MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 2420 Spencerville Rd., Spencerville  
Meeting Date: 12/5/2018

Resource: Individually Listed Master Plan Site  
Report Date: 11/28/2018

Spencer-Carr House

Applicant: Cedar Ridge Community Church  
Public Notice: 11/21/2018
(Bryan Peterson, Agent)

Review: Historic Area Work Permit  
Tax Credit: n/a

Case Number: 15/55-18C  
Staff: Dan Bruechert

PROPOSAL: Partial Demolition and Stabilization

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC approve with three (3) conditions the Historic Area Work Permit: application:

1. The applicant needs to provide cost estimates for successfully mothballing the Spencer-Carr House, annual maintenance estimates for the house in its mothballed state, and estimates of rehabilitation costs, with any additional information requested by the HPC prior to issuance of the demolition permit.

2. Historic materials from the c.1871 addition must be salvaged to the greatest extent possible. The applicant needs to coordinate with Staff for verification that this condition has been met.

3. The work carried out to stabilize the Spencer-Carr House must be carried out according to the guidance provided in Preservation Briefs #31: Mothballing Historic Buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Individually Listed Master Plan Site (Spencer-Carr House - #15/55)
STYLE: Spencerville Style/Folk Victorian
DATE: c.1855 and c.1871

From Places from the Past:
A distinctive three-story, three bay house, the Spencer-Carr House was built c.1855 with a rear addition dating from the 1870s. An illusion of added height is achieved through the incremental decrease in spacing between windows from the bottom level to the top together with decrease of window size. The center passage house is constructed of brick and covered with weatherboard siding. Reputedly building by William Spencer, founder of Spencerville, the house has a strong historical association with the early development of the community and is a significant example of rural antebellum building traditions in the county.
BACKGROUND
The applicant presented a preliminary consultation at the October 10, 2018 meeting\(^1\). The HPC was generally supportive of the proposal, however, many of the Commissioners expressed reservations that without more concrete plans the use and utilization the Spencer-Carr house would face the same fate as its rear addition. The Commissioners requested that the buildings be documented using both in measured drawings and photographs; and had more specific questions regarding the financial aspects of this project. The applicant has provided the requested documentation and has included detailed specifications for the demolition work as part of this application. The applicant will present the financial details at the hearing.

PROPOSAL
The applicant proposes to stabilize the c.1855 portion of the house and demolish the rear c.1870 addition.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES
Proposed alterations to individual Master Plan Sites are reviewed under Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A) and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is defined 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.

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

\( (b) \) 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.

Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

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.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
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 Spencer-Carr House (c.1855) was the home to the founder of Spencerville, William Spencer. It consists of the original, side gable, three bay wide massing of the house and a c.1871 rear L addition. It appears as though the L addition had a very shallow rear-facing gable roof. Much of this roof has collapsed and a portion of the structure on the right side of the addition projects through the wall plane. The Spencer-Carr house has not been occupied since the mid-1990s. The historic windows for the house have been removed and are stored until they can be reinstalled.

The applicant proposes to demolish the rear addition and to stabilize the structure and seal the envelope of the original 1855 structure.

Demolition
The c.1871 L-addition to the Spencer-Car House has significantly degraded as shown in the submitted photographs and discussed at the October 10, 2018 Preliminary Consultation. The
roof has collapsed, and significant water infiltration has cause interior floor failure and significant bowing in one of the exterior walls. In 2015, the owner had an assessment of the entire property (attached) which stated, “The rear addition is dilapidated and beyond feasible rehabilitation. It is unstable, unsafe, and at risk of collapse, creating a dangerous condition.”

In September 2018, RGA Structural Engineers examined the building and determined that the rear addition had areas of structural rot and decay and was beyond repair. The engineers recommended that the addition be demolished while determining the original section of the house could be stabilized and repaired.

At the preliminary consultation the consulting architect expressed concerns that if the c.1871 addition was not removed, there was a significant risk that it could collapse and cause significant damage to the c.1855 portion of the house.

Staff has visited the building on two occasions and agrees that the building has suffered a significant amount of damage and that retaining the rear L may be impossible and its collapse may put the c.1855 portion of the house at risk. The applicant proposes retaining the original foundation of the c.1871 addition so that the dimensions of the building will remain visible and so the addition could be reconstructed at a later date. Staff finds that demolition of the c.1871 addition is necessary so that an unsafe condition on the site can be remedied (per 24A-8(b)(4)).

The HPC expressed concern that the cost of maintaining and rehabilitating the Spencer-Carr House may be beyond the capacity of the applicant, as they are a non-profit with several other areas of focus. In order to assure the HPC that the applicant can successfully undertake this work and maintain the building in a reasonable manner until such time that a full rehabilitation can be completed, Staff recommends the HPC review costs estimates of both the cyclical maintenance required to keep the Spencer-Carr House in a mothballed state and costs estimates of a rehabilitation that would put the Spencer-Carr House back into use. Staff has requested the applicant to provide this information to the HPC. Staff recommends that an approval of this HAWP be conditional on the HPC’s review of this financial information, and that any additional information requested by the HPC be submitted prior to issuance of the demolition permit.

Staff additionally recommends that the HPC include a condition for approval that the applicant salvage historic fabric from the c.1871 addition to the greatest extent possible. The applicant should coordinate with Staff on the timeframe for the demolition so Staff may be at the site to verify that the condition has been met.

**Stabilization and Restoration**

The applicant will conduct repairs necessary to secure the building envelope and stabilize the foundation of the original, c.1855 portion of the house. This work is repair in nature and does not require the HPC’s approval. Generally, the applicant proposes to re-coat the existing roof, re-point the chimney as necessary, replace damaged clapboards, re-point the foundation, reinforce sagging structural measures, to secure the envelope to prevent pest infiltration. The applicant will maintain the boarded-up windows and the building will remain in the mothballed state until such time that it can be rehabilitated or restored and put into use. The historic windows, which have been removed and stored, will be reinstalled in their original openings.
Staff recommended, and the applicant agrees, that the necessary repairs to secure the building envelope will follow the guidance provided in Preservation Briefs 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings\(^2\) to ensure the future utility of the Spencer-Carr House until such time that the restoration of the interior can be undertaken. Staff has also recommended that the applicant consult Staff prior to undertaking this work to determine if it will require a HAWP. Staff recommends that a condition be added to the approval of the demolition that all work carried out be done under the Guidance of Preservation Briefs #31.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the HPC **approve with three (3) conditions** the HAWP application:

1. The applicant needs to provide cost estimates for successfully mothballing the Spencer-Carr House and annual maintenance estimates for the house in its mothballed state prior to HPC approval with any additional information requested by the HPC prior to issuance of the demolition permit;
2. Historic materials from the c.1871 addition must be salvaged to the greatest extent possible. The applicant needs to coordinate with Staff for verification that this condition has been met;
3. The work carried out to stabilize the Spencer-Carr House must be carried out according to the guidance provided in Preservation Briefs #31: Mothballing Historic Buildings; and with the general condition applicable to all Historic Area Work Permits that the applicant will present 3 permit sets of drawings to HPC staff for review and stamping prior to submission for permits (if applicable). After issuance of the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS) permit, the applicant will arrange for a field inspection by calling the DPS Field Services Office at 240-777-6370 prior to commencement of work and not more than two weeks following completion of work.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301/563-3400

APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Name: Bryon K. Nelson
Contact Person: Bryon K. Nelson
Daytime Phone No.: 301-421-5949 (ext. 220)

Tax Account No.: 03233387
(Fed 52-13 5329)

Name of Property Owner: Carroll Ridge Community Church
Daytime Phone No.: 301-421-5949 (ext. 220)

Address: 2720 Spencerville Rd, Spencerville, MD 20867

Contractor: TBD

Contractor Registration No.: 

Agent for Owner: 

Daytime Phone No.: 

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISES

House Number: 2720
Street: Spencerville Rd

Town/City: Spencerville
Nearest Cross Street: Peach Orchard Rd

Lot: m08 Block: NOA Subdivision: 0001 PARA Spencer Farm

Parcel: 201

PART ONE: TYPE OF PEDESTRIAN ACTION AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
☐ Construct ☐ Extend ☒ Alter/Renovate
☐ Move ☐ Install ☒ Wreck/Fix
☐ Rebuild ☐ Repair ☒ Revocable
☐ Subdivide ☐ Single Family

1B. Construction cost estimate: TBD ($100,000)

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

PART TWO: COMPARE 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 FENCING RETAINING WALL

3A. Height: feet __ inches __

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

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

Bryan Nelson
Signature of owner or authorized agent

Date: 11/9/18

Approved: For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission

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

1. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
   a. Description of existing structure(s) and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance:
      See attached

   b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district:
      See attached

      Additional materials will be sent electronically to Historic Preservation staff.

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

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

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

5. PHOTOGRAPHS
   a. Clearly labeled photographic prints of each facade of existing resource, including details of the affected portions. All labels should be placed on the front of photographs.
   b. Clearly 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 photographs.

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

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

PLEASE PRINT IN BLUE OR BLACK INK OR TYPE THIS INFORMATION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE.
PLEASE STAY WITHIN THE GUIDES OF THE TEMPLATE, AS THIS WILL BE PHOTOCOPIED DIRECTLY ONTO MAILING LABELS.
1a. Description of existing structures and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance:

The Spencer-Carr farmhouse was built by William Spencer ca. 1850. It is a rare example of the "Spencerville style" farmhouse: a symmetrical 3-bay, 2-1/2 story house with a distinctive row of 1/2-size double hung windows on the third level directly below the cornice. Circa 1870 a 2-story addition with a low slope roof was added to the rear of the farmhouse. An in-depth description of the farmhouse is attached.

The farmhouse is owned by the Cedar Ridge Community Church, which built a large sanctuary to the rear of the farmhouse and restored the barn for classroom uses. The unrestored second barn is used to house maintenance equipment. The original silo is in the circle in front of the sanctuary building, and is in need of structural stabilization. With the exception of some small farming activity, the balance of the site is undeveloped.

1b. General description of the project and its effect on the historic resources, the environmental setting, and where applicable, the historic district:

Cedar Ridge Community Church is seeking to remove the 1870’s addition to the farmhouse due to its advanced structural deterioration (see attached letter from Rathgeber/Goss consulting structural engineers), and structurally stabilize the original 1850’s farmhouse. We have included measured drawings of the farmhouse and addition, and photo-documented the addition. The funding available to the church will go toward rebuilding the stone foundation where it is collapsing, replacing insect damaged wood framing, and making it weather tight and vermin free. When additional funds are available, the church intends to restore the farmhouse, potentially using it for temporary quarters or as a teaching farm.
# HAWP Application: Mailing Addresses for Notifying

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's mailing address</th>
<th>Owner's Agent's mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cedar Ridge Community Church  
2410 Spencerville Rd.  
Spencer ville, MD 20868 | CEM Design  
520 Anderson Ave.  
Rockville, MD 20850 |

## Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners mailing addresses

| Resident  
2312 Spencerville Rd.  
Spencer ville, MD 20868 | Ben Girons  
2308 Spencerville Rd  
Spencer ville, MD 20868 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Spencer Ville Adventist Academy  
2502 Spencerville Rd  
Spencer ville, MD 20868 | United States Postal Service  
2323 Spencerville Rd.  
Spencer ville, MD 20868 |
Brief History of the Cedar Ridge Property

In 1703, a 600-acre tract of land was conveyed by the Lord Proprietor of Maryland and surveyed for Mark Richardson. This land was named Bear (or Bare) Bacon—reputedly because of the wild animals that roamed the area. Adjoining or possibly overlapping land in the same vicinity was patented in 1715 as “Snowden’s Manor Enlarged” in what was then Prince George’s County. Montgomery County was formed out of Prince George’s County in 1776.

In the 1740s, Anglicans began moving into this part of Maryland, including the Duvall family. Lewis (Louis) H. Duvall was born in Prince George’s County in 1827. He purchased 251 acres of Bear Bacon from Isaac B. Igelhart in 1851 for $600. Igelhart had bought the property the previous year from Elias Ellicott of Prince George’s County in payment of a debt of $333.34 plus interest. This may be the same Elias Ellicott who co-founded the Muirkirk Furnace in Prince George’s County in 1847 with his brother Andrew. Although Quakers had long opposed slavery (Sandy Spring Quakers, for example, banished households from meetings for holding slaves in 1781), the brothers relied on slave labor to operate the furnace.

Duvall married Mary Jane Spencer (1834-1904) in 1853, and they had 8 children. Mary Jane’s passing was noted in the Annals of Sandy Spring:

“Also on 20 November, Mary J., wife of Louis H. Duvall, of Spencerville, passed from earth. Although not actually a resident of Sandy Spring, she was well known to many of our people, for she was active in the temperance movement, and ready to help in any good work. She will be keenly missed and long remembered by many outside her own immediate circle of relatives and friends.”

In April 1855, Lewis Duvall sold 122 acres of Bear Bacon to his father-in-law, William H. Spencer (1805-1892) for $610. William Spencer, together with his wife and five children, other relatives and neighbors from Southampton Township, Pennsylvania, arrived in this area, originally called Drayton, in 1848. This small community, formed by Spencer on the Laurel Road

---

1 “The History of Montgomery County, Maryland” by Thomas H. S. Boyd (1879), p 32
2 Volume 1 of the Annals of Sandy Spring, p xvii
3 Maryland Historical Trust Addendum Sheet M:15-80 (PACS D3.39)
4 Volume 6 of the Annals of Sandy Spring, p 14
5 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., STS 5/449
6 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., STS 4/367
8 The Annals of Sandy Spring, Volume 3, p 303-304
9 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., JGH 4/485
10 Maryland Historical Trust Addendum Sheet M:15-80 (PACS D3.39)
(present Spencerville Road), connected the Quaker settlements of Sandy Spring and Ashton with the railroad line at Laurel. Drayton was renamed Spencerville in William Spencer’s honor, and he became the first postmaster of Spencerville in 1859.12

William Spencer bought 91¾ acres from the William Holmes estate (also known as Bealls Manor) in or before 185613 and farmed the land, which was noted as being productive for wheat, corn and hay.14 He is thought to have built the front part of the farmhouse around 1855 and the addition circa 1870.15 Since William Spencer owned several parcels of land, and there are no maps available showing the property lines for these parcels, there is confusion in the records as to whether the farmhouse was built on Bare Bacon,16 or (more likely) on adjoining land, such as land from the William Holmes estate.

William Spencer sold both the 91¾ acres from the William Holmes estate and the 122-acre Bare Bacon tract to his son-in-law Charles Dickenson in 1857 for $2000—together with 3 horses, 2 mules, 5 cows, 3 wagons, a cart, 4 ploughs, 3 harnesses, 7 beds, 500 bushels of corn, winter grain, furniture and farming implements for an additional $1000.17 William Spencer repurchased the land for the same price of $2000 from his daughter Amelia A. Dickenson in 1859,18 following the death of Charles the previous year.

William Spencer sold Bare Bacon to his son Hiriam Spencer in 1861 for $1000.19 Hiriam married in 1868,20 and died two years later from tuberculosis at the age of 31. In compliance with a court order, his property was sold at auction. Hiriam had greatly increased the value of Bare Bacon with a large house (the Spencer/Oursler house located behind Burtonsville Park at 15920 Oursler Road21) smokehouse, icehouse, and orchards.22 William Spencer repurchased Bare Bacon in 1873 for $4650 through the court-ordered Trustee sale23 and one month later, took out a mortgage on the property for $1000 from Thomas Conley, which was transferred to Joseph Stabler in 1886.24

---

13 Montgomery County Commissioners Tax Assessment Book of 1853-63, p 326
14 Boyd, T.H.S. (1879) The History of Montgomery County, Maryland, from its Earliest Settlement in 1650 to 1879. p.142
15 The date is based on the date that William Spencer purchased the property, tax assessments, and appearance on the Martenet and Bond map of 1865.
16 As claimed in Maryland Historical Trust Addendum Sheet M:15-55 (PACS D3.32)
17 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., JGH 5/593
18 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., JGH 7/349
19 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., JGH 8/485
21 See Maryland Historical Trust Addendum Sheet M:15-58 (PACS D3.29)
22 Montgomery County Equity Case Record, 193 (1870).
23 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., EBP 11/165
24 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., EBP 10/201
In 1871, William Spencer purchased 35¼ acres of Snowden’s Manor Enlarged from Charles and Sarah Stabler for $616.87. Ten years later, he sold this land, the 122-acre Bare Bacon and the 91¾-acre William Holmes estate—less 23 acres, which had been sold off previously—together with 3 horses, 5 wagons, 4 cows, 9 hogs, 4 harnesses, crops of wheat and corn, a mule, a hay rack, a mower and household and kitchen furniture to his daughter, Margaret Jamison for $3,000.25

The William Spencer household is described in the 1880 census as including William (a 75 year old widowed farmer); John Spencer (his 36 year old son) and U.W. Jamison (his son-in-law) who worked on the farm; Margaret Jamison (his 47 year old daughter); and Laura Johnson, an 18 year old black servant.26

William Spencer died in 1892, and Joseph Stabler began mortgage foreclosure procedures against Margaret Jamison the following year, which led to the sale in 1894 of Bare Bacon for $1342.27

Margaret lived on the remaining property until her death about 1905, at which point, her only living child, Anna Wilson,28 sold the house on 62½ acres, referred to as Snowden’s Manor Enlarged (or “whatever name or names the same may be known or called”), to farmer Edward Carr for $3,100.29 The Carr family added outbuildings to the property during the 1920s.30 Edward died in 1956, leaving the farm to his wife Laura and their children Gilbert and Clara. At that time, the farm consisted of the farmhouse, two tenant houses and various outbuildings.31 Later, Laura conveyed the house to Gilbert and Clara.32 Clara Carr was the owner of the farm until her death in 1986. Cedar Ridge Community Church purchased the farm from the estates of Gilbert and Clara Carr in December 1995.

**Description of the Farmhouse**

The farmhouse (Spencer/Carr House) was originally constructed ca. 1855, and is a rare surviving example of a once common farmhouse type locally identified as the "Spencerville style." The symmetrical building, with a near flat roof, is a variation of the three-bay I-house form that adds a distinctive third (attic) level decorated by vernacular Greek Revival frieze band windows directly beneath the cornice.

---

25 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., EBP 25/36
26 1880 Census cited in Maryland Historical Trust Addendum Sheet M:15·58 (PACS D3.29)
27 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., JA 44/164
29 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., 184/167
30 Montgomery County Commissioners Tax Assessment Books cited in Maryland Historical Trust Addendum Sheet M:15·55 (PACS D3.32)
31 Will #19407, Montgomery County Register of Wills cited in Maryland Historical Trust Addendum Sheet M:15·58 (PACS D3.29)
32 Land Records of Montgomery County, Md., 320/174
The main block of this three-story house has six-over-six sash windows on the first and second floors, and shorter three-over-three windows on the third floor. The hip-roofed front porch is shorter than most front porches found in Burtonsville; it being only half as long as the house. It has chamfered posts and elaborate corner brackets. The gable ends are plain, with a pair of small two-over-four windows in the gable. A chimney rises from within each gable end. This main block contains a central stair flanked by one room on either side. There is a full depth basement under this portion of the house, which was rare for the time. There is no stair hall, and access to the slightly later rear addition is through the room to the left.

The frame rear addition containing the kitchen is only two stories high. There are two box stairs, each containing winder steps, at each end of this addition, providing access to the second floor. A box spiral stair in the main house connects the second and third floors. The rear wing originally consisted of a frame two-story room. The kitchen room was added later, probably during the 1870s, and the porch to the west of the wing is enclosed. Unusually for farmhouses of this period, the studs, second floor and roof framing are milled (rather than hand-hewn) lumber. Species range from pine to oak, and both circular and band saws were used, suggesting the lumber came from different mills. The house was sheathed in dimensional boards (of varying widths but consistent thickness) laid diagonally, and then lap
siding was applied. This was uncommon for the day—typical practice being lap siding only—and would have made the frame exceptionally strong.

The lack of an open-hearth fireplace and the presence of chimneys with thimbles (holes to receive stovepipes) suggest the house was heated with iron stoves, as pioneered by Benjamin Franklin a generation before. The presence of an old well under the rear addition to the house may indicate early indoor plumbing, with a hand pump at the wellhead, later replaced by an electrical pump.

**Recent Changes to the Property**

In 1973, the Spencer/Carr farm was visited by a park historian for the Park and Planning Commission, and nominated for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places with the National Parks Service. The property was visited and inventoried by the Maryland Historical Trust in 1982, and the farmhouse was described at that time as being “well preserved.” In 1986, the entire property was designated on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation and therefore protected under the Historic Preservation Ordinance, Chapter 24A of the Montgomery County Code.

When Cedar Ridge purchased the property in 1995, the farmhouse was in very poor condition: it had been unoccupied for at least nine years, had been vandalized by local youth, and was infested with various animals and insects. While restoring the farmhouse was a priority for Cedar Ridge (as indicated by the repeated discussions held with the Department of Park and Planning, as well as internal Cedar Ridge communications), all available funds were required for the construction of the church building.

In late 1996, Cedar Ridge contacted Neubauer-Sohn Consulting Engineers to conduct a structural study of the farmhouse. The technical drawings were reviewed in 1997 by Dave Morrison, who noted access issues with shoring up the basement under the main block of the house. Additional studies of the basement were conducted by WQQM Architects, who described the foundational problems as “very severe.” They recommended temporary support through shoring, cribbing and jacks, and the replacement of the foundation walls and footings.

In 1998, Cedar Ridge requested a proposal from WQQM Architects for design services to rehabilitate the main block of the farmhouse and seal up the connection to the rear addition. The proposal was priced at $7,360. SPN, Inc., provided a proposal for the renovation based on WQQM Architects design, and estimated the cost to be $175,883.

Such funds were unavailable at the time, as the church building was still under construction, but volunteer work was undertaken to remove debris from the farmhouse, and ready it for rehabilitation. However, work was halted when bee/wasp infestation was discovered in entire exterior wall.
The Cedar Ridge property was again inspected by the Maryland Historical Trust in 2001, to ensure the new church building had not interfered with the “architectural integrity and distinction of the house.” The official noted: “The house itself remains intact, if in a somewhat deteriorated condition.”

In 2001, the historic barn was determined to be in need of immediate attention as the barn sills were rotten, and this was noted by professionals to be a liability. All Cedar Ridge resources were therefore put to barn renovation. Robert Schwartz Associates Architects was hired and SPN Construction completed the barn renovation at a cost of approximately $750K.

In 2003, the Park and Planning Commission conducted a site visit to inspect the farmhouse. They described the house as “in extremely poor condition... Damage is severe, even apparently structurally threatening on 1870s wing. Building is open to the elements... Windows were recently vandalized...” The officials noted the immediate need to close the house to protect it from the elements, as well as the longer-term need to develop and implement a preservation plan. Cedar Ridge staff again asked about demolishing the addition, and was told that it was not usually permissible, but could be possible as part of a restoration plan, particularly if the restored house was opened to the public.

The following repairs were made by Cedar Ridge in an effort to preserve the structure: All the windows were boarded with plywood to protect further vandalism of the windows. The plywood was painted to mimic a 6-over-6 window to preserve the view from the road. The exterior siding was scrapped and painted to preserve the original wood siding. The gutters were cleaned and repaired to keep water away from the building.

In 2003 and 2004, Cedar Ridge made inquiries about available grants to support the rehabilitation of the farmhouse, but these inquiries did not lead to concrete funding opportunities. Discussions with Habitat for Humanity to restore the farmhouse fell through when their plans to build other structures on the property conflicted with zoning limitations.

From 2003 to 2008 a local contractor worked extensively to restore and maintain the front porch and siding, seal up the foundations to prevent further pest infestation, and patch the roof to prevent water infiltration.

In 2008, the historical barn was inspected by a structural engineer, who determined it was still not stable, despite the expensive professional renovation. Cedar Ridge raised an additional $250K and employed Fitzgerald’s Heavy Timber for one year to secure, restore and re-open the barn. This effort left no funds for work on the farmhouse restoration.

In 2015, Cedar Ridge hired ARC Environmental to conduct an assessment of the property, including the farmhouse. The report read: “The rear addition is dilapidated and beyond feasible rehabilitation. It is unstable, unsafe, and at risk of collapse, creating a dangerous condition.” The report noted that the first priority should be the removal of the electrical drop from this part of the house. The main block of the farmhouse was considered to be in better condition,
and could be eventually restored. The estimated cost of repairing the exterior of the main block and demolishing the rear portion was up to $91,500.

Despite ongoing efforts to keep water away from the house and keep it sealed from the elements, the side wall of the addition to the farmhouse separated from the floor joists and the second story partially collapsed in late 2015 while Cedar Ridge was in the process of renegotiating the mortgage to release funds for needed property repairs.

Cedar Ridge has relocated the electrical drop, as instructed by ARC Environmental, and is moving forward with recommended repairs to other structures on the property.

**Farmhouse Maintenance Plan**

Once the Spencer-Carr Farmhouse has been stabilized, we will implement a comprehensive maintenance plan. Our Property and Facilities Manager will conduct a monthly walkthrough of the house, checking the exterior, all interior floors, window panes, entrances, and the crawlspace for any signs of leakage, animal intrusion, or other problems, and will promptly ensure that any necessary repairs are made. In addition to these regular walkthroughs, the Property and Facilities Manager will also make inspections after any intense weather conditions or upon any signs of rodent activity around the house.

Other regular maintenance will take place biannually and annually, in adherence to the Maintenance Chart in “Preservation Briefs 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings,” published by the U.S. Department of the Interior. The farmhouse is in a central location on our property, so mowing around the building will continue on a weekly basis.

Our annual operating budget will allocate funds (in addition to staff time) for routine farmhouse maintenance and repairs.

**Plan for the Restored Spencer-Carr Farmhouse**

The circa 1850 Spencer-Carr farmhouse is one of the most significant defining features of the Cedar Ridge property—together with the historic barn and the silo, all of which are visible from route 198. The architectural charm and historical significance of the farmhouse lead to its regular use as the backdrop for Cedar Ridge and other community functions. The porch on the south façade is used regularly throughout the year as a stage for musicians and speakers—particularly during farm events and the annual community harvest festival. The farmhouse is also one of 17 stations on the 40-minute prayer walk around the property, which is open to the public. Careful mothballing of the farmhouse will greatly enhance the attractiveness of this structure, and ongoing maintenance will ensure this remains a key feature in the life of the Cedar Ridge community.

As part of a yearlong church community consultation process, Cedar Ridge Board of Trustees and Pastoral Team have developed a plan for use of the Spencer-Carr farmhouse in its restored
condition. Fully cognizant of the rich history of the farmhouse, its architectural significance and the role of its original owner in establishing the town of Spencerville, Cedar Ridge Community Church wishes to preserve and use the house in three ways: (i) for the charitable purposes of the church, (ii) as a productive, revenue-generating space, and (iii) as an educational resource accessible to the public.

On the first floor are two parlors, separated by a box spiral stair. These two rooms will be designed as multi-purpose meeting spaces, available for church use and community rentals. Based on experience with renting the historic barn, and given the unique characteristics of the farmhouse, and the picturesque setting (with mature trees and picnic tables), we anticipate this being a valued space for small functions held by church and neighboring community members.

The parlors will maintain their original wood floors and current shelving. Any artifacts in the house will be displayed on the shelves, together with a display case of photos and documents. The simple furniture will be compatible with the style and age of the building, such as a faux wood-burning stove, rocking chairs, and a woven rug on the floor. Interpretative panels will be installed describing the history and architecture of the farmhouse, the history of the property as a whole, and of the Spencerville area. A particular focus will be placed on the history of agriculture in and around the property, including the Cedar Ridge farm, and information will be provided on hunger issues and opportunities for advocacy and action in Montgomery County. The farmhouse will be open to the public periodically, including during monthly farm events, the annual harvest festival, and Advent and Christmas events.

On the second floor, the two bedrooms will be restored, and a bathroom will be installed in the small third room. Hospitality facilities (microwave and refrigerator) will also be installed. This living space will be used to accommodate short- or medium-term guests at Cedar Ridge, such as farm apprentices, volunteers through Worldwide Opportunities on Organic Farms, pastoral interns, and/or people on spiritual retreats. This space will either provide rental income, or defray the expense of renting accommodation for guests elsewhere.

The third floor has less potential because the egress windows are not large enough to permit regular use. This area will be preserved, and used for temporary storage of seasonal items—such as Christmas decorations and harvest festival supplies.

The foundations of the addition to the farmhouse will be delineated by stones flush with the ground to prevent tripping or puddle hazards. Grass will be planted inside this stone outline to create an attractive picnic area.

Notwithstanding these plans, Cedar Ridge Community Church will continue to seek out other partnership opportunities—such as long-term rental to a charitable organization—that might allow for a more timely restoration of the farmhouse.
Funding for the Farmhouse Restoration

If an Historic Area Work Permit is granted, we will immediately begin seeking specific quotes for completion of the mothballing process from experienced contractors, and expect this to be in the region of $200,000. We will draw on our cash reserves to the extent possible, we have a planned fundraising campaign within our church community, and we are currently arranging financing with Sandy Spring Bank (with whom we have a mortgage for our whole property) for the remainder. We are also actively seeking any grants available for this phase, including Preservation Maryland Heritage Fund grants, Maryland Historic Trust Historic Preservation capital grants, as well as smaller private funding sources.

In addition to these funding efforts, which will supplement our regular congregational donations, we currently have a steady stream of revenue from two churches and one middle school that rent our facilities. We are also actively working to increase rental income, and are engaged in serious discussions with a community solar developer and an elementary school program. Once the restored farmhouse is operational, we will explore income-generating activities such as short- or medium-term guest accommodation, rentals for community events, and/or leasing office space to nonprofit organizations.

We expect the restoration phase work to cost in the range of $300-400,000, based on ballpark estimates made by a contractor who visited the site. For this phase, we will pursue similar sources of funding, including community fundraising events, grants, and loans. Based on our past experience of raising close to $1 million to restore the historic barn on our property—transforming it into a beautiful and productive resource—we are confident of our community’s ability and commitment to the future restoration of the farmhouse.
Property Condition Report

Cedar Ridge Community Church
2410 Spencerville Road
Spencerville, MD 20868

Historic Farmhouse

Inspected on 31 AUGUST 2015
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The historic farmhouse consists of two attached main structures – the original front portion constructed circa 1850; and the rear addition dating to the 1870’s. This rear addition is dilapidated and beyond feasible rehabilitation. It is unstable, unsafe, and at risk of collapse creating a dangerous condition. The electrical service drop is connected to this part of the structure as well and poses a serious hazard should the building shift or collapse, separating the service drop from the SE cables. Further, the electrical distribution panel to the farmhouse is hazardous, improperly maintained and unprotected, and is directly exposed to rainwater.

These dangerous conditions should be immediately addressed to lessen the risks. The electrical service drop is recommended to be relocated; one of the two (2) electrical services considered for termination of service; and, rear portion of the farmhouse is recommended to be demolished.

If there are any historic preservation covenants or requirements to retain the rear portion of the farmhouse, an appeal or discussion should be initiated to negotiate alternative means for still meeting the spirit of the preservation standards for the farmhouse, but within more realistic financial parameters than reconstructing it, as repair and restoration are no longer possible.

The front portion of the structure is in comparatively better structural condition, though not habitable and is infested with rodents. Nonetheless, this portion can eventually be rehabilitated and restored. The first priority should be to repair the envelope of this section of the farmhouse to weatherproof it and prevent further damage from continued exposure.

Please refer to the Appendix-A for terminology used in this report to categorize the type of condition, defect, or deficiency observed.
**Historic Farmhouse Conditions**

**Dangerous Condition:** The overhead electrical service drop is connected to an unstable portion of the structure which is at risk of collapsing. If the structure shifts or does collapse, the service entrance cable (“SE cable”) could pull away from the connection at the structure and potentially drop a live wire onto the ground endangering persons nearby until the local utility provider responds.

The electrical panel mounted inside the structure is exposed to weather with evidence of water on the panel (see inset photo). The circuit breakers are exposed with no blank plates over empty breaker slots. The panel and breakers are not intended for an exterior application, which is essentially the case given the weather exposure, and poses serious risks and creates a hazardous condition.

Both electrical services do not appear to serve the farmhouse. One is fed underground to outbuildings and does not necessarily have to be mounted to the building.

Immediate steps should be taken to minimize the risk of an electrical fire and the risk of electrocution. See the below recommendations.
**Dangerous Condition:** The rear portion of the farmhouse is dilapidated and at risk of collapse. The east exterior wall (inset photo left) is load-bearing and is buckling. Sections of 2nd floor are no longer connected at the wall studs on this wall and are exerting outward pressure on the wall causing it to buckle. Missing portions of the wood lap siding have exposed the structural wood framing to weather and precipitation (see photo below). This exposure will advance the deterioration and further undermine the structural integrity increasing the risk of collapse for this portion of the building.

The west exterior wall (opposite to the wall depicted in the left photo) appears be leaning to the east, which is very likely due to the drop of the 2nd floor at the buckled east wall pulling the west wall studs eastward.

Areas of the roof on the rear west portion of the farmhouse have collapsed allowing rainwater and precipitation to enter the interior and exacerbate deterioration. This portion of the structure is unsafe to enter; cannot be occupied; is infested with rodents; and, condemnable by the government authorities having jurisdiction.

**Deferred Maintenance Conditions:** While not habitable and also rodent-infested, the front portion of the farmhouse was in comparatively better structural condition than the rear portion, but a number of conditions were observed that require repair and restoration in order to preserve the structure for this part of the historic building.
Deferred Maintenance Condition - Foundation and Cellar: The stone foundation along the rear wall of the cellar is crumbling where an access door opening was created at some time after the original construction to enter the crawlspace under the rear portion of the farmhouse, which was a later addition according to information provided by the facilities manager, Mark Hartley. The stonework around the access opening appears to not have been properly re-laid for a fenestration, and has subsequently crumbled. The floor joists and support members bear on this part of the foundation as does the original rear of building and roof structure above (the rafters run perpendicular to this foundation wall).

This area of the foundation is compromising the structural support for the building and should be addressed to prohibit further damage.

The exterior cellar doors over the stairs to the cellar are not watertight. Precipitation entering around the cellar doors further increases the humid and moist conditions of the cellar promoting rot of the structural wood elements of the building from below such as the floor supports and sill beams. Other small sections of the foundation for the front portion of the farmhouse are in disrepair and are being undermined by rodents (see the below photo). Note stonework missing at the southwest corner of the farmhouse behind the safety cone.
At the northeast corner of the cellar daylight entering between the wood structure and the stone foundation is due to missing stonework which should be repaired for preserving the structure. See recommendations below.

Some repointing work appears to have been performed along the east wall of the foundation in the cellar; however, the appearance of the mortar used for repointing indicates a high content of portland cement which further damages stone foundations, especially below grade.
Deferred Maintenance Condition – Wood Lap Siding: Generally the lap siding of the front portion of the farmhouse is in moderate condition with only a few defective areas. On the west gable wall of the building a siding board has twisted out from under the course above and is exposing the building fabric underneath to weather and precipitation. On the southeast corner the first two courses of siding have apparently been removed possibly by rodents as evidenced by the wear on the bottom of the 3rd course and on exposed edges of the lower two courses.
Deferred Maintenance Condition – Front Porch Floor: The front porch floor is showing signs of rot and deterioration. Although the floor boards were painted at some point in time, the wood appears to have been still absorbing and retaining moisture – probably due to their orientation perpendicular to the floor slope. Additionally, if the other three surfaces of each board are not primed or treated to resist absorption, the paint on the top surface will lose its adhesion and peel away due to the high moisture content within the lumber.

Most porch floors are sloped away from the front façade and thus the porch boards are typically oriented parallel with the slope for sheeting rainwater along the length of the boards. The existing boards, however, appear instead to be oriented perpendicular to the slope, which allows water to trap in the joints between the boards, and eventually causes rot as seen in the photo.

Deferred Maintenance Condition – Standing Seam Roof: Only the front porch was accessible for inspection. Overall the metal and seams were observed to be in moderately good condition; however, the coating has not been maintained and has peeled away with rust forming on the surfaces of the pans.
NOT included in the Property Conditions Assessment:

- **Heating and A/C Units:** No operable air-conditioning or heating system in the building.
- **Plumbing:** No operable plumbing fixtures in the building.
- **Windows:** According to information provided by the facilities manager, Mark Hartley, the windows were ordered to be boarded by Montgomery County. If any of the original double-hung window sashes have been salvaged or stored or remain in place, they were not inspected.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**ELECTRICAL:** Relocate the electrical service drop off of the unstable building structure. The most efficient method is to erect a 14'-0” post (18'-0” total length with 4'-0” in the ground) in accordance with the local electric utility’s specifications, which are available at:


An application for service relocation/change of service will have to be submitted to BGE for relocating the service drop to the new post.

Because there are currently two (2) separate electrical services, consider terminating one of the services since the farmhouse is not currently occupied and will likely not be occupied in the near future. Electrical power needed for any lighting in the farmhouse and for the well pump can be fed from the other service.

The electrical distribution panel mounted in the rear portion of the farmhouse should be disconnected and removed.

**REAR PORTION of Farmhouse:** Demolish the dilapidated rear portion of the farmhouse. Its condition is dangerous and beyond feasible reparations or restoration. If there are any deed covenants or other historic preservation requirements imposed by the authorities having jurisdiction (AHJ) to retain the rear structure, an appeal or discussions can be initiated to consider alternatives or compromises to any such covenants or requirements due to the added financial hardship of restoring/rebuilding this portion of the farmhouse. The spirit of historic preservation standards for retaining the historic significance and value of many other properties is often achieved through various negotiated means that are mutually agreeable and financially realistic.

Extreme care should be taken when dismantling the rear structure for both safety reasons and to protect the remaining front portion of the farmhouse, which is presumed to be preserved. Appropriately skilled and experienced contractors should be qualified and interviewed before negotiating a contract for demolishing the structure as well as for repairing the back of the original farmhouse where residual openings and penetrations will have to be closed-in; restored to their original design; and weather-proofed.
STONE FOUNDATION: Repair the crumbled areas of the foundation as described above. Also, removal of the high-portland cement mortar and repointing with an appropriate mortar will improve the integrity of the stonework by minimizing the destructive effects of subflorescence and efflorescence caused by high-portland mortars. The proper mix of mortar for historic stone walls is similar to a Type-O mortar mix using 1:2:9 ratio with a Type-S hydrated lime.

CELLAR DOORS: Replace the existing plywood doors with watertight basement stair doors to prevent water infiltration and prohibit rot of the adjacent structural wood members. Bilco® is a popular product for pre-fabricated/pre-hung cellar doors. Properly sealing and flashing the cellar door unit is critical to ensure a watertight connection to the building and at the foundation surrounding the cellar stairwell.

WOOD LAP SIDING: Repair the areas of lap siding to maintain a weatherproof envelope around the front portion of the structure. Repainting the siding after repairs are complete is also recommended.

PORCH FLOOR: Remove the porch floor boards and inspect the framing. If the joists are running parallel with the slope of the porch, this explains the orientation of the porch flooring running perpendicular to the floor slope. The porch floor joists should run perpendicular to the slope and so the flooring will parallel the slope for shedding rainwater along the length of the flooring boards.

Proper flashings are critical between the framing and the underside of the porch flooring for maintaining a rot-free wooden porch. There are several detail drawings available depicting the proper installations of flashing at each typical section of porch construction. Because pressure-treated framing lumber is commonly used for porches, the flashing material should be compatible with the chemicals contained in the pressure-treated lumber to avoid corrosive reaction.

STANDING SEAM ROOF: Assuming the front portion of the farmhouse will be preserved, the standing seam roof should be replaced based on the conditions observed on the porch roof. These conditions may or may not be the same on the upper main roof. However, rust has formed on the pans of the porch roof because the coating applied over the roofing has worn away over time exposing the metal to oxygen and moisture causing corrosion. This is likely the same condition on the upper roof considering the factor of time and the probability of infrequent maintenance.

Although cleaning and preparing the existing metal for re-coating is an option, the callbacks on recoated residential standing seam metal roofing are high. In order to prevent future rust, the existing metal has to be meticulously cleaned and prepared ensuring that the surfaces are 100% free of any residual, deleterious material that may cause a loss of adhesion with the new coating sealant. This is a painstakingly labor-intensive process which can sometimes exceed the labor cost for installing a new roof.

Most of the coating products available on the market are for commercial roof applications where appearance is not particularly scrutinized. New and improved products are continually offered by manufacturers; however, a proven track-record over a satisfactorily long period of time is preferred before committing funds to these applications.
Therefore, the recommendation is roof replacement whichever roofing material is historically accurate or acceptable to the AHJ. Note that the original roof under the existing standing seam is cedar shingles, which are still in place. A new roof of new cedar shingles may not be necessarily required for meeting historic preservation criterion. Other less expensive modern roofing products closely simulate many historic roof materials, one or more of which may be accepted by the AHJ.

**OPINIONS OF PROBABLE COSTS**

The opinions of probable costs are to assist in a general understanding of the physical condition of the subject property or building. The costs do not include capital replacement costs; routine maintenance expenses; costs for usual and customary repairs; cosmetic and/or decorative enhancements; and, leasehold improvements.

Actual costs may vary from the dollar amounts approximated in this report. The probable cost values are only to be construed as rough order of magnitude estimates. Many factors such as the extent of actual scope, design details, quality of materials, phasing of the work, contractor performance, and other variables will influence the actual costs either greater or less than the amounts provided herein.

**RELOCATE ELECTRICAL SERVICE DROP:** $3,500 - $4,500

**DEMOLISH REAR PORTION of BUILDING:** $20,000 - $25,000

  **NOTE:** Included are the costs of 30-yard containers, landfill fees, equipment, and carpentry labor to disconnect attachments to the original section (front portion) of the farmhouse and infill residual openings in the rear wall.

**STONE FOUNDATION REPAIRS:** $3,000 - $4,000

**NEW PRE-FABRICATED CELLAR DOORS:** $4,500 - $5,000

  **NOTE:** Assumes masonry and carpentry labor for properly seating pre-fabricated cellar door unit on stairs foundation.

**RE-FRAME FRONT PORCH and NEW FLOORING:** $5,000 - $5,500

**REPLACE STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING:** $20,000 - $25,000

  **ALTERNATE:** **NEW CEDAR SHINGLE ROOF:** $17,500 - $22,500
Types of Physical Deficiencies

- **Dangerous or Adverse Conditions** – Observed defect, deficiency, and/or condition that poses a danger, risk of injury, or hazardous situation.

- **Design Conditions** – Observed defect, deficiency, and/or condition resulting from an error, fault, and/or oversight in the design.

- **Improper Installation Conditions** – Observed defect, deficiency, and/or condition caused by a failure to install in accordance with the intended design, the specifications, and/or the manufacturer's installation requirements.

- **Deferred Maintenance Conditions** – Observed defect, deficiency, and/or condition that could have been averted or lessened by routine and regular maintenance.

- **De Minimis Conditions** – Observed defect, deficiency, and/or condition which is comparatively minor and generally not recognized as problematic, such as due to normal wear and tear, but is mentioned in the report for information only, however, is not included in the Opinions of Probable Costs.
19 September 2018

Craig Moloney, AIA, LEED AP
CEM Design
520 Anderson Avenue
Rockville, MD 20850

RE: Cedar Ridge Farmhouse- Demolition of Previous Addition
Spencerville, MD

Dear Craig,

Rathgeber/Goss Associates visited the site of the historic farm house to assess the current structural condition on 23 May 2018. The house is composed of two main sections, the original three-story building to the south and two-story addition to the north. The original building can be stabilized and repaired such that it can eventually be restored and occupied. However, the addition to the north is currently a safety hazard. The roof has been partially collapsed for some time resulting in direct exposure of the structure to weather. This has resulted in the collapse of the second floor due to the structure continuing to rot and decay. The walls are bowed out due to the lack of second floor bracing and there are significant areas of rotten members. In our professional opinion, the north addition is beyond repair and should be demolished. The original section of the house can be stabilized and repaired.

Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

RATHGEBER/GOSS ASSOCIATES, P.C.

Bill Duvall, P.E.
Vice-President
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

1. The work includes the design and construction of the five-story, 100,000 square foot office building, with an adjacent parking garage. The building will be clad in a combination of precast concrete panels and glass. The parking garage will consist of two levels with a total of 500 parking spaces. The project is located in the heart of the city, near the main train station.

2. The project is subject to the requirements of state and federal regulations, including the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Energy Star program. The building must achieve a minimum of Energy Star rating of 80.

3. The project team includes the architect, structural engineer, civil engineer, and general contractor. The project manager is responsible for coordinating the efforts of all team members.

4. The project is scheduled to be completed within 24 months from the date of issuance of the construction permit.

DIVISION 4 - MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. The building will be constructed using high-quality materials, including structural steel with a yield strength of at least 50 ksi and precast concrete panels with a compressive strength of at least 4000 psi.

2. The building envelope will be insulated with R-19 Rated Insulation, which meets the current energy efficiency standards.

3. The building will be designed to be LEED certified at the Silver level.

DIVISION 5 - MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT

1. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all machinery and equipment are in good working condition and meet the project specifications.

2. The project team will be responsible for preparing detailed maintenance and repair schedules for all machinery and equipment.

3. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all machinery and equipment are tagged and identified with appropriate labels.

DIVISION 6 - PLUMBING AND ELECTRICAL

1. The building will be designed to meet all local and national codes for plumbing and electrical systems.

2. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all plumbing and electrical systems are properly tested and commissioned.

3. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all plumbing and electrical systems are properly maintained and repaired as necessary.

DIVISION 7 - HISTORIC PRESERVATION

1. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all historic preservation guidelines are followed during the construction process.

2. The project team will be responsible for coordinating with the local historic preservation board to ensure that the project is in compliance with all historic preservation regulations.

3. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all historic preservation guidelines are followed during the construction process.

DIVISION 8 - SUSTAINABILITY

1. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all sustainable practices are followed during the construction process.

2. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all sustainable materials are used in the construction process.

3. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all sustainable energy practices are followed during the construction process.

DIVISION 9 - RISK MANAGEMENT

1. The project team will be responsible for identifying and managing all potential risks associated with the project.

2. The project team will be responsible for developing contingency plans for all potential risks.

3. The project team will be responsible for monitoring all risks throughout the construction process.

DIVISION 10 - CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS

1. The construction documents are subject to revision by the owner and the architect at any time during the construction process.

2. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all construction documents are up-to-date and reflect the current project specifications.

3. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all construction documents are properly reviewed and approved by the owner and the architect.

DIVISION 11 - PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1. The project team will be responsible for managing all aspects of the project, including scheduling, budgeting, and quality control.

2. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all project milestones are met on time and within budget.

3. The project team will be responsible for managing all project risks and ensuring that all project risks are properly addressed.

DIVISION 12 - COMPLETION

1. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that the project is completed on time and within budget.

2. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all project deliverables are completed and accepted by the owner.

3. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all project warranties are in place and properly fulfilled.

DIVISION 13 - HUMAN RESOURCES

1. The project team will be responsible for managing all human resources aspects of the project, including hiring, training, and performance evaluations.

2. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all human resources policies are followed and enforced.

3. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all human resources issues are properly addressed.

DIVISION 14 - ENVIRONMENT

1. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all environmental regulations are followed during the construction process.

2. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all environmental impacts are properly addressed.

3. The project team will be responsible for ensuring that all environmental best practices are followed throughout the construction process.
SECOND FLOOR FRAMING PLAN

N

PLAN NOTES:

1. SEE SET 3 FOR GENERAL NOTES.

2. SEE SET 34 AND SET 3 FOR DETAILS.

3. WALL BRACKETS SHOWN ARE BETWEEN 2ND AND 3RD FLOORS.
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THIRD FLOOR FRAMING PLAN

N

PLAN NOTES:

1. SEE SET 3 FOR GENERAL NOTES.

2. SEE SET 34 AND SET 3 FOR DETAILS.

3. WALL BRACKETS SHOWN ARE BETWEEN 2ND FLOOR TO ROOF.