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Address: 5813 Surrey St., Chevy Chase  
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Resource: Secondary (Post-1915) Resource  
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(Somerset Historic District)

Applicant: Dan & Aviva Rosenthal  
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(Tahani Share, Architect)

Tax Credit: N/A

Review: HAWP  
Staff: Michael Kyne

Case Number: 35/36-17J

PROPOSAL: Side addition and hardscape alterations

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Additional specifications will be submitted for the proposed doors, garage door, and windows, demonstrating that they are consistent with the Commission’s requirements.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Secondary (Post-1915) Resource within the Somerset Historic District

STYLE: Colonial Revival

DATE: c. 1933

BACKGROUND

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission for preliminary consultations at the September 19, 2017 and October 25, 2017 HPC meetings. At the October 25, 2017 preliminary consultation, the Commission was generally supportive of the applicants’ proposal, but some Commissioners expressed the following concerns:

- The proposed enlarged driveway at the front of the house was still too wide.
- The proposed casement windows on the right side and rear elevations of the proposed addition should be more consistent with the double-hung windows on the historic house and front elevation of the addition.

PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes the following work items at the subject property:

- Enlarge an existing one-story addition and below grade garage at the right side of the subject property.
- Construct a second-story expansion over the enlarged right-side addition and garage.
• Enlarge the existing driveway at the front of the subject property.
• Construct a new central walkway/steps at the front of the subject property.
• Construct an at grade flagstone patio and pergola at the right side of the property.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Somerset Historic District several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include 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.

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 applicants have made the following revisions to their proposal, attempting to address the Commission’s comments/concerns from the October 25, 2017 preliminary consultation:

Driveway

The width of the proposed driveway at the front of the house has been reduced from 18’ to 16’. At the first
(September 19, 2017) preliminary consultation, the applicants proposed enlarging the existing 8’-4”
driveway at the front of the house to 20’. Overall, the width of the proposed driveway enlargement has been
reduced by 4’, as the applicants now propose a 16’ wide driveway. The applicants have also provided
photographic examples of other driveways with a similar width in the surrounding neighborhood.

Windows

Several Commissioners expressed concerns with the proposed casement windows on the right side and rear
elevations of the proposed addition at the October 25, 2017 preliminary consultation, suggesting that they
should be made more consistent with the double-hung windows on the historic house and front elevation of
the proposed addition; however, the general sentiment was that the proposed casement windows would be
approved. While the proposed casement windows have been retained in the current proposal, the
proportions of the casement windows have been altered to be more consistent with those of the double-hung
windows on the historic house and front elevation of the proposed addition.

Typically, the Commission requires that any proposed SDL doors, garage doors, and windows have
permanently affixed 7/8” profile muntins with internal spacer bars. Staff recommends a condition of
approval, stipulating that additional specifications be submitted for the proposed doors, garage door, and
windows, demonstrating that they are consistent with the Commission’s requirements.

After full and fair consideration of the applicants’ submission, staff finds the proposal, as modified by the
condition, as being consistent with the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-(b) 1 and 2, and having found
the proposal is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation outlined above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

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

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

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

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

Contact Email: tahani@landisconstruction.com
Contact Person: Tahani Share/Chris Landis

Tax Account No.: _______________________________________________________

Name of Property Owner: Dan & Aviva Rosenthal

Address: ________________________________________________________________

Street Number: __________ City: __________ State: __________ Zip Code: __________

Contractor: Landis Architects/Builders

Contractor Registration No.: _______________________________________________

Agent for Owner: Chris Landis

Daytime Phone No.: 202-370-3410

Daytime Phone No.: 202-489-1516

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISE

House Number: 5813

Street: Surrey St.

Town/City: Chevy Chase

Nearest Cross Street: Surrey St. & Cumberland Ave.

Lot: __________ Block: __________ Subdivision: __________

Lot: __________ Block: __________ Subdivision: __________

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT, ACTION AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:

☐ Construct ☐ Extend ☐ Alter/Renovate ☐ A/C ☐ Slab ☐ Room Addition ☐ Porch ☐ Deck ☐ Shed

☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Wheel/Rais ☐ Solar ☐ Fireplace ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Single Family

☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☐ Revocable ☐ Fence/Wall (completes 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 EXTEND/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/assessment

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

Tahani Share
Signature of owner or authorized agent 11/14/17

Approved: ___________________________ For Chairman, 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 house on 5813 Surrey St. was built in 1917. It sits on a corner lot with an area of 11,900 SP. It's comprised of 2 1/2 brick stories. The plan is a typical colonial house with stair in the center. The house has an existing non-historic one story addition built on a garage at the basement level. The house has two front setbacks (24F & 31'F) a side setback (19F) and a rear setback (67F).

   b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district:
      -- ENLARGE THE EXISTING ONE STORY ADDITION AND BELOW GRADE GARAGE AT THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE HOUSE.
      -- CONSTRUCT A SECOND STORY EXPANSION OVER THE ENLARGED RIGHT SIDE ADDITION AND GARAGE.
      -- ENLARGED THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY AT THE FRONT OF THE HOUSE
      -- CONSTRUCT A NEW CENTRAL WALKWAY/ STEPS AT THE FRONT OF THE PROPERTY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

PLEASE PRINT (IN BLUE OR BLACK INK) OR TYPE THIS INFORMATION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE. PLEASE STAY WITHIN THE GUIDES OF THE TEMPLATE, AS THIS WILL BE PHOTOCOPIED DIRECTLY ONTO MAILING LABELS.
## HAWP APPLICATION: MAILING ADDRESSES FOR NOTIFYING

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner’s mailing address</th>
<th>Owner’s Agent’s mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviva and Dan Rosenthal</td>
<td>Landis Architects/ Builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5813 Surrey St.</td>
<td>7059 Blair Road, NW #300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Regan &amp; Sandra Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5809 Surrey St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Holland &amp; Matthew Groolowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47722 Cumberland Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS PROPOSAL
ROSENTHAL RESIDENCE

5813 Surrey Street  Chevy Chase, MD

HOUSE AS SEEN FROM CUMBERLAND & SURREY STREETS
HOUSE AS SEEN FROM SURREY STREET
DRIVEWAY AS SEEN FROM SURREY STREET
HOUSE AS SEEN FROM CUMBERLAND STREET
HOUSE AS SEEN FROM CUMBERLAND STREET
HOUSE AS SEEN FROM SIDE YARD
A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
October 25, 2017, commencing at 7:49 p.m., in the MRO
Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland
20910, before:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Kirwan, Chair
Sandra Heiler
Marsha Barnes
Kenneth Firestone
Richard Arkin
Eliza Voigt
Robert Sutton
ALSO PRESENT:

Phillip Estes
Michael Kyne
Daniel Bruechert
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MR. FARNSWORTH: Yeah. And actually, when I submitted this, I didn't know if I should go as a preliminary or as a application. And, it was kind of left to Staff, and Staff was like, you know, go that route. So that's the reason that I'm down that road. So, I think, is it a continuance, is that what it is?

MR. KIRWAN: Yes, we'll continue this matter at a future hearing and based on your deadline, so you can get things into Staff.

MR. FARNSWORTH: Yeah, I think I'll do the continuance.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay, great. Thank you very much, I appreciate that. We look forward to seeing you come back. Sorry, we don't take any questions. Okay. We're going to move on to the next item on our agenda, which are the preliminary consultations. The first of which is II.A at 5813 Surrey Street in Chevy Chase. Do we have a Staff Report?

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do have a Staff Report. And I guess I can start over here since we don't have the microphones. As noted, this is 5813 Surrey Street, Chevy Chase. A secondary post-1915 resource within the Somerset Historic District, colonial revival style, circa 1933. The Commission saw this at the September 19th meeting, and at that time expressed the following concerns.
The Commission did not support the proposed rear extension or addition, finding that the rear (indiscernible) of the house was likely historic and that due to the visibility of the rear from Cumberland Avenue, the proposal had the potential to detract from the character of the house. The Commission expressed general support for the proposed side addition, finding that that was the best location for an addition at this property. However, the Commission found that the proposed side addition must take more visual cues from the historic house. Specifically, the side addition was too complex with too many roof forms, and needed to be more symmetrical.

The Commission supported slightly enlarging the existing driveway at the front, but found that the proposed expansion from 8 feet, 4 inches to 20 feet wide was inconsistent with the character of the streetscape. And the Commission found that the proposed front stairs and walkway were too substantial and suggested that the perceived massing should be minimized.

So the current proposal, the revised proposal is to enlarge an existing one-story addition and below grade garage at the right side of the house. Construction a second-story expansion over the enlarged right side addition and garage, enlarge the existing driveway at the
front of the property, and construct a new central walkway
and steps at the front. And, we'll just walk around the
property starting at the front, and moving around to the
right. And I can come back to any of these if we need to
later.

Just looking at the space at the right side of
the property. Back toward the house. And then moving
around toward the rear. Looking towards Cumberland
Avenue. And then standing on Cumberland Avenue looking
back at the house. And I do have the plans, both of the
existing structure and the proposed, if we need to
reference those later.

And the applicable guidelines here are the
Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. And
the applicant has made some revisions based upon the
Commission's previous comments. The previously proposed
rear extension and addition has been removed from the
proposal. The proposed side addition has been simplified
and made more symmetrical. The windows on the front
elevation of the proposed side addition take more cues
from the historic house with double hung divided light
windows, matching head heights, similar muntin patterns,
and a stacked appearance.

The width of the proposed expanded driveway has
been reduced from 20 feet to 18 feet. From the submitted
plans and elevation it appears that the width of the proposed front stairs and walkway has been decreased, and it appears that the materials for the front stairs and walkway have also been made -- have been simplified, and they are proposing concrete in lieu of the previously proposed stone.

Staff is generally supportive of the revisions, finding that most of the Commission's concerns have been addressed. However, I ask for your guidance regarding the following: because they are located on secondary elevations, are the proposed casement windows on the side and rear of the proposed side addition appropriate, or should they be more consistent with the windows of the historic house?

Has the width of the proposed driveway been reduced enough, or should it be reduced further? Because materials have not been specified on the proposed plans and elevations, Staff asks the Commission's guidance regarding the appropriateness or regarding appropriate and compatible materials for all aspects of the proposed project. And, with that, I will conclude. I do recommend at this point that the applicants listen to the Commissions concerns and suggestions, and return with a HAWP application. And I can take any questions the Commission might have for me.
MR. KIRWAN: Any questions? Yes, Commissioner Arkin?

MR. ARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You mentioned that most of the concerns expressed by the Commission had been addressed. Could you outline those that were not addressed.

MR. KYNE: Oh, I'm sorry. If I did say that, I misspoke. Most of the concerns have been addressed. And the concerns were the ones that I mentioned at the beginning of the presentation which I can reiterate now.

MR. ARKIN: Well, I'm asking the negative side of that. Were there suggestions that were made by the Commission that were not incorporated into this design?

MR. KYNE: Oh sorry, I misunderstood. I don't believe that there were any specific suggestions that weren't incorporated. I know that there was specific mention of reducing the driveway, I think, to a max of 14 feet by at least one Commissioner. And, as noted, they're proposing 18 feet, so that's probably why I stated that most of the concerns have been addressed.

MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for Staff? All right, if not, welcome the applicant to please come forward. We can give you seven minutes for your testimony and please state your name for the record before you
speak, and be mindful of the little mouse there in the
middle. That's the microphone tonight.

MS. SHARE: Hello, my name is Tahani Share. I'm
here representing Landis Architects Builders, and I'm here
with the homeowner, Dan Rosenthal.

MR. ARKIN: Could you speak up, please, I can't
-- I'm having trouble hearing you.

MS. SHARE: I introduced myself. I'm Tahani
Share from Landis Architects Builders, and I'm here with
Dan Rosenthal, the owner of the property. So, at this
point actually, we would like to hear if the Commission
has any other concerns that you would like us to address.

Just wanted to address the driveway width. And again,
this is an issue with the parking, limitations of parking
in Somerset Town. Eighteen feet would actually allow for
two cars, which is what the homeowners are hoping for.

Two cars, and maybe another car in the garage would solve
the problem. And actually, this is something that the
neighbors were very happy with when we showed them the
plans because that is also something that can help the
neighbors solve the limitation of parking in the area.

The other comment is on the materials.

Actually, we are proposing Hardi siding with Hardi band
boards that will be painted in a color that is
complimentary to the existing brick house. And, we're
taking cues, as Michael said, so the band boards and
windows. As far as the side windows being casements or
double hung, I think we are open. At this point we just
think that the side elevation with the side lights next to
the door just make the casement windows appear more
appropriate. But we are willing to listen to your
comments on that.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Good evening, I'm Dan Rosenthal,
the homeowner. I have really nothing to add. I
appreciate the work of Staff and the Commission up to this
point.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you. Any questions for the
applicant? All right, if not, we don't have any
witnesses, so we'll move into deliberations. Anybody want
to kick things off with our comments. I think it'll be
helpful for them to hear from all of us and our views on
what they propose since there may be a different
composition to the Commission when they come back for a
HAWP.

MS. BARNES: First, I want to say that I
appreciate the changes you've made to the design of the
house. I think it's a better outcome, and I also
appreciate the reduction of attention you gave to the
steps and the walk. I think this is more compatible. The
only thing that is an issue for me still is the width of
the driveway and how that compares with other homes in the neighborhood. But, I'm grateful that you took on board the suggestions that were made about the addition when you came for the first preliminary. And with regard to the casement windows on the side, I would be comfortable with those.

MR. SUTTON: I agree that I like the changes you've made. I think the -- one of the concerns I had, I think, was that the addition looked a little bit too historic, and I think you have delineated that it's a modern addition, and I appreciate that. We have friends that live in the neighborhood, and I understand the parking issue. And I understand that to get two cars you really have to have that width. So, that was a concern of mine originally. I appreciate that you've cut it down a little bit, and I think you've addressed most of our issues.

MR. KIRWAN: Commissioner Arkin, you want to wrap up that side of the?

MR. ARKIN: Thank you. I agree. I think this is -- I do appreciate the additional work that you have put into this. And I would agree that I think this is much improved. It is much simpler, and I think reflects the neighborhood so much better. And as was previously stated, the addition is clearly something newer, but also
is very respectful of the historic part of the house and
the surrounding.

I would prefer windows that are more historic in
design where you are using casement windows. I think it's
more important on the side than on the back. But, the
casement windows would not be a deal killer for me. And,
because I think there is a necessity to try to squeeze as
many parking spaces as possible onto the lot with this
house to lighten the parking load on the streets, I could
accept an 18-foot wide driveway. Thank you.

MR. FIRESTONE: I'm going to concur with the
other Commissioners who've spoken so far. This plan is
definitely an improvement. I guess I would be a little
concerned about the driveway, but sometimes there's a
necessity for it, and it is something that could
conceivably be reversed at some point. You know, with new
construction in the future you could make a narrower
driveway when the need for cars decreases. And, I guess
at this point, I'm ready for you to come back with an
actual application.

MS. HEILER: I would agree with the previous
comments as well. The one thing I think you could do that
might minimize the width of the driveway is to delineate
the end of the house, or the end of the addition where it
meets that wall of the lower level. Since that's 16 feet,
if there were a way to continue that line, I think it
would make the very large width of the driveway less
obvious. Otherwise, I have no objection to the casement
windows, and I think this is a big improvement to the
design of the front of the addition.

MR. KIRWAN: I generally concur with the other
Commissioners. I remain concerned about the 18 foot width
of the driveway. I had wanted, if my schedule had
allowed, I wanted to drive through the neighborhood and
just get a sense of whether there were other driveways of
similar width. It would be very helpful for me when you
come back for a HAWP if you have comparisons and you can
provide evidence that this is not, you know, grossly
unusual in the district. I will, before you come back for
a HAWP, make sure I do go by and try and do that myself.
But I think that would be very helpful for me when you
come back for a HAWP is to see some sort of driveway
comparison, so we can make a better assessment.

MS. VOIGT: Yeah, I'm okay with this. Thank
you. Appreciate it.

MR. KIRWAN: All right. So, I think you heard
general appreciation and acceptance of the addition
proposal with just possibly me in the minority as the one
concerned about the driveway. But, that may be relieved
when I go by the neighborhood next time before you come
back. So we look forward to seeing you for a HAWP.

MS. SHARE: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: All right, thank you. The next last preliminary consultation tonight is II.B at 7400 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda. The former Bethesda Post Office site.

MR. KYNE: Yes. And we do have a presentation. So, 7400 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda. This is a Master Plan Site, the Bethesda Post Office. This is a second preliminary consultation. The site, again it's a Master Plan site, classical revival style, circa 1938. And the applicants appeared for a prelim at the August 16th meeting. At that time, the applicant proposed four different options for sign installation that ranged from one to four, 9 to 19 feet tall freestanding figures at the front of the property. And the Commission did not support of any of these options, finding that they overwhelmed and detracted from the building.

So we have a new proposal for sign installation at the front and left side tonight. And just to familiarize you with the site a bit, we have some photographs. The same photographs from back in the Summer, as you can maybe tell. And again, plans for reference. And the Commission did request in the work session that I get copies of the--color copies of the plans. And I do