MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 7204 Cedar Ave., Takoma Park  
Meeting Date: 2/21/2018

Resource: Outstanding Resource  
(Takoma Park Historic District)  
Report Date: 2/14/2018

Applicant: Nancy Augustine and Adam Oppenheim  
(Jackie Bratman, Architect)  
Public Notice: 2/7/2018

Tax Credit: No

Review: HAWP

Staff: Michael Kyne

Case Number: 37/03-18J

PROPOSAL: Building addition

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. Window and door specifications will be submitted, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:

SIGNIFICANCE: Outstanding Resource within the Takoma Park Historic District
STYLE: Classical Revival
DATE: c. 1913

BACKGROUND:

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission for a preliminary consultation at the January 23, 2018 HPC meeting.

PROPOSAL:

The applicant proposes a building addition and other alterations at the subject property.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

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

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

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

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

Outstanding Resources – Residential

The Guidelines characterize Outstanding Resources as those

... which [are] of outstanding significance due to [their] architectural and/or historical features. An Outstanding Resource may date from any historical period and may be representative of any architectural style. However, it must have special features, architectural details and/or historical associations that make the resource especially representative of an architectural style, it must be especially important to the history of the district, and/or it must be especially unique within the context of the district.

These resources have the highest level of architectural and/or historical significance. While they will receive the most detailed level of design review, it is permissible to make sympathetic alterations, changes and additions to Outstanding Resources.

As a set of guiding principles for design review of Outstanding Resources, the Historic Preservation Commission will utilize the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

The Guidelines that pertain to this project are as follows:

- Plans for all alterations should be compatible with the resource’s original design; additions, specifically, should be sympathetic to existing architectural character, including massing, height, setbacks, and materials.

- Emphasize placement of major additions to the rear of existing structures so that they are less visible from the public right-of-way.

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

- Preservation of original and distinctive architectural features, such as porches, dormers, decorative details, shutters, etc. is encouraged.

- Preservation of original windows and doors, particularly those with specific architectural importance, and of original size and shape of openings is encouraged.

- Preservation of original building materials and the use of appropriate, compatible new materials is encouraged.
• All changes and additions should respect existing environmental settings, landscaping, and patterns of open space.

Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8

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

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

(1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or

(2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or

(3) The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or

(4) The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or

(5) The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship; or

(6) In balancing the interests of the public in preserving the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district, with the interests of the public from the use and benefit of the alternative proposal, the general public welfare is better served by granting the permit.

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

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

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation:

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

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**STAFF DISCUSSION**

The subject property is a 1 ½-story Classical Revival-style Outstanding Resource within the Takoma Park Historic District. Records indicate that the historic house was constructed in 1913, replacing a Queen Anne-style house that burned down that same year. The house is located on a corner lot, with its front facing Tulip Avenue and its right side facing Cedar Avenue. Because of the house’s location, three of its elevations – the front, rear, and right side – are clearly visible from the public right-of-way. The applicant has indicated that the house experienced previous alterations, including the replacement of the original slate roof with asphalt and the replacement of the original clapboard siding on the dormers with asphalt shingles.

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission for a preliminary consultation at the January 23, 2018 HPC meeting. The Commission was supportive of the applicants’ proposal, but expressed the following comments and concerns:

- The hyphen approach is appropriate, but some steps should be taken to make it read more as a
hyphen and/or distinct space. This could be accomplished by adding more fenestration, or perhaps by simply swapping the previously proposed right and left elevations of the hyphen.

- If possible, the hyphen should be shortened, while retaining the view of the dormers and other character-defining features on the rear of the historic house.

- The standing seam metal roof could be appropriate, if the correct details and finish (no ridge caps or vents, appropriate seam height, and a paintable matte finish) are proposed.

- The proposed curvilinear wheelchair ramp should be straight and moved adjacent to the building.

- The proposed poured concrete foundations and ramp should be parged to be more consistent with the historic house’s foundation.

- There was no real support for the suggestion of three different roof types or for the suggestion of asphalt shingles on the addition and copper on the hyphen.

- There was concern from one Commissioner about the Palladian windows on the addition; however, the majority of Commissioners thought that you successfully referenced the details of the historic house.

- There was concern from one Commissioner about the paired window and shutters on the right side of the proposed hyphen; however, if the previous suggestions regarding fenestration changes are incorporated, these features will likely be removed from the proposal anyway.

The applicants have returned for a HAWP application, with the following revisions:

- More fenestration has been added to the proposed hyphen, with 12-lite doors and windows added to the left and right elevations.

- The length of the proposed hyphen has been reduced, going from 25’-11” to 20’.

- Asphalt shingle roofing is proposed for the hyphen and rear addition, differentiating the new structures from the historic house with slate roof.

- As revised, the wheelchair ramp is straight and directly adjacent to the proposed rear addition.

- The proposed wheelchair ramp will be parged to be consistent with the painted stone foundation of the historic house.

- The Palladian windows on the side elevations of the proposed rear addition have been simplified to take cues from but not but replicate the details of the historic house.

Staff finds that the applicants have successfully responded to the Commission’s previous comments and concerns and recommends that the Commission approve the HAWP application, with the following condition: Window and door specifications will be submitted, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

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

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

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

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

Contact Person: Jackie Braitman
Daytime Phone No.: 301-891-3800

Tax Account No.: 01057103
Name of Property Owner: Nancy Augustine & Adam Oppenheim
Daytime Phone No.: ________________
Address: 9029 Fairview Rd, Silver Spring, MD 20910-4120
City: Silver Spring Zip Code: 20910
State: MD Contractor: Braitman Design Studio, Inc.
Phone No.: 301-891-3800
Contractor Registration No.: MHIC# 125978
Agent for Owner: Jackie Braitman
Daytime Phone No.: 301-891-3800

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PERMISE
House Number: 7204
Street: Cedar Ave
Town/City: Takoma Park Nearest Cross Street: Tulip Ave
Lot: P18 Block: 6 Subdivision: 0025

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT ACTION AND USE
1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
☐ Construct ☐ Extend ☐ Alter/Remove ☐ A/C ☐ Slab ☐ Room Addition ☐ Porch ☐ Deck ☐ Shed
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Wreck/Reair ☐ Solar ☐ Fireplace ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Singlefamily
☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☐ Rebuildable ☐ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☐ Other:

1B. Construction cost estimate: $350,000

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 sewer 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. Indicates 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 sign 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.

[Signature] 1/29/18

Signature of owner or authorized agent

Approved: ____________________ For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission
Disapproved: ____________________ Date:
Application/Permit No.: ________________ Date Filed: ________________ Date Issued:

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS
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Schedule 1a: Description of Existing Structures and environmental setting.

7204 is an Outstanding Resource in the Takoma Park historic district. The house is on the site of the BF Gilbert House from 1885 - 1913. BF Gilbert was the developer for Takoma Park. The original house on the site was a Queen Anne style home; it burned down in 1913. The rebuilt house -- the existing house -- is a "classical revival" style.

The house sits at the northwest corner of Tulip and Cedar Avenues. The lot is 28,768 sf -- almost 4 times the size of the more typical lot in Takoma Park. A large 13ft by 44ft front porch has 6 large colonial columns. The house faces Tulip Ave even though the address is Cedar Ave. Continuing the "grand" style, the house is sits 115ft back from the sidewalk on Tulip.

There is a terra cotta paver walkway on the property from the sidewalk gate to the front porch. These pavers possibly date from 1885. They match the terra cotta pavers on the public sidewalk adjacent to the house -- which are the only remaining original sidewalks in Takoma Park.

The home is 1-1/2 stories with 2 front gable dormers, 3 back gable dormers, and partial basement. The home sits on a limestone foundation that extends partially (~30 inches) up the first floor walls. The stone foundation appears to be older than the current early 1900's construction. We hypothesize that the stone foundation was from the original 1885 home. The Takoma Park Master Plan says this current home was built in 1913 while the Maryland real property database lists the construction date as 1918.

The current home has been owned by the Augustine family for 65 years. The Augustine parents "aged in place" - delaying needed maintenance for the past 20-or-so years. In addition, many of the "repairs" made in the 1970's were ones that destroyed the original materials -- such as replacing the slate roof with asphalt and replacing the clapboard siding on the dormers with asphalt shingles.

The lot is landscaped with mature plantings and trees.
Schedule 1b: General Description of Project & Effect on the Historic Resource, Setting and District

As mentioned, the house has been owned by one family for the past 65 years. The daughter has recently inherited the property and is committed to restoring the historic character and materials. She is also planning to pursue a Maryland Historical Trust Easement further protecting the home and its setting.

The objective of the work is to provide better living space while preserving and restoring the historic character of the home, including:

- **Repairs and Restoration of the original structure**: The owners plan to restore historic materials removed from the home including: replacing the asphalt shingle roof with slate and replacing the asphalt shingle siding on the dormers with clapboard. They also plan to modernize or repair old mechanical systems. Historic exterior trim, windows, siding, and foundation walls will be restored and repaired.

- **The historic Terra Cotta Paver walkway** on the site will be preserved and protected. The builder will also prepare a protection plan for the adjacent historic public sidewalk, coordinate that plan with the City of Takoma Park, and will execute that plan to fully protect that historic sidewalk.

- **Proposed Addition**: We propose to add an addition to the rear of the house that is subordinate to the original structure in both size and height. The proposed addition will also reflect the architectural style of the original home – same roof slope and window detail. The proposed addition will echo (but simplify) the original details including the 10-lite casement windows, tall 8 ft doors, and roof eaves detail.

- **Proposed Connector**: We propose to connect the addition to the original home with a 1-story connector with a lower roof line than the original home or the addition. The addition is located and designed such that no historic details are changed or obscured. The proposed connector will also provide a family entrance off the existing Cedar Avenue parking area. The entrance will not compete architecturally with the original front porch facing Tulip Ave.

- **Original Architectural Elements will be Repaired or Restored**: The original windows and doors will be repaired as will the original shutters and porch columns. We will remove chain-link security coverings, restore a slate roof on the original structure, and restore clapboard siding to the dormer walls. We explored the idea of removing the paint from and exposing the original stone foundation. However, the structural engineer believes that the stone and mortar are soft and could be damaged. So we will repaint instead.

- **Two Small Changes to the Original Home Will Not Be Visible**: The project will also include an interior first floor remodel to create a larger kitchen, better indoor/outdoor access, and safe stairs to the basement. As part of this interior change we propose to change a small section of roof over a back porch that was previously enclosed and incorporated into the kitchen. The current roof extends over that porch lowering the ceiling well below the 10ft ceilings in the home. This roof extension will no longer be visible once the addition is built and we propose to change that one small section of roof to a gable roof. We also propose to remove one original window and install a new French door to a new deck. The new doors is not exactly in the same location as the window being removed. Again, these changes will be hidden behind the new connector and addition.
PROPOSED - FIRST FLOOR PLAN
1/16 in = 1 ft
E1 - PROPOSED FRONT - TULIP ELEVATION
3/32 in = 1 ft
Proposed Cedar Ave Elevation

3/32 in = 1 ft
E4 - PROPOSED NORTHWEST ELEVATION
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AUGUSTINE-OPPENHEIM RESIDENCE
7204 Cedar Ave, Takoma Park, MD 20912
TREES SURVEY

No construction will occur within the drip lines of any trees that are 4" in diameter or larger. However, in order to ensure that all trees on site are protected, we plan to root prune 3 ft out from excavation and to install protective fencing at that same point. The root pruning is scheduled for February during dormancy and months prior to construction.

There are also numerous accent trees and newly planted over-story trees (all 2" caliber or less) no closer than 50 ft from the construction area and will be fully contained within the tree protection area.

1. White Oak - 30" in diameter
2. White Oak - 18" in diameter
3. Tulip Poplar - 18" in diameter
4. White Oak - 12" in diameter
5. White Oak - 8" in diameter
6. Red Oak - 12" in diameter
7. Red Oak - 18" in diameter
8. White Oak - 12" in diameter
9. White Oak - 12" in diameter
10. Red Oak - 12" in diameter
11. White Oak - 18" in diameter

TREE SURVEY
1 in = 30 ft

AUGUSTINE-OPPENHEIM RESIDENCE
7204 Cedar Ave, Takoma Park, MD 20912
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Braitman Design Studio
MBIC License #125978
120 Park Ave
Takoma Park, MD 20912
Phone: 301-861-3800

www.BraitmanDesign.Com
NORTHWEST SIDE FACADE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's mailing address</th>
<th>Owner's Agent's mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Augustine &amp; Adam Oppenheim</td>
<td>JACKIE BRAITMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9029 FAIRVIEW RD</td>
<td>Braitman Design Studio, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER SPRING, MD 20910-4120</td>
<td>120 PARK AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912-4311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BADT STEVEN M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEISS ALICE M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7201 CEDAR AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARAFELLI JOSEPH JR &amp; M A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7203 CEDAR AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAMBERG GEMMA &amp; DANIEL M LEVIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7205 CEDAR AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS PROPOSAL
E3 - EXISTING - RIGHT ELEVATION
3/32 in = 1 ft
E4 - EXISTING LEFT SIDE
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ALL HISTORIC ELEMENTS RETAINED
- Roof Line & Gable Dormers
- Painted Clapboard
- Wood Porch Columns and Porch Trim
- Concrete Porch
- Wood Eave Trim Windows & Doors

HISTORIC MASSING UNCHANGED

STAIRS TO NEW SIDE PORCH

WHEELEDCHAIR RAMP BLENDED INTO LANDSCAPE MULLS

E1 - PROPOSED FRONT - TULIP ELEVATION
3/32 in = 1 ft
E2 - PROPOSED BACK ELEVATION
3/32 in = 1 ft
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

---

HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT -
17 Hesketh Street : HPC Case No. 35/13-18C
---

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION -
7204 Cedar Avenue :
---

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
January 23, 2018, commencing at 7:34 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

Deposition Services, Inc.
12321 Middlebrook Road, Suite 210
Germantown, MD 20874
Tel: (301) 881-3344 Fax: (301) 881-3338
info@DepositionServices.com www.DepositionServices.com
ALSO PRESENT:
Phillip Estes
Michael Kyne
Daniel Bruechert

APPEARANCES

STATEMENT OF: PAGE
Charlet Wang 16
Jackie Braitman 32
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MR. KIRWAN: Any discussion? All in favor, please raise your right hand.

VOTE.

MR. KIRWAN: The motion passes unanimously. We want to thank you for coming out tonight, Ms. Wang, and wish you the best with your project as you go forward. Thank you.

The next item on our agenda this evening is a preliminary consultation for 7204 Cedar Avenue in Takoma Park. Do we have a Staff Report?

MR. KYNE: Yes, we do. Thank you. Again, 7204 Cedar Avenue, Takoma Park. This is an outstanding resource, classical revival style, circa 1913. And the applicant is here tonight with a proposal for a building addition and other alterations. And I will start with a walk around the property.

This is starting at the front. And this is actually from Tulip Avenue. And, as you can see, we have quite a large setback here. And this is, I'm angled sort of to the left front, and then just moving right around. This is across the street, again on Tulip Avenue, looking directly at the front at a right angle. And then across Cedar Avenue and moving up.

And then this is moving toward the rear. The rear yard. Back on the same side of the street as the house.
Looking across the rear yard at the rear neighbor. And then from the approximate rear right hand corner looking back at the house. And then, moving into the rear yard. This is looking straight on at the rear. Moving to the left, and when I say left and right in this instance, I'm referring to as viewed from the front. And this is the left side. Toward the front of the house looking back along the left side into the rear. This is the right side. And then the front from the left corner.

And, this is the front dormer. And, as you may have noted, this is identical to the three dormers on the rear. Another view of the front dormers. This is just looking at the existing paver patio/driveway in the rear. And this is looking at an existing terracotta walkway that leads from the sidewalk to the house. This is on the right side of the house. And you may have also noted the terracotta sidewalk in the previous photos along Cedar Avenue on this side of the street.

This is an example of the chain link fence that is in the windows, all of the windows, currently, for security. On the front their actually installed on the inside. And then, on the sides and rear, they're installed on the outside. And just a quick view of some of the trees in the rear yard. I'm not sure if any of these are proposed to be impacted but, we want to make sure that we are taking this
into consideration.

And then the plans. The image on the screen in front of you is actually the existing site plan, which I inadvertently left out of the Staff Report. And the proposed site plan. Existing floor plans. Existing elevations. Then proposed floor plans and elevations.

The applicable guidelines in this case are the Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines, and the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. And, onto discussion. As you can see from the photographs, this is a one and a half story classic revival style outstanding resource. And records indicate that the historic house was constructed in 1913, replacing a Queen Anne style house that burned that same year. The house is located on a corner lot as noted, and as seen in the photographs, the front of the house faces Tulip Avenue, and the right side faces Cedar Avenue. And because of this, three of its elevations are clearly visible. That being the front, rear and right side. And the applicant has indicated that house experienced previous alterations including the replacement of the original slate roof with asphalt, and the replacement of the original clapboard siding on the dormers with asphalt shingles.

So, I'll just go into some detail for the proposed work. There is an extensive list of restoration work
including replacing the existing asphalt roof with slate.
Replacing the asphalt shingles on the dormers with wood
clapboard siding to match the historic house. Repairing the
exterior trim, siding and foundation walls as necessary.
Repairing the original windows and doors. Repairing the
original shutters. Repairing the original porch columns.
Removing the chain link security coverings from the windows.

Regarding the additions, the proposal is to
countect and one and a half story addition at the rear of
the house which will be connected by a one-story hypen. And
the proposed materials for the hypen and the addition
include fiber cement siding, SDL wood windows, and standing
seam metal roofing. Other work includes the construction of
an attached deck at the left side of the proposed hypen and
rear addition. The construction of a covered porch at the
right side of the proposed hypen.

The construction of stone paver walkways at the
right side of the property connecting to the proposed
coverage porch. Construction of a stone wheelchair ramp at
the right side of the property connecting to the proposed
covered porch. The alteration of a small roof overhang at
the rear/left side of the historic house. Changing the
existing shed roof overhang to a gable roof overhang. And
the conversion of an existing original window at the rear of
the historic house to a French door.
Staff does fully support restoration and repair work finding that it will enhance the preservation of the resource. But I do ask for your guidance regarding the following, and for many of the things I'll list here, I did go in-depth in the Staff Report, so I won't repeat that verbatim here tonight, but hopefully, you've all had a chance to read that, and we can reference that if we need to. But, the questions that I, or the issues that I would seek your guidance on include the following: does the combined length of the proposed hyphen and rear addition have the potential to detract from and/or overwhelm the historic house? Is the hyphen approach appropriate at the subject property, or would a more traditional addition be more compatible with the surrounding district and streetscape? If the Commission finds that the hyphen approach is appropriate in this case, should the materials and/or design be more clearly differentiated from the historic house, especially given the hyphen's visibility from Cedar Avenue?

Would a more traditional addition be more appropriate, although it would require the alteration and/or removal of character defining features which are clearly visible from the right-of-way? I see any general guidance regarding the proposed materials, especially the standing seam metal roofing, and with regard to that, I would be looking for advice or more specifically, I'd be asking you
to give the applicant advice regarding the finish and the ridge details for the standing seam metal roof. Any guidance regarding the proposed conversion of the original window at the rear to a French door, noting the visibility from Cedar Avenue, and that the Guidelines for outstanding resources encourage the preservation of original windows and doors.

And, as I did state in the Staff Report, while the Guidelines do stress the importance of preserving the original windows and doors, if you find the hyphen approach appropriate, and if you find the proposal appropriate, that window will not be visible from Cedar Avenue. Any guidance regarding the proposed alteration of the small roof overhang at the rear left side of the house. And Staff asks that the applicant provide any additional information regarding the existing overhang that may help the Commission in making their recommendations. Specifically regarding date and whether or not that is original.

And this was not in the Staff Report, but it has come to Staff's attention that this property may be in a sensitive area as the existing terracotta sidewalks along Cedar Avenue are the only remaining original sidewalks in the historic district. The City of Takoma Park is actively working with Historic Takoma to formulate a plan to protect these sidewalks. From the submitted site plan it is unclear
how the existing rear paver driveway is proposed to be
altered, and whether these alterations have the potential to
impact the adjacent sidewalks. Staff asks the applicant to
clarify the proposal so that the Commission can ensure that
the sidewalks will not be damaged. And, Staff also notes
that there is an existing terracotta walkway. You saw that
in the photos at the right side of the house. The walkway
shares characteristics with the sidewalks along Cedar
Avenue, but it's unclear if it is original and/or if it is
proposed to be altered. Any information that can be
provided regarding the walkway, and whether it is original,
will help the Commission make informed recommendations.

And, so with that, I do recommend the applicant
make any revisions based on the Historic Preservation
Commission's recommendations and return for a HAWP. And
finally, I do want to show you some of the existing
surrounding streetscape. This was just taken from Google
street view. So this is basically from the subject property
or the same side of the street as the subject property
looking at the houses on the opposite side of the street of
Cedar Avenue. So moving along. And then this is the
existing property to the rear. and with that, I would be
glad to take any questions you might have for me.

MR. KIRWAN: Michael, have we heard from Historic
Takoma?
MR. KYNE: We haven't received any comments, no.

MR. KIRWAN: And we're kind of referring to this as a hyphen, but it's not the typical hyphen that we usually see and want to see, more of a connector. So, determining the use of that word versus just calling the whole thing an addition, I'm just curious. Is it just because it's physically in floor plan?

MR. KYNE: I think, in discussing with the applicant it was, in discussing with the applicants and determining why they were proposing this design, it was for the same reasons that we would often see a hyphen proposed. It's to separate the addition from the historic house providing differentiation. As I noted in the Staff Report, this one has some major differences from what we usually see in a hyphen. Hypens are usually very modest. They're not as long as the ones being proposed, and one of the main objectives in having a hyphen at the rear is, of course, differentiation. But in making it more modest, it reduces the visibility from the oblique angles at the front. Because you can see the rear clearly from Cedar Avenue, it may not be as appropriate in this case.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. And the last question I had was, the side porch, deck, which is the side entrance into the house, it's rendered as if it, I mean, it kind of looks like it's brick. Have there been any indication of what the
material is for the side porch yet, or is that specified?

MR. KYNE: It hasn't been specified.

MR. KIRWAN: I mean, it has a lattice opening, so it almost look like it would be a light structure, like it would be a wood structure. We can ask the applicant.

MR. KYNE: Yes, let's ask the applicant because, as I noted, it hasn't been specified, so I'm not sure.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay. Any other questions?

MS. HEILER: You had mentioned the terracotta paving. Can you tell us again what would be the impact on the existing terracotta paving around the house?

MR. KYNE: Well again, one of my main reasons for mentioning that in the Staff Report tonight, I want the applicants to be aware that this information has come to light, and I want them to provide any information to you and to us as Staff, that might help us in making our future recommendations, because at this point it's unclear whether it will be impacted. I don't believe that it will, but I think it's just important that that's on the record, and that we can note that it will not be.

MS. VOIGT: Because, Michael, the existing walkway, there is an existing walkway that's adjacent to the terracotta, and the brick paving pad. None of this that connects to the terracotta is new? We can ask the applicant that too.
MR. KYNE: So -- yeah, let's ask the applicant.

But, if you look at the existing site plan, we can see the terracotta walkway at the right side that I identified in the photographs. And it looks to be in the same location in the proposed, so I don't think that's being impacted. But, it would be, I think, important for us to make that determination tonight.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions?

MR. ARKIN: Mr. Chairman, yes. Am I correct in assuming that the house is not occupied?

MR. KYNE: That is my understanding, yes. So, if you want me to be a little more specific. Again, the applicants can address this but, I believe the house is currently unoccupied, but it's planned to be occupied by the daughter of the present owners.

MR. ARKIN: And because it's been unoccupied was the reason for installing the chain link?

MR. KYNE: That's my understanding, yes.

MR. ARKIN: Okay, thank you.

MR. KRIWAN: 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 then we probably have some questions for you. And, please state your name for the record before you speak.

MS. BRAINTMAN: I'm Jackie Braitman.
MR. KIRWAN: Is it on yet? Push the little square button and the light will come on. There you go.

MS. BRAINTMAN: Jackie Braitman, Braitman Design Studio. I'm an agent for the owners. The answer to your question is that that chain link has been on for a very long time. The owners, current owner is the estate of the Augustines, and the heir is their daughter, who is my client. The Augustines have owned the house for 65 years, and Nancy, the daughter, the current owner, or to be owned, the heir, is very interested in restoring the house and preserving its character. The terracotta walkway is not being impacted. The existing terracotta walkway on the property, so the -- this is brick, and not historic. This is terracotta and is the same terracotta as the sidewalk that is in the, on Cedar Avenue. There's no work that we would be proposing that would impact the terracotta.

We worked real hard to try to come up with a proposal that would meet the guidelines as we understood them. And so, because of the shape, if you could put the side view, the view from Cedar, because of the shape of the house and the shape of the roof, and the three back dormers, and the fact that it's on a corner and so visible, it was a challenge to come up with a program that would meet my client's needs as well as preserve that character. And it's, you know, in our view, a gable end addition would
destroy the character of the house viewed from Cedar, in particular.

So, I've always called it a connector rather than an ell. That connector is specifically meant to, so that from any view, you know, any oblique view or direct view from Cedar, you could always see the defining characteristics of the house. So that's one of the reasons for the length of that connector. You know, the reason I included the perspective view in addition to the elevations is because you can see that as you bring that addition closer to the house, we start to obscure the defining characteristics of the house. And, in addition, my client was very, I mean, from her perspective, she wants to preserve the interior character of the house too. And those upstairs rooms, what you don't appreciate from the pictures is that the house has 10 and 11 foot ceilings, including on the second floor. And the views from those dormers are quite dramatic, and we really don't want to block those views. So, that's one of the reasons for the long connector and for the way the addition is designed.

By my reading of the guidelines which talks about scale and character and form, it seems to me that we are in compliance with the guidelines, even though, if you look at the, you know, yes, the length along Cedar of the new construction is virtually identical to the historic massing.
They're both about 50 feet. But because of the way the
connector and addition are developed, the scale, the massing
is clearly subordinate to it. And I think that also the
materials help define that difference. So the standing seam
metal roof, which actually fairly typical in the
neighborhood. One of the streets almost directly across,
one of the houses almost directly across the street is a
standing seam metal roof. I know that there is a house on
Willow which was a standing seam metal roof, and you guys
allowed them to remove that decaying roof a few years ago.
But of that period, standing seam metal was typical in the
construction there.

In addition, Cedar Avenue -- so, this is the site
of the original Gilbert house. Gilbert is the gentleman who
developed Takoma Park, and this was his house. The Queen
Anne house that burned was his house. It was substantially
more massive than the existing house. It was a Queen Anne,
and the houses around it, the, absolutely, the pictures that
Michael showed were directly across the street. But if you
going one more block, there are some very large houses, and the
lots on Cedar are larger than the average lots in Takoma
Park. And most of those houses are larger. So, I don't
think that the proposal is counter to the scale of that part
of the neighborhood. Whereas, I'm on Park Avenue, a few
blocks away, and it would be completely inappropriate on
Park. So, I think that's everything.

MR. KIRWAN: All right, great. Thank you for our testimony. I have a couple of questions. Coming back to the metal roof. The Commission has spent a long time looking at modern metal roofs compared to old historic metal roofs, and back in the day when you could still do painted tin, that was a great modern material to use --

MS. BRAITMAN: Right.

MR. KIRWAN: -- for a standing seam metal roof. We've had concerns with the modern prefinished roof systems because they tend to have, because those joints are welded and seamed, they have heavy cap details, heavy venting details, heavy eave line details, so it'd be important as you begin to formalize exactly what material you want to use there to better understand, because we're making reference to historic metal roofs, but my guess is that's, you know, unless you're going to do a standing seam copper roof, which I'd be all in favor of, but that would be very expensive. You know, I think we'll struggle with prefinished metal roofs as we go forward.

MS. BRAITMAN: Okay.

MR. KIRWAN: And going back to a question I asked Staff, the side porch deck, is that --

MS. BRAITMAN: It's wood construction.

MR. KIRWAN: It's a wood deck, okay.
MS. BRAINTMAN: It is, it could be something different, but it's currently proposed as wood.

MR. KIRWAN: All right. Yes, Commissioner Firestone?

MR. FIRESTONE: Okay, I'll try and kick this off, but one thing about the size of the lot and the proportions and size of this building, if I remember correctly, if you continue along Cedar towards Holly, the property adjacent to this one, doesn't it have basically have two houses on it?

MS. BRAINTMAN: As you continue along Tulip towards --

MR. FIRESTONE: Tulip rather, yes, towards Holly.

MS. BRAINTMAN: You know, I'm, that's where Wolfgang lives and I'm not completely sure of where those property lines are.

MR. FIRESTONE: But it's like one house is behind the other there?

MS. BRAINTMAN: Yes, that's right. Although, the house I think directly adjacent on Tulip has already entered into some kind of, I'm sure I'll use the term incorrectly, an historic preservation easement, so because of the size of the lot which guarantees that the lot is not subdivided. And my client intends to enter into the same type of agreement with this lot to further protect the house. But, you know, it is a huge lot.

MR. FIRESTONE: Yeah, I mean, the point I was
trying to make is that, considering the size of the lot and
considering the historic house that was there previously, I
don't know that enlarging this house is unreasonable.

MS. BRAITMAN: Yeah, we're still at something
like, you know, even with the addition, 15 percent lot
coverage or something like that.

MR. FIRESTONE: The other question I had concerned
the terracotta pavers. You said there shouldn't be any
impact on them, but I think, I'm wondering is you are going
to take some consideration for protecting or perhaps even
removing and reinstalling them once construction starts?

MS. BRAITMAN: The plan was, is to, in the same
way that we would do a tree protection plan, we would do a
plan to protect those pavers on the lot, and also the pavers
that we would be crossing as we bring construction equipment
into the site. They actually are in pretty good, the
sidewalk on the property is in quite good shape, and my
worry would be that in uninstalling them, we would damage.
them. And so, my current plan would be to protect them
rather than to uninstall them and reinstall them.

MR. KIRWAN: Just to add onto that. I think it'll
be important ultimately for us to see exactly where that
existing walkway ends and how you're connecting into it. In
the drawings it looks seamlessly, they all look like they're
one material. So, at some point, we're going to want to see
the detail of --

MS. BRAITMAN: There's actually a step, right at the, right at where the current parking pad is, there's a, it's really a short, really tiny retaining wall, and it's a step, and that's where the brick starts and the pavers end.

MR. KIRWAN: Well, just make that very clear in the drawings. What material you're using compared to the new material will be important for us to see as you go forward. Commissioner Voigt, you had a question?

MS. VOIGT: Hi. Well, thank you very much for taking care of this house. I think it's a beautiful house.

MS. BRAITMAN: Isn't it a great house? Yeah.

MS. VOIGT: Yeah, I think so. It could be the lot too, it's really pretty. But, my question, so that the original house is one and a half stories, and the addition is one and a half stories, but because, you're saying because of this hyphen or because of this separator, that you won't get the feeling. And I think the grade of the property --

MS. BRAITMAN: It's slight. The front grade is pretty steep, but in the back there's a little bit of grade there, but not a whole lot. But it does set it down a little bit. The addition is not actually one and a half stories. It's a vaulted ceiling, but the roofs line is the same as, the same slope as the historic roofline, and the
windows are the same. So it appears to be a one and a half
story addition. It's really a one-story addition.

MS. VOIGT: Okay.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions?

MS. HEILER: Yes. I'm assuming that the
foundation of the connector there is not ever visible
because of the steps. Does the foundation of the addition,
whatever part is visible, and the wall by the wheelchair
ramp, does that match the foundation of the house?

MS. BRAITMAN: No. This is one of the curious
things. It's a stone foundation. I mean it's, you'll love
to walk into this basement. You know, the base of the stone
foundation walls are about 30 inches wide, you know, and
they taper up to, you know, 15 inches or so. What doesn't
make sense is that that's not typical of construction for a
house in 1913. So we believe that at least some of those
stone walls were original foundation walls of the Gilbert
house. However, one of the foundation, one of them is no
longer, it's in the middle of the house and is no longer
supporting. We suspect it was the original exterior wall of
the Gilbert house, and then they matched that stone
foundation in building a portion of the new house that goes
beyond that. That's supposition, because we can't find
plans on it. But, I don't, we couldn't match that. It's a
limestone, it's a pretty soft stone, which is one of the
reasons we're doing as little as possible to that stone
foundation. We were planning on doing poured concrete for
the foundation walls for the connector, and for the
addition. But they would not be visible, mostly because of
that, of the wheelchair ramp and the porch.

MS. BARNES: Several questions. I share my
colleagues views that it looks like a very, very wonderful
house and it's great to know that it's going to be rehabbed.
Really, a slate roof or a fake slate roof?

MS. BRAINTMAN: No. My client is committed to this
house, and she wants to install a true fake, a true fake, a
true slate roof. Yeah.

MS. BARNES: Which will make the issue of any
metal seam roof become even more important, I think, in
terms of how it corresponds. I wanted to ask about the
lights in the doorway in the connector. You have side
lights? At least it appears that.

MS. BREITMAN: Right.

MS. BARNES: And, I --

MS. BRAINTMAN: Because the original house has side
lights.

MS. BARNES: I see.

MS. BRAINTMAN: So if you look at the, well there's
not a good picture of it in any of the material you've seen.
The front porch that faces Tulip has two glass doors with
side lights. So, that's the, you know, I actually had not
originally drawn it that way, but she wanted the skylights
to coordinate with the original.

MS. BARNES: Okay. And there seems to be a
pergola over the deck?

MS. BRAITMAN: Yeah.

MS. BARNES: Okay.

MS. BRAITMAN: Which is not visible from any place,
but yes.

MS. BARNES: And then, I wanted to ask you, given
the size of the lot and everything, if you had given
consideration to having the connector and the addition
slightly broader? It would appear that you have doorways
out onto the deck.

MS. BRAITMAN: Right.

MS. BARNES: And I just wondered if you had given
any thought to that all being a little broader. This, I
suppose, comes back to the question of a more standard
addition rather than a connector with --

MS. BRAITMAN: One of the, as is true with any
house of this era, one of the drawbacks for today's
lifestyle is no indoor/outdoor connection. And, except for
the front porch, although the chain link kind of destroys
that right at the moment. But, Mrs. Augustine, was a
gardener, and while the garden beds haven't been maintained
well in the last 10 or 15 years, it's a wonderfully
landscaped lot. And Nancy very much wants to restore the
garden beds and improve them, and get an indoor/outdoor
connection. And so one of the reasons we did design it the
way we did, was so that while preserving completely the
historic view, we could create good light and garden views
from the kitchen, and from the new master bedroom. So,
that's the reason we did it the way we did it, and if we
brought it farther over, we would, it would make it harder
to create that connection.

MS. BARNES: And because you've mentioned the
garden beds and the lot, are there any trees that would be
impacted by your design?

MS. BRAITMAN: Thankfully, no. I'm not quite sure
why they didn't allow any mature trees to grow that close to
the house in the back, but no.

MS. BARNES: Because they were wise.

MS. BRAITMAN: Could be, but there are -- and
unfortunately, a lot, they've lost a lot of the mature oaks
that were in that area. And we've already started planting
more trees.

MS. BARNES: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions? Do you have
question? Okay.

MR. ARKIN: I guess what I'm asking are questions.
But I'll begin by saying that I think the connector as you've described it is, really does succeed in drawing attention to the features of the main house, of the old historic house, and limiting, rather than obscuring them. I am concerned about two things that sort of jumped out at me, and I wonder if you could tell me why you plan on doing that. On the connector, looking at Circle 19, that elevation, the Cedar Avenue elevation, why do you have two windows with the shutters butting? You don't seem to have that anywhere else on the property, and I'm wondering why you chose those option if there is some other option that wouldn't stand out so much.

MS. BRAINTMAN: May I ask whether the question is about the shutters or about the windows or both?

MR. ARKIN Well, both, really. You have on the original house the conventional, the conventional windows on the first floor seem to be shuttered, and you have the showier windows in the gable.

MR. KIRWAN: Commissioner Arkin, can I make a suggestion?

MR. ARKIN: Yeah.

MR. KIRWAN: That you simply state what you think is the appropriate thing to do in your comments during deliberation as opposed to asking a rhetorical, I mean not a rhetorical, but a sort of an open ended question that -- I
think you should state what your opinion is on those windows
and your comments.

MR. ARKIN: I don't have an answer. That's why
I'm posing it as a question.

MR. KIRWAN: Then maybe if you don't have the
answer --

MR. ARKIN: So, I don't have the answer. And so
I'm asking.

MR. KIRWAN: Somebody else might pick it up, or
it's maybe not a question to ask.

MR. ARKIN: And then my other question has to do
with the standing seam roof. And it's quite a lot of roof
you're adding to the historic house, and with the colors
that you show on your renderings, it tends to, from that
perspective it seems to overwhelm the roof, and I was, the
slate roof, and I was wondering if there's some way you
could perhaps, maybe, mute the color so it would not be so
striking?

MS. BRAITMAN: Absolutely. And, you know, as I'm
sitting here, one of the, you know, and thinking about the
problems with trying to do anything with the metal that
would not cause problems in terms of modernity, inclined to
go to talk to my client about a copper roof on the
connector, standing seam copper roof on the connector and a
shingle roof, you know, an asphalt shingle roof on the
addition, which I think would probably solve the problem
that you're raising as well as the issue of the materials.

MR. KIRWAN: Any other questions for the
applicant?

MS. BRAINTMAN: Can I ask a question?

MR. KIRWAN: Sure.

MS. BRAINTMAN: One of the things that we've
proposed in this is metal railings. And I haven't heard any
concern about that. I wonder if there is any concern about
that?

MR. KIRWAN: I, for one, don't. I think they're
most appropriate when they're fully exposed to the weather
like this. Wood and, you know, they're getting better and
better with the synthetic wood railings, but they often
still look a little fake, so I don't have a personal issue
with metal railings when they're out and exposed like this.
I think you're seeing heads nodding in agreement with that.

I'll just kick off with my comments. I do support
the addition, an addition to this house, and I think the
general configuration of what you've done, I find to be
something that is an appropriate response to this resource
for all the reasons you stated. I think it -- I do
appreciate what you're doing with the hyphen with regards to
the interior views from the back of the house out into the
garden. So I think that can be a good response.
I think my biggest issue that I kind of raised at the Staff report was, the hyphen is not reading like a hyphen. And I think it really should. It should. And I think more to the point with the introduction of a copper roof, that's going to differentiate it even more from the other two volumes. I think the hyphen should read like some sort of enclosed glass gallery or something like that, so it really does read as a distinct thing separating these two pieces. And you have an opportunity, within the hyphen you're actually showing us the back side of the hyphen. The better side of the hyphen is what's facing the garden, and I think, I would consider flipping that plan. That gives you the opportunity to have this very glassy long hallway that leads from the bedroom back to the rest of the house. And puts those -- I'm not going to take comments or questions. This is our thoughts that you'll have to take back to Staff and consider.

So, that's my kind of view on this hyphen, is it's right now looking too much like both the addition and the original resource, and it really needs to read as a distinct piece on its own. As you have already kind of alluded to, I think the roofs, and I don't think the roof of the hyphen necessarily has to be copper. I think it could be an asphalt shingle roof if the roof of the addition is an asphalt shingle roof. They could all be slate. But I think
metal, I'm concerned about metal for the all the reasons I posed in my question. Standing seam copper would be great, and I think that would be an acceptable solution for the hypen, but again, it kind of leads to the hypen wanting to read more like a hypen.

With regards to the ramp, I do have concerns about the curvilinear shape of it. I totally agree the ramp is something completely appropriate to request, especially for long term residents in the house. But I think you actually ought to push the ramp up against the house and have the planting bed be what's facing the street, so that helps conceal the ramp and its exposure to the street view, and puts the planting bed that allows the plants to grow and conceal the railing that's coming down. I think the ramp's a little bit too much of a sculptural, calling too much attention to itself as some sort of sculptural thing that doesn't fit with the style of the house. I think it could be more rectilinear and concealed by the planters.

The railing details. You brought up the railings. The railing details will be important. Staff has lots of guidelines on things that we've approved before with regard to railings, so I would definitely get information from them on what you finally present to us. And with regard to the foundation, I'm a little, I was a little paused by the concrete foundation comment. I think actually wherever the
foundation is exposed, especially on the rear elevation, because there's no decks and things concealing it, it will be visible from public space. You might want to consider putting a parge coat over it that can be painted to match the stone foundation. Similarly, with the planting beds, I'm a little hesitant with stone on the ramp and the planting beds, so you may want to consider making a parged wall surface your sort of standard for the foundations of the addition to again, make those distinct from the stone foundation of the resource.

And lastly, Staff, I'm sure, will advise you, we're going to want to see a lot of information and specificity on the types of windows and doors you'll be using for the project, the muntin details, all that kind of stuff that they can sort of direct you to what we've find appropriate. You know, but I think a lot of the things I'm talking about are detail tweaks. I'm not talking about major changes to this project, and I think it's really just sort of tweaking it to get it there. But I think it's very close right now. It's generally headed in a great direction, and I appreciate your work with your client to do a sensitive addition to this resource.

MS. HEILER: I agree with the Chairman, that I think this is the right approach to putting an addition on this house. And with his suggestion that the better side of
the hypen faces the garden, and you might want to use that
for the side that's most visible. I disagree with the whole
idea of having three different roof materials, the slate on
the house, and using wood on the or even asphalt shingle on
the addition, and copper on the hypen. I think, you know,
the state of the art right now with standing seam metal
roofs that are prefinished has improved enormously in the
last couple of years, and I think that you can come up with
quite an appropriate standing seam metal roof that's what a
matte finish that you could use on both the hypen and the
addition. I would certainly not put an asphalt shingle roof
on the addition with slate on the house. The addition does
deffer to the house, but not that much.

I fully understand what you're doing with this
very long connector in preserving the view from the dormers
on the house. I think though that the connector is
disconcertingly long. If there is any way to reduce that
size, and one way of doing it is as the Chairman suggested,
making it glass. Otherwise, any way that you can reduce the
length of it, I think improves the look of the total
addition. Moving that at the addition closer to the house,
I think benefits the entire structure. I think you've done
a masterful job in repeating many of the elements of the
house, the design elements in the addition and simplifying
them somewhat. I think that's completely successful. And,
I agree with the notion of making the visible parts of the foundation, parging them or doing something to prevent that concrete from the contrast that it would provide with the house. And, in general, I don't like metal railings, but sometimes I think you have to do it. I hate to see a metal railing on a house that's this good but, you know, you're the architect.

MS. BARNES: I have to say that I appreciate the project you've brought to us. I do not share quite the concerns of other Commissioners about the length of the connector. I think that you could distinguish it a bit by removing the shutters on the windows and altering them slightly. And I find that the door with the lights, which is sympathetic to the main structure, perhaps is mimicking it too much and then not giving us the differentiation that we want. And I think there's always this tension between differentiation and sympathetic additions, and I appreciate what I think you've done in terms of being sympathetic.

I feel that the Chair's suggestion about the ramp is a very excellent one. And, I also support the suggestions about parging if you're using the concrete. I think that would work out better. And I am glad to hear that you will be taking steps to protect the terracotta walkways.

MR. FIRESTONE: I'm not going to add too much to
the comments of the other Commissioners, other than to say
that I think that this is a very thoughtful and sensitive
project that you're undertaking and your concerns about the
original house, and doing, you know, keeping that as the
primary focus of the area so that it will be visible and
they'll be minimal alteration to is, and preserving it, is
admirable and I'm looking forward to seeing some finished
plans on this.

MR. SUTTON: Hi. I like the building a lot. I've
been very interested in this type of Colonial revival, Greek
revival, and I think it's preserving the front of the house
is fantastic. I would like to see the connector reduced
some. If you need more space, you might be able to put it
in the rear addition. And so I agree that, I don't feel
strongly one way or the other about the roof on the
addition.

The one thing I would like to see that, is the
Palladian window on the addition. Palladian windows, look
like they match the ones on the historic side, and I would
like to see a little bit of differentiation. And the reason
I say that, the other windows on the addition are different
than the windows on the historic house in design, and I'd
like to see, I think, you know, the shutters and the windows
themselves are a little bit different, and I'd like to see,
personally, but I'm not going to fall on my sword over it,
maybe some modification of the Palladian windows.

MR. ARKIN: I don't have very much to add. I do think that the suggestion of shortening the connector is worth looking at. Even shortening it a little bit would make it stand out less. If you decide not to reverse the inside treatment of the connector, then I would suggest that you remove the shutters on the connector. I think they're unnecessary. They're not on the other side of the connector. And, be careful where you're using windows that abut. I also think that the comment about the curvilinear ramp is an excellent comment. I think having a ramp like this is wonderful if the objective is to keep the house comfortable perhaps for aging, for the occupant to age in place. But the curvilinear treatment does stand out.

And similarly, I agree with the prior speaker that the Palladian window should repeat the suggestion or the sense of the window in the historic house, but not duplicate it exactly.

MS. VOIGT: Okay, well I'll just wrap it up. I think this is a great project. I really appreciate your restoration work on this house. I think it's a beautiful house. The size of the lot, I don't have a problem with the length of the connector. I actually think it works pretty well. I mean, when I looked through at a lot of different hypens, because I also thought that a hyphen should be more
differentiated. But I went and looked at materials, and
many of the hypens kind of do resemble the addition. So, I
think this works really well. I think that the
Commissioners had a lot of great details that I won't
repeat, but I think they will really work well. So, it's
all good. Thank you.

MR. FIRESTONE: Mr. Chairman, can I add one more
comment?

MR. KIRWAN: Yes.

MR. FIRESTONE: I'm in favor of a longer hyphen or
connector, or whatever we want to call it, because I think,
as you stated, one of the reasons for doing that is to
preserve the views and appearance of the original house, and
that if you make that shorter or larger, or bring the
addition closer in, it will start to obscure the main house.

MR. KIRWAN: So I think overall you heard some
pretty consistent comments. And again, I think it really is
the details. I think the general approach seems to be very
strong and we're very supportive of it. You should consult
with Staff, but I think many of things are easily solvable,
and we hope to see you when you come in for a historic area
work permit.

MS. BRAITMAN: Thank you.

MR. KIRWAN: Thank you very much for coming in
tonight. Okay. The next item on our agenda are the meeting
minutes. Do we have any that we should approve tonight, as
a closing to the old way of doing?

MR. ESTES: Mr. Chairman, no, we have no meetings
to approve tonight.

MR. KIRWAN: Okay, very good. And I do not
believe we need a volunteer for tonight, so we'll move on to
Commission items. None? Then we'll have a few Staff items
to discuss.

MR. KYNE: Yes. We looked at two Staff items in
the worksession. One for 5912 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase,
and that was approved. And then we looked at a revision at
7400 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda, and that was not approved.

MR. KIRWAN: That's correct. We agree with those
conclusions. And with that, we're adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 8:59 p.m., the meeting was
adjourned.)