, coplanar.

MR. KIRWAN: Commissioner Carroll?

MR. CARROLL: I'm just curious. On Circle 9 the description written by the homeowner or the applicant says -- -- I'm just wondering if it's a misprint or something -- it
says, original roof frame is two by fours, two feet on
center, 20 foot lengths. Is that, do you have any idea if
that's correct?

MR. KYNE: I believe that that is probably
accurate. We can ask the applicant when they come forward.
But that was one of the reasons why, if you see the
description of the project, this is from the original
application that Scott referenced earlier. The description
says, replace the roof, changing in the peak from a side to
side to front to back. So that was part of the original
proposal. They were actually coming in with a proposal to
make this a front gable house, and one of the reasons that
the applicant cited was the fact that the framing of the
roof was insufficient for --

MR. CARROLL: And when it says original, is that
to the --

MR. KYNE: I believe that that is a no, because
the applicant also indicated when I spoke with them via
telephone, that there is physical evidence that the roof has
been altered over time. So I would say that when they say
original, they actually mean existing.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff? All
right. We can ask the applicant to please come forward.
I'll give you seven minutes for your testimony, and you may
have heard us mention this before, before you speak, make
sure your microphone is on and you state your name for the
record.

MS. MARSH: My name is Joan Marsh, and I'm the
owner of the property.

MR. PHILBIN: My name is Owen Philbin, and I'm her
husband.

MS. MARSH: And the contractor.

MR. PHILBIN: And the contractor.

MS. MARSH: So, just a little bit of background.

We're long time residents of Takoma Park, and we buy
distressed property in Takoma Park, and then my husband
rehabilitates it. We are very committed to the historic
nature of Takoma Park, and we've worked on historic
properties in the past, and we do our best to make sure
we're staying consistent with guidelines and enhancing the
beauty of a historic property. So, we appreciate, you know,
your willingness to consult with us on this particularly
unique property, which, by the way, sat vacant for many
years and fell into foreclosure. We bought it out of
foreclosure and the neighborhood is quite eager to see
someone try to restore some beauty in this sad little piece
of property.

So, I think we can start with some easy stuff, and
take it off the table. So the windows --
MR. PHILBIN: All wood.

MS. MARSH: All wood. I mean, you know, that's just the way we build, so that's not going to be an issue. The brackets, not essential. I mean, we like to try to do ornamentation on bungalows but, you know, if that's a problem, that's not essential. So I think we'll move on to some of the more significant issues raised by Michael. So the rear addition, and I don't know if you want to address or how the rear, the current rear of the home is constructed.

MR. PHILBIN: I think he's correct. The one section was, I think it was labeled number two, was a sleeper porch. It's length is about 15 foot long, and it was built on top of two by six's on the 15 foot span. Well, on two foot centers. Bounces really well. And then, they enclosed below it at some point. It's got newer two by four's and section number three is the siding. And then, I think the raised enclosed space at one point was a deck that they enclosed at a later date, because the floor joists are also two foot centers.

My hope is that I could take that all down. The foundation under section three is poured concrete four inches thick. So, I know that's not big enough to build a two-story addition on. So I'm willing to take those out as well, and set back the six inches on either side with my new
foundation, and I'd probably go with textured block on that as well. And then take that back all the way underneath the enclosed porch, so that the foundation goes all the way across.

MS. MARSH: On the front porch, so the front porch as the pictures indicate is a small central front porch. The houses on either side have a front porch that runs the length of the house. So, our thought was for purposes of making this historic property consistent with the character of the neighborhood, we would like to extend the front porch as the designs were indicated. And that's why we brought that proposal forward. And, I don't know if you have any comments on how the front porch is constructed?

MR. PHILPIN: The original front porch, or not the original, the existing, is really in bad shape. It appears that a few of the original blocks that were the front footings are still there. The columns have been replaced. The sheathing and the two by four's holding the roof have been replaced. It's just a mess. Not much salvageable on that front porch. You can see there that most of the original sheathing on the roof has been replaced. The rafter tails that did come through, most of them have been sistered with new two by four's. The roof has significant damage on the inside. It just sags. They built a wall in the attic to help support the span of the two by four's
which they cracked the plaster ceiling below. So, my intent
is to take the whole roof off and reframe it with two by
ten's, and come back with a proper structure. And then, you
know, rework the exposed rafters on the ends.

MS. MARSH: And then why don't you address the
siding?

MR. PHILBIN: Oh, the siding. There's evidence of
fire damage on the front corner where the meters. So that
siding is relatively new to the house. I would say it was
30, 40 years old. Along the back -- oh, and the siding goes
directly to the two by four's. There's no sheathing
underneath it. So removing the siding is just not an option
because at this point it's structurally holding up the
house. It is the sheathing. It's got a lot of peeling
paint. It's cracked in spots. It's checking.

My intent was to encapsulate it, wrap the whole
house with Tyvek and side over top of it. If that's not
feasible, and we showed the cedar shake in the gable ends,
or Hardie shake in the gable ends. That was trying to
eliminate all those horizontal lines. From the driveway
view, it just is, it's overwhelming the amount of horizontal
line going there. So we're trying to soften that up with
some cedar shake.

MS. MARSH: Michael, is there anything else we
needed to address? I know it was a long list.
MR. KYNE: The list is in front of you now, but I think you've covered everything.

MS. MARSH: Oh, I guess the window/door conversion. So that was to create -- we're trying to turn it into a nice single family residence, and that was to create an opportunity for access to the, access to the house from the driveway. And we are trying to stick with the historic opening. I think one of the Commissioner's observed the transom, and that's our effort is to try to respect the original historic opening there.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you for your testimony. Do we have any questions?

MR. CARROLL: I have a question about the -- from the shots, I can't tell whether it's just overgrown or there is no surface on the driveway? If there isn't, are you going to put something on there down to the garage?

MR. PHILBIN: I am. I'm working with the neighbor next door. He wants to have his driveway done.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. PHILBIN: So, we're still hammering it out, because it's not a shared driveway, but it's, they're right next to each other. And there's two big trees, I don't know if you can see in the picture, but there's two big trees that kind of separate our driveways. Anyway, so we've met with Todd, before he quit.
MS. MARSH: That's the arborist.

MR. PHILBIN: And, we got his guidance. But, I just want to go slowly because we can't move forward.

MS. MARSH: And it is our intent to keep the garage. I know somebody asked that question. We're not planning to demolish the garage.

MR. PHILBIN: The garage was rebuilt at one point, because it's now with trusses and somebody is carrying electric line out to it as well. So it's been redone at one point.

MR. KIRWAN: A question I, it's not so much a question, I just want to confirm you understood what I asked Staff with regard to existing conditions, drawings, and proposed drawings. I think when you come back it will be critical that you have a set of existing condition drawings, including floor plans, and then proposed drawings. Because that'll help us understand those six inch offsets. We can't really tell that right now, where those are exactly occurring. That'll help us understand, you know, exactly what you're, how you're transitioning the exterior materials --

MR. PHILBIN: Right.

MS. MARSH: Yeah, absolutely.

MR. KIRWAN: -- between existing volume and the proposed.
MS. MARSH: We just didn't want to get too far down the path until we understood and got guidance from this Commission.

MS. HEILER: The picture in Circle 15 which shows the side of the house with the roofline that continues over the sleeping porch, essentially. Can you talk about the condition of the roof on that part?

MR. PHILBIN: The section above two?

MS. HEILER: Yes.

MR. PHILBIN: Okay. That, one skin is two by four's. At some point in the last two years, a tree had fallen in it, so there's a hole in it, we've patched. But, most of that existing structure is rotted. But it's two by four's, once again, two foot centers. There's not much of the original sheathing left. You can see where part of it was cut and patched into what was there for sheathing. It's rolled roofing, not shingles.

MS. HEILER: Is it vastly different from the condition of the roof -- of the main part of the house there that appears to continue over that original sleeping porch?

MR. PHILBIN: Well, they're tied together. But they're definitely different materials.

MS. HEILER: Okay. The structural materials, I'm not talking about the surface.

MR. PHILBIN: Oh. Okay, the structural materials,
the two by four's that frame that roof are connected to the bearing wall that ran across the original back of the house. No hangars or anything, they just landed on it.

MS. HEILER: And one other question. The front porch, it appears that all of the components have been replaced. Do you have any photographs that show -- do we know that the replacements match what was there?

MR. PHILBIN: Oh, I don't have any originals.

MS. HEILER: You don't have any earlier photographs?

MR. PHILBIN: The only thing that I have is the fact that there was a porch there.

MS. HEILER: Like, do these columns match what was there?

MR. PHILBIN: I know that the columns have been replaced because there's actually a mail drop thing placed in it, and they've got like a laundry shoot basically for mail, that goes down into the basement apartment.

MS. MARSH: At one point the home was divided into maybe three apartments. You would not believe the inside of this property.

MR. KIRWAN: Are there similar houses to this one, this type of house on that street?

MS. MARSH: Yes. I think both the house to the right and to the left.
MR. PHILBIN: Well, no, those are --

MR. KIRWAN: Well, we can do that as a site visit to look at, but it would be good to document what those houses look like. That'll help us better understand the porch and what might be, we might be able to tell on those houses what the materials of the existing porches may have been, given if this has been replaced. For instance, we don't see, these columns are full high columns on the existing front porch, and you're showing a masonry pedestal with a half column. So, there's a significant change there to what may or may not have been consistent with that style of house. Any other questions for the applicant?

Commissioner Arkin?

MR. ARKIN: I'm not sure I quite understand the discussion of the front porch. That is not an existing, I mean, that is not an original front porch?

MR. PHILBIN: Oh no, it was originally there.

MR. KIRWAN: So the foundation is original?

MR. PHILBIN: There was a front porch on the front of the house.

MR. ARKIN: It was not full width?

MR. PHILBIN: No, it was not full width. The original front porch was the same dimensions I'm going to say that it is now, based on the block that's still there. But the components that make up the front porch now are not
original to the structure.

MR. ARKIN: It also appears that there were full width front porches on the houses that bracket this house?

MR. PHILBIN: Yes.

MR. ARKIN: In 1927. Your proposed drawings for north and south elevations, you have rather dramatic board boards, is that simply an esthetic?

MR. PHILBIN: Yes. To help break up all the siding and lines, and I was hoping that where the siding meets the block to also put in another vertical trim board to help. Currently the siding just buts right up to the block without a trim board, where the siding meets the original position.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for the applicant. Okay, if not, we're going to move into deliberations. We'll give you our thoughts on the matter. If you can make sure you turn your microphones off while we do that. I'll just go ahead and jump in again. So, I think for me, I mean, generally speaking, I think the new rear addition is something I can be okay with down the line. I don't have a problem with the square footage that you're adding to the house. I think for me what I, and I don't know what the answer is tonight, I think it's going to have to come when you provide those additional drawings, but it's really trying to figure out what we're willing to consider
in the existing historic portion of the house versus what we're going to let you demolish and add on toward the rear.

Right now, tonight, from me, it's that section one on that photograph. That to me is the main volume of the house that I think is important to preserve. You know, right now tonight, that also affects my thoughts on the siding replacement. I think that part of the house should be preserved unless you can give us a very strong argument for why that has to be replaced.

And, I hear your concerns about the siding being applied directly to the two by four wall framing, but that's consistent with historic resources. So, that's now how we build today, but that was very consistent with the way they did it back then. So, that doesn't concern me from a preservation point of view. But it does carry with it some issues with how you would insulate that and properly introduce a vapor barrier. But there are things like foam insulation that can get you there.

So it's really that section one that I think is the beginning for me of what we need to try to preserve to the greatest extent possible and restore. Then back from that I have more flexibility to what you're proposing, and understanding exactly how you're going to do that, and a plan with the six inch setbacks will be helpful to see. The window and door conversion, I don't really have an issue
with that. I think that's fine, even though it is in the, that center main portion of the historic resource. I'm okay with that.

The front porch alterations, I'm not okay with it as I see it tonight. I think having seen that house type with that single bay front porch before in Takoma Park and other historic districts around here, I think that probably was the appropriate front porch for that house. If you can come at us with that style house had this porch, and you think that's not a good indication of how those houses had front porch, I'm willing to entertain that. But I think given the foundation that we see, the existing foundation, I think that front porch probably ought to be restored along with the main volume of the front portion of the house.

I've already sort of addressed the siding replacement. I think I'm fine once we get beyond, at least for me tonight, beyond section one. It's fine to replace that siding, introduce Hardie plank, siding alternatives, that's all fine. I'm not crazy about all the banding and the breaking up of the facade you're doing. The existing resource is just very simply done in one style of siding all the way from the block up to the gable end, and I think at least in that section one, that should be maintained. I think the introduction of the band boards and the change of siding from siding to shingle is going to confuse the
history of that house, at least in that main center portion. So I think that less important to preserve.

I feel the same way about the brackets. Unless you can find evidence that the brackets have been there, I don't think they should be added on to the existing main body of the house. And it's probably best for the consistency of the additions with the main body to not add those on as well.

And, you've already sort of taken care of the window issues for us. I think the wood window replacement is the appropriate one. Both for the existing windows and in existing locations as well the new windows you're proposing. And, I was just reminded that there is this issue, not on here, of the larger scale window on the north elevation basement level, of the north elevation of the rear most part of the addition. I would agree with Staff that probably the scale of that window seems odd compared to the other ones that are being proposed. So, I think it'd be better to have it more consistent in that location as well.

MS. HEILER: Actually, I do appreciate your saving the house. We're concerned here, I think, with two different issues. One is preserving the style of the house. And, another is preserving the historic materials of the house. This house appears to be, it's difficult to save those materials. You know, some of the siding appears to be
useable, as the Chairman said, the way things were built, the siding may well have been connected to the framing directly. And so, I think whatever you can save of those historic materials, that's good. But clearly, the front porch, you're not dealing with historic materials. The roof is not useable.

When it comes to the style, I think that roofline that connects the main house, the gable connecting the original sleeping porch is really an important characteristic of the design of this house, and of many of the houses of this period in that area. And so, I would object to removing that section. I think it's important to preserve that and find a way to use that particular element of the design to do part of your addition. I would not have any objection to putting an addition on the back of this house to accommodate the other needs that you're covering in that addition. But, I think losing that roofline in favor of removing that and putting, you know, the gabled addition straight out the back is a serious loss.

I agree with the Chairman also about preserving the size, the dimensions of that shape of the original front porch. You know, it would be lovely if you could find out what the original columns looked like. If you can't, then of course you'll have to probably copy columns from the neighborhood. I think those two things are very significant
to the design of this house, and they need to be preserved.

The other design element that I think you should preserve is the clapboard siding in the gable of that original part. I think this loses something very significant to the design. And the design, what you have left, to use shingles there. I think they change the look, which is very simple. If you use the same kind of siding throughout the whole thing. And I would preserve the look that you have. At the rate things are going to improve when you replace these windows. I think your proposal to change the window and door on the side, those two windows into a door, just makes it more livable. I think you have a hard problem here.

And, I think it's wonderful to preserve this house even though so little of it is left, really. So little of the material is left, but I think that you do have the design and the structure, and I think it's worth preserving. I agree with the other thing is no brackets. And the rear addition, as I said, I have a problem with removing this and putting in the large rear addition. I can imagine saving this part and putting a small rear addition on it, whatever style you want.

MS. VOIGT: I really don't have anything to add.

I stand with the two commissioners before said it well, and I commend you on bringing this house back, and I think
simple is better with this house, because it was a simple
house.

MR. CARROLL: I would tend to agree. I think the
one design element that you probably have that you could
play with a little bit is that if somebody's already torn
out all the windows in the house, and you're going to put
them back, it would be good to look around the neighborhood
and see, you know, if some of them are two over one, or
something like that. There may be some other mullion
patterns that are appropriate to this age of house. I think
adding the brackets while, you know, if it was a new house,
I would do that, but you know, a false sense of history with
a house like this.

I'd like to see the porch stay at the same size
that it is. Though obviously it needs some help, and when
you look at things like two by four's, you know, 24 inches
on center from the roof that's kind of frightening to me.
But, I think the windows, because they've all been taken out
at this point, when you go to put them back, that might be
something to look at, and look for precedence in the
neighborhood, bring us some pictures of those, and that's
probably a pretty easy sale as long as it's appropriate to
1910 to '25. Although, that might be a place to get a
little bit of detail in there. Thank you.

MR. ARKIN: I'm pretty much in agreement with the
comments that have already been made. I agree particularly
with the Chairman's statements that he thinks that the
original box, the original element, the original, the most
original, clearly original part of the house should be
preserved. What I find interesting about this house is that
it so clearly illustrates, perhaps too clearly, the
evolution of a lot of houses in Takoma Park, and
Commissioner Heiler's comment about preserving the roofline
on the first rear addition, I think is worth considering
that there might be some way to make the evolution to at
least adjust the evolution much more clearly instead of
trying to look at this as a single design to come out of
this with a design of a nice looking total house. I think
it would be nice to preserve the sense of evolution. Well,
simplifying it in cleaning up some of the anomalies that
have happened from the patching and the use of probably
materials that were available over the years.

And, the exposed rafter tails in the back of the
house seem to me to be too much. And, a truly false sense
of history that while you may have seen exposed rafter tails
in the early part of the house, it's unlikely you would have
seen it in the additions. So, and I'm not really sure what
they add. I have no problem with the window/door
conversion. I think if you can use a, where you show a
larger window on the right side, if you can perhaps not use
a larger window. That seems to stick out inappropriately. I would like to see the smaller, a form of the front porch preserved rather than going full width. I'm not sure that a full width front porch would be a deal killer. But I think it would be nice to preserve the sense of the way that section of the streetscape worked at one time. Even though you will have to rebuild, clearly you will have to rebuild that front porch.

As far as siding replacement, if you can preserve the siding on the main portion of the house, I think that would be good. I have some trouble with putting a band board in at the front of the house, the original portion of the house. That's a more modern element. I understand that you would like to break up the large expanse of siding. But I think that's worth looking at to see if there's a better solution. You've already said that you are not going to, that you're going to remove the proposed brackets and that all your windows will be wood when you replace them. I think that's very good.

The evolution is really the design, and design, scare quotes, of the house. It's not an architectural project, product, I mean, and, but I truly appreciate your taking this house, an essentially derelict house and making it into something which is useable and functional. And, I'm looking forward to seeing what you propose on the next
iteration. Thank you.

MS. BARNES: I would like to echo that comment. That I think it's wonderful that you are both willing to take on this project which sounds pretty daunting.

MS. MARSH: I was not particularly willing. It was his idea.

MS. BARNES: Well then I particularly thank you for being here this evening and sitting through all of this. I'd like to start with the bottom and move up. I'm delighted to hear you're going to use wood replacement windows. I don't think that brackets are appropriate. I think that the siding should remain on the historic core of the house, which I took to be that portion of the house in the pictures before we got to two and three. I would not be amenable to a front porch alteration. I think it's very clear from the 27 Sanborn Map that in spite of the fact your neighbors have porches across the front, this was a small porch. What remains to be seen is what kind of columns are used, and we'll look forward to seeing that when you come back.

The window/door conversion is fine, and once I understood how it was going to work, I was even happier. And here, I think I part company with some of the Commissioners. After listening to everyone, I have to confess, I was confused as to what we were suggesting. I
feel very strongly after listening to your description of 
the structure, that I am supportive in removing the historic 
structures to the rear, which would be two and three in our 
little slide. And, starting over. And while it is 
interesting to talk about the roofline and the issue of 
evolution, I would be supportive of an addition to the rear 
which is inset, and has no rafter tails exposed. And you 
can come back to us with more detail. I think you've also 
heard that there was concern about the size in this one set 
of drawings you've given us about a window on the right hand 
side. So I would deal with that.

But, I would be supportive of removal of the 
historic addition to the rear of the house, given what you 
said about the condition.

MS. LEGG: Thank you for coming in, and I will be 
brief. Actually, Commissioner Barnes has summarized much of 
what I think. So I align myself with her thoughts.

MR. KIRWAN: Great. Well, you've heard from all 
of us.

MS. VOIGT: I'm just a little confused, just to 
clarify the two-story, the historic structure. Can we bring 
up that one, two three? So, I think what we're saying is 
two and three.

MR. KIRWAN: So, you've heard from all of us. I 
think we're generally supportive of the big moves that
you're making. I think that really we're getting sort of, where we're having hang ups are on the details, particularly the original massing of the main body of the house, and our general thoughts there about preserving it. There's some thoughts about the shed roof in the back over the existing rear addition that a couple of Commissioners do think that that possibly should be saved, but that's something that sort of work for you in your design, and when you come back show us if whether you think that's something feasible or not to do.

And Staff will do an excellent job of interpreting our thoughts and comments, and helping you understand them all. But again, I think we generally are very, across the board, we're very appreciative of the efforts you're making here to preserve this resource. I mean it's spot on, and we look forward to seeing you come back with a more complete application next time. Thank you.

The next item on our agenda for -- we have a meeting to continue here -- are minutes. Do we have any minutes to approve this evening?

MR. WHIPPLE: Unless anybody has any news for me, no, we do not have --

MR. CARROLL: I'm a little curious. I thought I sent these in for the last, two weeks ago?

MR. WHIPPLE: You did. That's in error. That