Second Preliminary Consultation
MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 7230 Spruce Ave., Takoma Park  
Meeting Date: 2/22/2107

Resource: Contributing Resource  
Report Date: 2/15/2017
Takoma Park Historic District

Applicant: Aaron Kofner & Anat Shahar  
Public Notice: 2/8/2017
(Shawn Buehler, Architect)

Review: 2nd Preliminary Consultation  
Tax Credit: N/A

Case Number: N/A  
Staff: Michael Kyne

PROPOSAL: Addition and 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
STYLE: Bungalow
DATE: c. 1915-1925

BACKGROUND

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission for a preliminary consultation at the January 11, 2017 HPC meeting. At that time, the Commission expressed the following concerns regarding the proposal:

- The roof of the previously proposed addition on the left side was too steep
- The previously proposed attached garage was inconsistent with the Standards and Guidelines
- The projecting bay on the left side of the historic house should be preserved, and not covered by the previously proposed covered porch on the left side
- The second-floor of the previously proposed right side-projecting mudroom addition should be pushed back

PROPOSAL

The applicants propose the following work items:

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

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Takoma Park Historic District several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the historic preservation review guidelines in the approved and adopted amendment for the Takoma Park Historic District (Guidelines), Montgomery County Code Chapter 244 (Chapter 24A), and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). The pertinent information in these documents is outlined below.

Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines

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

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

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

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

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

The Guidelines that pertain to this project are as follows:

• All exterior alterations, including those to architectural features and details, should be generally consistent with the predominant architectural style and period of the resource and should preserve the predominant architectural features of the resource; exact replication of existing details and features is, however, not required.
• Major additions should, where feasible, be placed to the rear of existing structures so that they are
less visible from the public right-of-way; additions and alterations to the first floor at the front of a structure are discouraged but not automatically prohibited.

- While additions should be compatible, they are not required to be replicative of earlier architectural styles.
- Second story additions or expansions should be generally consistent with the predominant architectural style and period of the resource (although structures that have been historically single story can be expanded) and should be appropriate to the surrounding streetscape in terms of scale and massing.
- Original size and shape of window and door openings should be maintained, where feasible.
- Some non-original building materials may be acceptable on a case-by-case basis; artificial siding on areas visible from the public right-of-way is discouraged where such materials would replace or damage original building materials that are in good condition.
- Alterations to features that are not visible at all from the public right-of-way should be allowed as a matter of course.
- All changes and additions should respect existing environmental settings, landscaping, and patterns of open space.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Secretary of the Interior defines rehabilitation as “the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.” Standards 2, 9, and 10 most directly apply to the application before the commission:

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

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

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

STAFF DISCUSSION

BACKGROUND

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission for a preliminary consultation at the January 11, 2017 HPC meeting. At that time, the Commission expressed the following concerns regarding the proposal:

- The roof of the previously proposed addition on the left side was too steep
- The projecting bay on the left side of the historic house should be preserved, and not covered by the previously proposed covered porch on the left side
- The previously proposed attached garage was inconsistent with the Standards and Guidelines
- The second-floor of the previously proposed right side-projecting mudroom addition should be pushed back

The applicants have revised their proposal consistent with the Commission’s previous comments and returned for a second preliminary consultation.

Staff asks for the Commission’s guidance regarding the following revisions:

Left Side Addition/Projecting Bay

The applicants have reduced the slope of the roof of the proposed left side addition. As revised, the proposed left side addition will not engage the windows of the proposed shed dormer above, which was a previous concern of both staff and the Commission.

The proposed left side addition no longer includes a covered porch, allowing the projecting bay on the left side of the historic house to remain unobscured. The proposed left side addition also retains the approximate distance to the historic house as the existing left side addition, further reducing any impact that the addition might have on the projecting bay or left side elevation of the historic house.
Staff is generally supportive of the proposed revisions, finding that they are consistent with the *Guidelines*. Although the proposed left side addition will be visible from the public right-of-way and is not entirely at the rear, it will replace an existing addition in the same location and, by ensuring that the projecting bay is not impacted, will preserve the predominant architectural features of the resource.

*Attached Garage*

At the first preliminary consultation, the Commission voiced concerns regarding the previously proposed attached garage, finding that an attached garage would be incompatible with the character of the subject property and surrounding historic district. While many of the Commissioners found that an attached garage of any type was likely not approvable, others suggested solutions, which would allow an attached garage to appear unattached and be more compatible with the historic house.

As revised, the applicants are no longer proposing an attached garage.

*Side-Projecting Mudroom*

With the attached garage removed from the proposal, the applicants are no longer proposing a second-floor for the proposed right-side projecting mudroom. As revised, the proposed mudroom will include a screened porch, which slightly wraps around and returns to the proposed rear addition.

*Shed Dormers*

The applicants propose to construct two new shed dormers (one on each side of the proposed new rear addition), which will return to the rear roof plane of the historic house. The shed dormer on the right (as viewed from the front) will be larger than that on the left, providing some of the interior space that would have been provided by the second-floor of the previously proposed mudroom.

The ridge of each dormer, as well as that of the proposed rear addition, will converge at the same approximate height as the historic ridgeline. Staff is generally supportive of the proposed shed dormer additions, finding that, in accordance with the *Guidelines*, they are at the rear of the property and generally consistent with the predominant architectural style of the subject property.

*Rear Addition*

Although the proposed rear addition is fairly consistent with the previous proposal, the architectural detailing has changed slightly, with board and batten being proposed in the gable end in place of the previously proposed Hardie Shakes. The proposed gable end materials are at the rear of the property, where they will not be at all visible from the public right-of-way; however, staff does prefer the previously proposed Hardie Shakes, finding them more compatible with the predominant architectural style and features of the historic house, in accordance with the *Guidelines*.

**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: SHAWN@RFMARCH.COM  Contact Person: SHAWN BUEHLER
Daytime Phone No.: 301.585.2222

Tax Account No.: 13.01068642

Name of Property Owner: AARON KOERPER+ANAT SHAHAR
Daytime Phone No.: 310.980.7136

Address: 7415 BIRCH AVE  TAKOMA PARK  MD 20912

Contractor: T.B.D
Contractor Registration No.: 
Agent for Owner: SHAWN BUEHLER
Daytime Phone No.: 301.585.2222

LOCATION OF BUILDING PERMITS

House Number: 7230 SPANGE AVE  Street: 
Town/City: TAKOMA PARK  Nearest Cross Street: PARK AVE
Lot #: 16124/17  Block: 8  Subdivision: PEACEMARK & EARNEST TRUSTEES ADDITION TO
Lot #: 14768  Folio: 450  Parcel: TAKOMA PARK

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT ACTION AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:  CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:  
Construct ☐  Extend ☒  Alter/Remove ☒  AC ☐  slab ☐  Room Addition ☐  Porch ☐  Deck ☒  Shed ☒ 
Move ☐  Install ☐  Wreck/Rez ☐  Solar ☐  Fireplace ☑  Wood Burning Stove ☐  Single Family ☐ 
Revision ☐  Repair ☐  Renovate ☒  Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☐  Other: ☐

1B. Construction cost estimate: $500,000

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

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTENSION 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: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCE/RETAINING WALL

3A. Height ______ feet ______ inches
3B. Indicate whether the fence or retaining wall is to be constructed on one of the following locations:
☑ On party line/property line ☐ Entirely on land of owner ☐ On public right of way/easement

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

[Signature of owner or authorized agent] 1.31.2017

Approved: For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission

Disapproved: Signature: Date:

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

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

1. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
   a. Description of existing structure(s) and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance:
      THE EXISTING HOME IS A TRADITIONAL BUNGALOW WITH A
      ONE STORY ROOF ADDITION. THE ROOF SLOPE IS SHALLOWER
      THAN MANY TYPICAL BUNGALOWS, LIMITING SECOND FLOOR TO A SINGLE
      BEDROOM. THE FRONT DORMER APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN ALTERED.
      WINDOWS DO NOT APPEAR TO BE HISTORIC. THE LOT IS IRREGULAR -
      IT DOES NOT Front THE STREET DIRECTLY AND THE SUBJECT
      HOME FACED THE BANK OF HOMES ON PARK AVE. THE LOT IS
      IRREGULARLY LARGE WHILE THE HOME IS UNUSUAL. THE ADJACENT
      NEIGHBOR HAS A LARGE ROOF-ADDITION ALREADY.
   b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district:
      THE PROPOSED ADDITION INCLUDES A STEEPER ROOF AND NEW FRONT
      DORMER TO ACCOMMODATE A LARGER SECOND FLOOR. NEW HISTORICALLY
      CONFORMAL DORMERS. NEW ROOF ADDITION WITH 1 STORY DRIVE
      AND SHED DORMERS AT 2nd FLOOR AND NEW SIDE MIDROOM + PORCH
      ADDITION. STEEPROOF ROOF ENABLES US TO EMULSIFY SIDE OF SECOND FLOOR
      WHILE PRESERVING BUNGALOW MASSING. SIDE ADDITION CONCEALS
      BULK OF NEW MASSING FROM SPAULD AVE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

PLEASE PRINT (IN BLUE OR BLACK INK) OR TYPE THIS INFORMATION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE.
PLEASE STAY WITHIN THE GUIDES OF THE TEMPLATE. AS THIS WILL BE PHOTOCOPIED DIRECTLY INTO MAILING LABELS.
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY NORTH ELEVATION
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY WEST (REAR) ELEVATION
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY SOUTH ELEVATION
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY AS VIEWED FROM STREET
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
SUBJECT PROPERTY W/ NON-TRADITIONAL DORMER WINDOWS
IMMEDIATE CONTEXT:
SUBJECT PROPERTY FRONTS BACK OF ADJACENT HOUSES
236 PARK AVENUE:
ROOF SLOPE & REAR MASSING PRECEDENT
238 PARK AVENUE:
ROOF SLOPE & MASSING PRECEDENT
7216 SPRUCE AVENUE:
ROOF SLOPE & MASSING PRECEDENT
7310 WILLOW AVENUE: ROOF SLOPE & DORMER PRECEDENT
7219 WILLOW AVENUE:
ROOF SLOPE & DORMER PRECEDENT
7204 WILLOW AVENUE:
ROOF SLOPE & DORMER PRECEDENT
# HAWP APPLICATION: MAILING ADDRESSES FOR NOTIFYING

[Owner, Owner’s Agent, Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner’s mailing address</th>
<th>Owner’s Agent’s mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aaron Kofner & Anat Shabar  
7415 Birch Avenue  
Takoma Park, MD 20912 | Shawn Buehler  
Bennett-Frank McCrory P.C., Inc.  
1400 Spring St., Suite 320  
Silver Spring, MD 20910 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Virginia A. Sharpe  
7228 Spruce Ave.  
Takoma Park, MD 20912 |
| Jessica C. Landman & L. Daniel Mullaney  
PSC 82 Box 204  
DPO AE 09110-0082  
(232 Park Ave.) |
| Ellen Ai Wen Knowles  
Slater McClellan Knowles  
230 Park Ave.  
Takoma Park, MD 20912 |
| Bonnie Jo Mount  
228 Park Ave.  
Takoma Park, MD 20912 |
| Barbara & Kenneth Firestone  
224 Park Ave.  
Takoma Park, MD 20912 |
| Gail K. Jensen  
7315 Willow Ave.  
Takoma Park, MD 20912 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner’s mailing address</th>
<th>Owner’s Agent’s mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Kofner &amp; Anat Shahan</td>
<td>Shawn Busheier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7415 Birch Avenue</td>
<td>Bennett Frank McCarthy Arch., Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
<td>1400 Spring St. - Suite 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Spring, MD 20910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Lamport &amp; Patrizia Ricci</td>
<td>7313 Willow Ave. Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Boocker</td>
<td>7311 Willow Ave. Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred E. Pinkney &amp; Pamela H. Sommers</td>
<td>7307 Willow Ave. Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederico S. Azcavate &amp; Maria A. Roper</td>
<td>7305 Willow St. Takoma Park, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXISTING

EC-4 KOFNER-SHAHAR RENOVATION
7230 Spruce Avenue, Takoma Park, MD 20912
EXISTING FRONT & SIDE ELEVATIONS
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

BENNETT FRANK McCARTHY
1403 Spring Street, Suite 230, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2755
(301) 585-2332 www.bfmarch.com fax (301) 585-6979
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- - - - - - - - - - - - - X

HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT - : HPC Case No. 37/03-17C
6801 Westmoreland Avenue :
-

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION - :
7230 Spruce Avenue :
-

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

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
January 11, 2017, commencing at 7:32 p.m., in the MRO
Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland
20910, before:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

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

MR. KIRWAN: Is there a second?

MS. BARNES: I second the motion.

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

VOTE.

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

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

MR. WHIPPLE: Mr. Chairman?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The roof alteration extension. The proposal here is to alter and expand the roof of the historic house, increasing the slope to add interior space while retaining the existing footprint. The roof will go from a 712 slope to, what is, I believe, a 912 slope. The existing two-over-two windows and the gables will be retained. The wood shakes and the gables will be replaced with Hardie shakes, and the existing wooden brackets will be replaced with new wooden brackets to match.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. Any Commissioner questions?

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

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

MS. BARNES: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff?

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

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

MS. HEILER: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

The mudroom addition between the garage and the 
house is a place where I would seek some guidance from the 
Commission. The functions associated with that portion of 
the addition, if not allowed on the side of the house as a 
modest six or seven foot projection, again, away from the 
street side of the house, if not allowed there, those would 
more realistically end up behind the house making it even 
longer. I'm personally not of the impression that making 
this house more than twice its original length is ideal. 

And so, my thought was, a modest amount of bulk away from 
the street side of the house was a reasonable ask. But, 
I'll be curious to hear your thoughts on that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. CARROLL: Can I just interject?

MR. KIRWAN: Sure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Are we prepared to hear --

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

MR. KIRWAN: Very good. Then, we will hear Case I.F now, and let's hear the Staff Report for 6801 Westmoreland Avenue in Takoma Park.

MR. BRUCHERT: Good evening. This is Case No. 37/03-17A, 6801 Westmoreland Avenue in Takoma Park. You see on your screen, this is an image of the house. It's constructed circa 1915 to 1925, and it is listed as Contributing to the Takoma Park Historic District. And it's reviewed under County Code Chapter 26A, and the Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines.

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