Preliminary Consultation
MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 10201 Menlo Ave.  
Meeting Date: 9/19/18

Resource: Vacant lot  
Report Date: 9/12/18

Capitol View Park Historic District

Review: Preliminary Consultation  
Public Notice: 9/5/18

Applicant: Minter Farnsworth  
Staff: Dan Bruechert

Proposal: New Construction

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC make the recommended change by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and return for either a second preliminary consultation or HAWP.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Vacant lot within the Capitol View Park Historic District
STYLE: N/A
DATE: N/A

The parcel is currently undeveloped and is located at the corner of Menlo Ave. and Loma St. in the Capitol View Historic District. The lot slopes steeply down a ravine and into a conservation easement that covers the rear third of the lot. When the district was surveyed and established in 1982, this area of the Capitol View Historic District was identified as associated with the period 1870-1916.

When the Capitol View Park Historic District was established in 1982, the subject property was part of a much larger parcel of the Hahn House c. 1895 (2801 Barker St.). The lot was subdivided on February 5, 1986 into six separate lots. At the time of subdivision a conservation easement was created that includes the easternmost third of the subject property. The other lots were subsequently developed, leaving the subject property as the only undeveloped land as part of this subdivision. A re-survey of the district in July 1990 identified 10201 Menlo Ave. as ‘Vacant Lot’.
BACKGROUND
A HAWP for this property was reviewed and approved by the HPC at the February 13, 2018 HPC meeting. The approval was appealed to the Montgomery County Board of Appeals and an appeal was heard on May 23, 2018. The June 29, 2018 opinion reversed the HPC decision to approve the HAWP.*

The Board of Appeals found that:
“the Intervenor’s (Mr. Farnsworth’s) proposal is not compatible with the character and nature of the overall historic district… the Board finds that the proposed house would be visible from Menlo Avenue and is out of proportion to the houses on Menlo Avenue. The Board therefore finds that the size and massing of the propose house is not in accordance with the historic district where the Property is located and is not compatible with the historic district, and that the building of the proposed house would impair the character of the historic district… The Board finds that the Intervenor can adjust the scale and mass of the proposed house so that the proposal is compatible with the other resources within the historic district.”

PROPOSAL
The applicant proposes to construct a two-story house with a rear deck and an attached garage, construct a retaining wall, fencing, driveway and parking area.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES
When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Capitol View Park Historic District, several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the Approved & Adopted Sector Plan for Capitol View & Vicinity (Sector Plan), 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.

Approved & Adopted Sector Plan for Capitol View & Vicinity (Sector Plan)
1. 1870-1916: Characterized by large lots and variety of setbacks, and architecturally encompassing the “Victorian” residential and revival styles and the early bungalow style popular during this period, these twenty-two houses are of a higher degree of architectural and historical significance than the other structures within the district.
2. Nominal: These houses of themselves are of no architectural or historical significance, but through their contiguity to the significant resources have some interest to the district.
3. Spatial: Spatial resources are unimproved parcels of land which visually and aesthetically contribute to the setting of the historic district, and which can be regarded as extensions of the environmental settings of the significant historic resources.
* Note: All the Approved and Adopted Sector Plan for Capitol View & Vicinity does not apply more stringent review to certain classes of resources in the same manner as the Design Guidelines for Takoma Park or Chevy Chase.

Montgomery County Code, Chapter 24A Historic Resources Preservation
(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
(d) In the case of an application for work on an historic resource located within an historic district, the commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historical or design significance or for plans involving new construction, unless such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding historic resources or would impair the character of the historic district. (Ord. No. 9-4, § 1; Ord. No. 11-59.)

_The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation_

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

**STAFF DISCUSSION**

The applicant proposes to construct a single-family home on the property located at 10201 Menlo Ave. and seeks feedback from the HPC prior to the submission of a HAWP application.

![Figure 2: View of the house from the corner of Menlo Ave. and Loma St](image-url)

**Lot Restrictions**

The subject property is located at the intersection of Loma St. and Menlo Ave. The lot has several challenges that somewhat limit what can be built on the site. First, the lot offers narrow access at the corner of Loma and Menlo. Much of the lot sits to the south of Loma St., so that only 15’ (fifteen feet) of the property abuts the public right-of-way. There are no other locations where a driveway onto the site could go. Second there are several utility easements that run...
across the site. There is a 25’ (twenty-five foot) storm water easement, a 20’ (twenty foot) water easement, and a 12’ (twelve foot) sewer easement that runs both north to south and another that runs east to west. The applicant is permitted to pave on top of these areas, but may not build on them. Finally, there is a conservation easement in the rear of the lot, encompassing 12,478 ft² (twelve thousand, four hundred and seventy-eight square feet), which is approximately forty-three percent of the total lot. Nothing may be constructed or altered within this easement. These limitations, coupled with zoning setback requirements, create a buildable envelope of 5,160 ft² (five thousand, one hundred sixty square feet) in the southwestern corner of the lot.

![Figure 3: The subject lot with the identified easements.](image)

The applicant included site plans showing the individual easements with the application materials.

**Size and Massing**

The proposed construction will be 23’ (twenty-three feet) above the grade of Menlo Ave. Staff finds that the height is generally consistent with the surrounding district (see the streetscape study below).

![Figure 4: Streetscape study along Menlo Ave.](image)
The applicant included a setback study (shown below). The setbacks on this section of the historic district range from approximately 22’ (twenty-two feet) to nearly 92’ (ninety-two feet). While the setback of the proposed construction is slightly deeper than many of the late 19th century and 1920s houses further up the block, it is generally consistent with the existing streetscape.

One of the questions of compatibility has to with the overall size of the proposed new construction. The applicant has presented a table of the square footage of the roof area of houses in the area. Absent other methodology of measuring livable house square footage, Staff finds this to be an acceptable, apples-to-apples comparison. The subject property as proposed is 1933.7 ft² (one thousand, nine hundred thirty-three point seven square feet). Of the other properties that were part of the subdivision of the Hahn house (including the Hahn house), the average roof square footage is 2421.6 (two thousand, four hundred twenty-one point six square feet). Staff finds that this is generally a reasonable comparison from the subject property, as four of these properties are infill construction, reviewed and approved by the HPC. The other buildings along Menlo are generally smaller than the proposed construction and are a mix of historic and infill houses average 1,337.75ft² (one thousand, three hundred thirty-seven point seven five square feet).

**Architectural Design and Compatibility**

The proposed house will be a two-story house, gable-L house, three bays wide, with a small front porch on the left, and an attached garage. The house will be clad in Hardi clapboard siding, with vinyl one-over-one windows, and shingle siding. Only two elevations, the west and north, will be visible from the public right-of-way from within the district.
On the first floor, the west (front) elevation of the house has paired one-over-one windows to the left and right of the centrally placed front door. There is a garage over the left window pair and the front door covered in a shed roof with a metal roof. The second floor also has paired one-over-one windows flanking a central sash window. There is a shed dormer with a pair of one-lite casement windows over the left pair of windows. The windows on the west elevation all have applied shutters. The shutters are significantly smaller than the window openings and appear to be a simple two panel configuration. There are two front facing gables. The larger of the two is over the central door and right pair of windows with a smaller projecting gable over only the right pair of windows. Both gables have decorative stickwork. To the right of the main house massing is a one-bay garage. No information on the material of the garage door was included with the submitted materials.

The north (left) elevation has a small projecting stair bay in the center of elevation. The bay projects approximately 10” (ten inches) from the wall plane. There are two side facing gables on this elevation, one over the central stair windows and front room windows, and a smaller gable over the stair bay. Both gables have a horizontal section of metal shed roofing below, similar to a return, running the full-width of the gable. The windows to the front and rear are one-over-one sash windows, while the windows in the stair bay are single-lite fixed windows. The steep drop off of the lot will expose much of the foundation on this elevation, which will be concrete with a stamped brick pattern.

The east (rear) elevation expresses three full floors as the grade change drops off significantly. All three floors of the rear are clad in Hardi siding. The rear is four bays wide with a combination of paired and single windows, with a single fixed casement window in the left-most opening on the second floor. There is a pair of doors at the basement level, and another on the first floor that provides access to the wood and Azek deck with Wolf metal railing.

The south (right) elevation is made up of the garage and living space above. There are two one-over-one windows on each floor. The roof of this elevation has two different slopes, with a steep, 14/12 slope in the front and a gentler 4/12 slope to the rear.

**Findings**

The applicant has lowered the height of the proposed construction by three feet, from 26’ (twenty-six feet) above the grade at Menlo Ave. in the previous approval to 23’ feet. This height is identical to the neighboring house and lower than both 10205 and 10207 Menlo Ave. Staff finds that the height is consistent with the surrounding district. The width of the main mass of the current proposal is 35’ (thirty-five feet), plus an additional 12’ (twelve feet) for the attached garage. Staff finds that width of the main massing of the house is generally consistent with the surrounding homes (see Fig. 4). The garage adds width to the house; however, Staff finds that its visual impact is mitigated by the inset of the garage wall plane and the limited angle that the house is visible from the public right-of-way (see Fig. 3). Staff additionally finds that changing the house form from a side gable house with two front gable dormers to what is in effect a gable-L house form helps to lessen the mass of the house at the front wall plane. Staff finds that these changes have created a house form that is compatible with the size, scale, and massing of the neighboring buildings on Menlo Ave.
Staff finds that the design of the house requires some modification before it would be determined
to be compatible with the surrounding historic district. In general, Staff’s comments can be
summed up as simplify and add depth. In simplifying, Staff recommends that the applicant
remove the decorative work under the gable roofs. The applicant should eliminate the shed
projections in the gables, both the full-width shed projections and the corner return. Staff also
encourages the removal of one or both of the stick elements in the front-facing gable roofs.
Staff’s other overall recommendation is that more depth needs to be added in the facades to
create more variation. Staff is concerned that the flat Hardi, combined with the flat vinyl
windows and relatively flat shutters will create a very flat building. In order to create and add
some more depth, Staff encourages the applicant to enlarge some of the wall offsets. As an
example, the projecting stair bay is only offset by 10” (ten inches). If this element projected
closer to 2’-3’ (two to three feet) the offset would add more variation to the elevation and would
allow this element to be read as a traditionally designed stairwell. The same could be undertaken
in the front gable, by either pushing the front entrance back to be co-planer with the left windows
or bring it forward in the same plane as the windows on right. Staff believes that these
alterations would improve the proposed house so that it would read more like a contemporary
interpretation of a traditional farmhouse in keeping with the surrounding architecture, and better
meet the standards for compatibility.

Staff has three recommendations for the revisions for proposed windows. First, Staff
recommends that the HPC require a window with more depth than a traditional Andersen vinyl
window (as proposed). As this is new construction, substitute materials are generally allowed,
but an aluminum clad window or milled composite window may provide more depth in the
frame, creating a more compatible appearance. Second, Staff finds that the proportions of the
windows appear to be slightly too wide for the proportions of the house. Staff finds that either a
narrower window or a SDL lite pattern would effectively accentuate the vertical orientation of
the window. Staff request the HPC provide opinions and comments for revision. Third, if the
house design will include shutters on any of the elevations, at a minimum, the shutters should be
the same width as the window openings. Staff recommends operable shutters, but finds that the
visual character is more important.

Staff finds that the window arrangement on the north elevation is not in keeping with the
rationally stacked windows found in traditional architecture and encourages a revision to this
design. The windows to the left of the stair bay create an unbalanced appearance. Staff
encourages the applicant to revise the design so that these windows are either placed in the center
of the wall plane or that another row of windows is added to the left to provide more visual
balance, more in keeping with traditional architecture.

Staff finds that the shed dormer does effectively break up the mass of the roof. However, Staff
finds that the dormer is out of scale with the windows in the building and recommends the HPC
provide guidance on revising this element. Staff recommends that the dormer either be widened
to match the width of the windows below or be eliminated based on the feedback from the HPC.

In front of the house the applicant proposes to construct an asphalt driveway and apron. Because
of the limited frontage, there is no on-street parking adjacent to the subject lot. Much of the
proposed asphalt apron will be obscured by the 4’ (four foot) and 6’ (six foot) tall vertical board
privacy fence in front of the house. Much of this fence is a continuation of the fence installed at 2900 Loma St. The applicant further proposes to create terraced retaining walls using 6” × 6” (six inch by six inch) railroad ties. These terraces will be created at the edge of the property on the north and south of the lot.

Staff finds that the massing, size, and placement of the proposed house are generally consistent with the surrounding district, and that if Staff’s recommended design revisions are made, the proposed house will be architecturally compatible with the surrounding district.

**Tree Removal**

In order to accommodate the proposed construction, the application proposes to remove a total of nine trees on the site. Four of these trees are located at the entrance to the lot and have to be removed. Staff finds that to deny the applicant the ability to remove these trees would deny any reasonable use of the subject property, contravening 24A-8(b)(5). Another three trees are at the center of the buildable envelope and any house construction on the site would require the removal of these trees. Two more trees proposed for removal are located near the southern property boundary within the limits of disturbance. Staff finds that the proposed tree removal will impact the character of the site but, so will the construction of any house on this lot. Under the forest conservation program, the applicant is required to re-plant trees one-for-one or pay a fee in lieu. Staff recommends that a maximum number of trees be re-planted on the site and that the species and placement be included with the HAWP application.

**Environmental Concerns**

The proposed house sits on an environmental sensitive area with a branch of Rock Creek running along the eastern edge of the lot within a conservation area. The applicant has undertaken soil testing (included in the application materials) according to Montgomery County Department of Permitting Service guidelines.

In order to address the storm water management requirements, the applicant proposes to install three drywells in the eastern portion of the lot. This section of the lot is outside of the sewer easements and outside of the conservation easement. The installation of these drywells will not result in a visual change to the site, and Staff finds that they will result in no material change.

The applicant has informed Staff that there is a known storm water drainage issue and has been working with the Department of Public Works to get the issue resolved prior to construction beginning on the site. If this work is undertaken, it will occur in the identified 25’ (twenty-five foot) Storm Drainage Easement and will be covered with ground cover. This easement pre-dates the conservation easement and is recorded on the plat map. This work, which will not be undertaken by the applicant, will not require a HAWP.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff recommends that the applicant makes the following revisions and any additional changes recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and return for either a second preliminary consultation or HAWP:

- The shed projections and returns should be eliminated from the gable roofs;
- The stickwork should be removed from at least one of the front-facing gables;
• The front entrance should either be brought forward to be co-planer with the windows to the right or pushed back to be co-planer with the windows on the left;
• The windows employed in the house should have depth consistent with a wood window;
• The windows should either be narrowed or have a grill pattern installed to accentuate the building’s verticality;
• The shutters should be either removed from the design or sized to the window width;
• The left stair bay should be enlarged to project further from the wall plane of the house;
• A second row of windows should be added to the left of the stair bay on the north elevation;
• The shed dormer should either be widened to match the windows below or be eliminated;
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301/563-3400

APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: FarnsworthHomes@Verizon.net

Name of Property Owner: 10201 Menlo LLC
Daytime Phone No.: 301-370-8625
Address: 25101 Peachtree Rd Clarksburg, MD 20871
Daytime Phone No.: 301-370-8625
Contact Person: Minter Farnsworth
Contractor Registration No.: 126100
Agent for Owner: Same

LOCATION OF BUILDING PREMISES

House Number: 10201 Menlo Ave
Street:
Town/City: Silver Spring
Nearest Cross Street: Loma St.
Lot: 13
Block: 18
Subdivision: Capitol View Park
Parcel: N/A

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT, ACTIONS AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:

☐ Construct ☐ Extend ☐ Alter/Remodel ☐ AC ☐ Slab ☐ Room Addition ☐ Porch ☐ Deck ☐ Shed
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Wreck/Raze ☐ Solar ☐ Fireplace ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Single Family
☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☐ Reconstr. ☐ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☐ Other: 

1B. Construction cost estimate: $350,000

1C. If this is a renewal of a previously approved active permit, see Permit #: N/A

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTENSIONS

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 FENCES/RETAINING WALLS

3A. Height (feet) 0 inches

3B. Indicate whether the fence or retaining wall is to be constructed on or to the following locations:

☐ On property 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.

Signature of owner or authorized agent 9.25.17

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

See reverse side for instructions

814607
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:

   Construct new house on vacant lot

   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________

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

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

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

5. PHOTOGRAPH
   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 photograpics.
   b. Clearly labeled 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 photograpics.

6. TREE SURVEY
   If you are proposing construction adjacent to or within the distance of any tree 6" or larger in diameter (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 CONTINUING PROPERTY OWNERS
   For all projects, provide an accurate list of adjacent and continuing 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 the lot or parcel(s) which lie directly across the street/intersection from the parcel in question.

PLEASE PRINT ON 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>10201 Menlo LLC</td>
<td>Minter P. Farnsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25101 Peachtree Rd</td>
<td>25101 Peachtree Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksburg, MD</td>
<td>Clarksburg, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20871</td>
<td>20871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Staguhn and K. Florian Staguhn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10203 Menlo Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tovi Lehman and Noa Livni Lehman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900 Loma St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry A. and E.C. Volz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2801 Barker St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's mailing address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10201 MENLO LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25101 PEACHTREE RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKSBURG, MD 20871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richard Nicholls ET AL</th>
<th>Michael E. Livermore and Fumiyu Hashida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10200 Leslie St.</td>
<td>10118 Leslie St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring, MD 20902</td>
<td>Silver Spring, MD 20902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Property Condition Photographs (duplicate as needed)

Detail: DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE @ CORNER OF MENLO + LOMA

Detail: PROPOSED NEW FENCE LOCATION (ON SITE PLAN)

Applicant: 10201 MENLO LLC
10201 MENLO AVENUE

PRELIMINARY (HAWP) SITE PLAN

SCALE 1"=10'
JULY 2018
March 17, 2018

GEOTECH ENGINEERS, INC.
1101 King Street, Suite 600
Alexandria, VA 22314-1433
Tel: 571-263-1234
Fax: 571-263-1235
www.geotech-engineers.com

Dear Mr. Meter Fortenberry,

Submitted is our report of soil testing performed for the above site:

Our sample was taken in the location shown on Enclosure 3. The sample was recovered at a depth of 8 ft below grade. Soil testing was performed according to the MDH R70 guidelines. The sampling was performed at the location as requested, but due to conditions at the time, the sampling was not performed at 8 ft below grade, as noted in the report. Soil testing was performed according to the MDH R70 guidelines.

The following is a summary of USDA tests performed in our laboratory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>USDA Classification</th>
<th>Maximum Infiltration Rate (in/hr)</th>
<th>Greenwater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-2-0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample was classified as Sandy Loam according to USDA Soil Classification System. An infiltration rate of 1.02 in/hr was calculated for the sample, according to MDH R70. The gradation unit curves and USDA triangle chart are enclosed herein.

Please call the undersigned if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

GEOTECH ENGINEERS, INC.

Paul Chang, P.E.
State of Maryland

Enclosures:
1. Gradation Test Reports
2. USDA Soil Classification Charts
3. Sample Location Plan

GEOTECH ENGINEERS, INC.
Beltsville, Maryland

DPS

10201 MENLO AVENUE
SOIL INFILTRATION RATE
GRADATION TEST REPORT
GEOTECH SOIL CLASSIFICATION
SAMPLE LOCATION PLAN
STORM WATER DRYWELL DESIGN
Menlo Ave. Street scape plan supporting information

Projected centerline Menlo Avenue

10201 Menlo Ave.
LOT 10

20' WATER E.

LOT 12

LOT 13--SITE--
28676 SqFt

For Cons Esmnt Area on our Lot
12478 SqFt

Buildable Envelope
5160 SqFt

LOT 14

LOT 17

AREAS OF
BUILDING ENVELOPE
& LOT 13 BLOCK 18
CAPITOL VIEW PARK
October, 2017
Square Footage Footprints

Mr. Staguhn's previously submitted square footage calculation for his house footprint located at 10203 Menlo was 1759.8 square feet, however this did not include the square footage of the front and rear bay windows.

Attached please find his calculation.

The proposed house located at 10201 Menlo Avenue that we are submitting for approval has a house footprint of 1761.7 square feet. As you can see, they are virtually the same footprint size.

Attached please find my calculation.
Mr. Staghun calculation of house footprints calculation of previous surface.

\[ \text{stairs:midt. } 2.658 \text{ ft} \]

\[ \text{Total: } 1.604 \text{ ft} \]

\[ \text{Difference: } 1.042 \text{ ft} \]

\[ \text{stairs: } 6 \times 1.59 = 47.4 \text{ ft}^2 \]

\[ \text{reach: } \]

\[ \frac{6}{16} \times 26 = 260 \]

\[ \frac{3}{16} \times 16.8 = 16.3 \]

\[ \frac{4}{16} \times 26 = 260 \]

\[ c = 10 \times 26 = 260 \]

\[ b = 16 \times 16.8 = 268.8 \]

\[ a = 16 \times 16 = 256 \]
1. Total

F = 11.8 sf ft
E = 14.9 sf ft
D = 39 sf ft
C = 132 sf ft
B = 408 sf ft
A = 1156 sf ft

August 2018
10201 Menlo Ave, Footprint Calculation
These are the calculations of the roofs’ square footage area for all of the houses in the historic area on that section of Menlo Avenue and houses located in the same subdivision as the proposed house. (These calculations were taken from a 30 scale aerial print provided by MNCPPC.)

**Proposed House**

10201 Menlo          1933.7 square feet

**Houses in same subdivision**

10203 Menlo          1992 square feet
2801 Barker           2334 square feet
2901 Barker           2200 square feet
2903 Barker           2020 square feet
2905 Barker           3562 square feet

**Houses on Menlo Avenue not in the same subdivision**

10205 Menlo          970 square feet
10207 Menlo          1295 square feet
10209 Menlo          1340 square feet
10211 Menlo          901 square feet
10213 Menlo          1115 square feet
10215 Menlo          1000 square feet
10217 Menlo          1921 square feet
10219 Menlo          2160 square feet
TREES PLAN

• WE HAD BARTLETT TREE EXPERTS COME OUT AND EVALUATE THE TREES AND THEY RECOMMENDED THE REMOVAL OF 9 TREES.

• DUE TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY'S NEW TREE CANOPY LAW, I WILL BE OBLIGATED TO PLANT 9 SHADE TREES OR WILL PAY A FEE IN LIEU OF IF I CANNOT FIT THEM ON THE PROPERTY.
Kevin Manarolla
Historic Preservation Committee

Christopher Larkin
Bartlett Tree Experts
Maryland LTE 616
ISA Certified Arborist MA-0131
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified

Mr. Manarolla
Historic Preservation Committee
Fax: 301 563 3412

This is an evaluation of the existing trees located on the development lot #13:
10201 Menlo Avenue
Silver Spring MD 20910.

Owner: Minter Farnsworth
25101 Peachtree Road
Clarksburg, MD 20871

Mobile Phone: 301-370-8625
E-Mail Address: farnsworthhomes@verizon.net

Eleven (11) trees are noted on the site development plan and located in or near the
building disturbance area. The following summary notes the condition of each of
the trees and factors affecting their survivability through the construction process.

Of the eleven (11) trees:

Four (4) are located near the street in the access to the lot.
1) 5” diameter Tulip Poplar overwhelmed with ivy in poor condition.
2) 13” diameter Walnut with a significant basal cavity and decay,
   leaning toward the street in fair condition.
3) 15” diameter Boxelder with no visible root flare and a severe lean
   in poor condition.

THE F.A. BARTLETT TREE EXPERT COMPANY
SCIENTIFIC TREE CARE SINCE 1907
4) 20" diameter Tulip Poplar with numerous vines in the canopy in fair condition.

Removal is recommended for these four trees. The narrow width of access and all construction activity will severely impact these trees.

Two (2) are located on the left side of the lot near the property line. These trees are growing at the edge of, if not in the drainage area.

5) 16" Tulip Poplar partially vine covered and in fair condition
6) 20" Tulip Poplar severely leaning toward the neighboring property and in fair condition.

Preservation of these two trees is possible. Root pruning (only if a soil cut is necessary on that side of the construction site) and tree protection fencing should be at the edge of the construction disturbance as far from the stems as possible but preferably a minimum of 17 feet (twice the 5 times diameter rule of thumb due to the soil conditions). Limited access and no storage of construction supplies or equipment should be made around the trees. The leaning Tulip Poplar should be considered for removal due to the wet nature of the area and the potential to impact the neighboring property if it fails.

Three (3) are located in the center of the lot on the land above the drainage area.

7) 17" diameter Tulip Poplar with numerous vines in fair condition
8) 23" diameter Tulip Poplar with numerous vines in fair condition
9) 20" diameter Tulip Poplar with numerous vines in fair condition

Removal of these trees will be required to build. They are in the center of the proposed house site.

Two (2) are located on the right side of the lot near the property line.

10) 29" Tulip Poplar with vines in the upper crown in fair condition.
11) 19" Tulip Poplar with a severe lean over the proposed building location and vines in the upper canopy in fair condition.

Removal is recommended for these two trees. Their proximity to the construction zone and the necessary limits of disturbance will severely impact the neighboring property.
impact the health of these trees and their roots. The weight distribution of
the crown would leave a high likelihood of failure onto the new structure.

The majority, 7 of 9, of the trees recommended for removal are Tulip Poplars, a
common tree of the mid-Atlantic region. Tulip Poplars are a rapidly growing
pioneer species often colonizing open spaces. The wood is soft, light when dry,
decays rapidly in moist conditions and is brittle. Construction activity closer than
5 times the diameter of the tree will cause root damage and often leads to root
decay increasing the likelihood of whole tree uprooting. Wet or saturated sites will
also affect the stability of the trees. A previously uprooted tree near tree number
(6) indicates that the soil in the drainage are often saturated.

You can contact me at: Christopher Larkin
Bartlett Tree Experts
1 Metropolitan Court
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
e-mail clarkin@bartlett.com
cell: 240-447-0837
Fax: 301-881-9063

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Christopher Larkin
ISA Certified Arborist MA-0131
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
MATERIALS SPECIFICATIONS

- ANDERSEN VINYL CLAD WOOD WINDOWS.
- HARDIE PLANK LAP SIDING SMOOTH
- DECK TO BE PRESSURE TREATED WOOD WITH COMPOSITE DECKING, AZEK TRIM & WOLF RAILS PER PHOTO
- ROOFING TO BE ASPHALT ARCHITECTURAL SHINGLE
- PORCH ROOF TO BE METAL STANDING SEAM
- DRIVEWAY AND PARKING AREA TO BE ASPHALT
- FENCING PER PHOTO
- RETAINING WALLS PER PHOTO
10201 MENLO AVENUE

PROPOSED RETAINING WALLS:
6" x 6" PRESSURE TREATED RETAINING WALLS
WITH 6" x 6" PRESSURE TREATED TIE BACKS
WITH NATURAL FINISH
LOCATIONS AS PER SITE PLAN DRAWING
10201 MENLO AVENUE

PROPOSED MACADAM DRIVEWAY
LOCATION AS PER SITE PLAN DRAWING
10201 MENLO AVENUE

PROPOSED FENCING:
PRESSURE TREATED 1" X 6" VERTICAL
6' HIGH PRIVACY FENCING WITH NATURAL FINISH
LOCATION AS PER SITE PLAN DRAWING
Although you cannot see this house from the street this is the view of the massing of 2905 Barker from my backyard. This house was approved by the HPC 5-13-92