3rd Preliminary Consultation
MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: Parcel 770, Brookeville
Meeting Date: 1/23/2019

Resource: Spatial Resource
Report Date: 1/16/2019
Brookeville Historic District

Applicant: 19501 Georgia LLC
Public Notice: 1/9/2019
(Luke Olson, Architect)

Review: 3rd Preliminary Consultation
Tax Credit: No

Case Number: N/A
Staff: Michael Kyne

PROPOSAL: Construction of four (4) new single-family houses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the applicant make revisions based upon the HPC’s comments and return with a revised proposal for a fourth preliminary consultation or HAWP application, per the HPC’s recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Spatial Resource within the Brookeville Historic District
STYLE: Undeveloped Parcel
DATE: N/A

Statement of historic significance, as summarized by staff:

The Town of Brookeville is a rural town in northeastern Montgomery County, approximately 18 miles from Washington, D.C. The Town was founded by Richard Thomas in 1794 and by the early 19th century had become a center of commerce. With the advent of the automobile in the early 20th century, the Town’s commercial success declined. Despite the encroachment of later suburban development, the Town remains a unique collection of structures, which exhibit a variety of architectural styles. The houses within the Brookeville Historic District retain their historic relationship to one another and to the roadways. The historic district is accessed via Georgia Avenue (High Street) from the south and northwest and via Market Street from the east. The Brookeville Historic District was designated in 1985, with its boundaries coinciding with the Town’s boundaries.
Fig. 1: Brookeville Historic District, with subject property marked by yellow star.

**BACKGROUND**

The applicant previously appeared before the Commission at the September 19, 2018 and November 14, 2018 HPC meetings for preliminary consultations.

**PROPOSAL:**

The applicant proposes to construct four (4) new single-family houses on the undeveloped 4.29-acre parcel.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES**

When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Brookeville Historic District several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the *Brookeville Historic District Master Plan Amendment*, the *Town of Brookeville Updated Comprehensive Plan*, the 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.

**Brookeville Historic District Master Plan Amendment**

The *Brookeville Historic District Master Plan Amendment* (#23/65) identifies Primary Resources, Secondary Resources, and Spatial Resources. Parcel 770 is an undeveloped Spatial Resource at the southern boundary of the historic district on Georgia Avenue (High Street).

**Town of Brookeville Updated Comprehensive Plan** (see attached).

*Sec. 24A-8. Same-Criteria for issuance.*
(a) The commission shall instruct the director to deny a permit if it finds, based on the evidence and information presented to or before the commission that the alteration for which the permit is sought would be inappropriate, inconsistent with or detrimental to the preservation, enhancement or ultimate protection of the historic site or historic resource within an historic district, and to the purposes of this chapter.

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

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

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

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

**Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation**

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

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

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

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

The applicant previously appeared before the Commission at the September 19, 2018 and November 14, 2018 HPC meetings for preliminary consultations. At the November 14, 2018 preliminary consultation, the Commission expressed the following regarding the applicant’s proposal:

- The proposed houses – especially the three proposed at the front - should demonstrate greater architectural variety, including height, width, materials, and style.
- The proposed houses should demonstrate a variety of fenestration and muntin patterns.
- Masonry should be introduced among the three houses proposed at the front, taking cues from the prevalent masonry structures within the historic district and on the opposite side of High Street.
- Traditional roofing materials, including standing seam metal and wood/cedar roofing, should be used to be more compatible with the historic district.
- The proposed garages should demonstrate greater variety, which could include a two-story garage with living space above.
- The proposed house at the rear should be reoriented to be parallel with High Street.
- The proposed house at the rear should be moved back to further reduce visibility from High Street.
- The garage of the proposed house at the rear should be detached.
- The proposed circle driveway at the rear house should be eliminated, and the driveway should be revised to access and encourage the use of the front entrance.

The applicant has returned for a third preliminary consultation with the following revisions:

- The style and dimensions of the three front houses have been revised to provide greater variety.
- The proposed three front houses demonstrate a variety of muntin patterns, including 6-over-1, 6-over-6, and 2-over-2, whereas they were all previously 6-over-1.
- The center house at the front is now proposed to be a brick house.
- Traditional roofing materials have been introduced to the proposed three front houses, with standing seam metal proposed on the northernmost house.
- The proposed garages demonstrate greater variety, including a two-car gable front garage, a two-car side gable garage, a two-car garage with single front gable and shed roof attachment, and a two-car 1 ½-story garage with front and rear dormers to provide space above.
- The proposed rear house has been moved back and reoriented to be parallel to High Street.
- The proposed garage has been detached from the proposed rear house and relocated to be behind the house.
- The previously proposed circle driveway at the rear house has been eliminated, and the driveway has been revised with a parking area near the front entrance.

Dimensions and Materials

The dimensions and materials for each proposed house is as follows:

- **Lot A (southernmost front house)**
  - House: 3,113 sf; +/- 50’-1” wide; +/- 26’-9” high; two-story rectangular house; two-story forward projecting front porch with living space on the second-floor; optional one-story screened porch on the rear (east) elevation; one-story octagonal bay window on the right (south) elevation; fiber cement (first-floor) and cedar shingle (second-floor) siding; 6-over-1 aluminum-clad wood windows; asphalt shingle roofing; brick veneer chimney on
the right (south) elevation; PVC columns and trim

- Garage: 22’ x 22’; 12’-8 ¾” high; two-car garage; gable front; fiber cement siding with cedar shingles in the gables; aluminum-clad wood window and door; carriage-style doors; stucco foundation; asphalt shingle roofing

- **Lot B (center front house)**

  - House (Option A): 3,194 sf; +/− 40’-6” wide; +/− 30’-9” high; two-story, two-bay main massing with entrance portico justified to the right (as viewed from the front); two-story, single-bay right-side (south) projection; rear ell; one-story octagonal bay window on the left (north) elevation; full-width one-story covered rear porch on right (south) side of rear ell; brick; fiber cement siding on the rear ell; asphalt shingle roofing; operable wooden shutters on the front (west) elevation; PVC columns and trim

  - House (Option B): 3,166 sf; +/− 38’ wide; +/− 30’-9” high; five-bay, two-story with center entrance portico; telescoping rear ell; one-story octagonal bay window on the left (north) elevation; one-story covered rear porch with flat roof and second-floor walkout on right (south) side of rear ell; one-story covered porch on rear (southeast corner) of main massing in brick; fiber cement siding on the rear ell; asphalt shingle roofing; operable wooden shutters on the front (west) and right (south) elevations; PVC columns and trim

  - Garage: 22’ x 22’; 12’-8 ¾” high; two-car garage; side gable; fiber cement siding; aluminum-clad wood window and door; carriage-style doors; stucco foundation; asphalt shingle roofing

- **Lot C**

  - **House**: 3,099 sf; +/- 42’ wide; +/- 28’-6” high; two-story, T-shape house; gable front two-story massing on the left (north) intersecting with three-bay two-story side gable massing on the right (south); low-sloping roof which extends to create a covered porch on the front (west) and rear (east) elevations of the right massing; three gable dormers on the front (west) elevation of the right massing; single shed dormer on the rear (east) elevation of the right massing; first-floor covered entry centered on the left (north) elevation; stone veneer chimney on the left (north) elevation; octagonal bay window on the front (west) and right (south) elevations; fiber cement siding; standing seam metal roofing; 2-over-2 aluminum-clad wood windows; PVC columns and trim; stone veneer foundation

  - **Garage**: 23’ x 24’; 12’-8 ¾” high; two-car garage; gable front with shed projection to the left; fiber cement siding; aluminum-clad wood windows and door; carriage-style doors; stucco foundation; standing seam metal roofing

- **Lot D**

  - **House**: 3,400 sf (not including the 1/2 story); 2 ½-story, three-bay main massing with two-story left (north) side projection; full-width front porch with standing seam metal roof; three shed dormers on the front (west) elevation of main massing; one shed dormer on the front (west) and rear (east) elevations on the left (north) side projection; first-floor covered entry with standing seam metal roof on the left (north) elevation; first-floor covered entry on the rear (east) elevation; stone veneer chimney on the right (south) elevation; octagonal
bay window on the front (west) and right (south) elevations; fiber cement siding; cedar shingle roofing; 6-over-6 aluminum-clad wood windows; PVC, porch railing, columns, and trim; stone veneer foundation

- **Garage:** 24’ x 24’; 12’-8 ¾” high; two-car garage; 1 ½-story; side gable with shed dormers on the front (west) and rear (east) elevations; fiber cement siding; aluminum-clad wood windows and door; single carriage-style door; stucco foundation; cedar shingle roofing

Staff is generally supportive of the applicant’s proposal, finding that the proposal has been revised in accordance with the Commission’s guidance. Staff acknowledges that, from a historic preservation standpoint, the proposal has improved since the initial September 19, 2018 preliminary consultation. Staff asks the Commission to consider the following points of discussion to further minimize any potential for the proposal to detract from the character-defining features of the Brookeville Historic District.

Specific points of discussion include:

- **Two site plan options:**
  - Option A includes two curb cuts, with the southernmost curb cut providing a shared driveway for Lots A and B and the northernmost curb cut providing a shared driveway to Lots C and D. With this option, all proposed garages are accessed from the front.
  - Option B includes one curb cut (the northernmost with a shared driveway providing access to all four lots. With this option, a rear access drive will be created to provide access to rear-loading garages on Lots A and B. As the Commission noted during the previous preliminary consultations, there are a variety of garages in the Brookeville Historic District, including rear-loading garages, making Option B a compatible option.
  - Staff met with the applicant on January 9, 2018 and encouraged them to explore Option B, as it would result in less driveway/parking area and fewer curb cuts adjacent to the public right-of-way at the southern entrance of the historic district.
  - Staff asks the Commission to provide feedback regarding the preferred option, if any.

- **Two design options for Lot B:**
  - As previously discussed, the applicant has proposed two options for Lot B.
  - Staff met with the applicant on January 9, 2018 and encouraged them to explore Option B, finding that it was a more traditional design and would be more compatible with the historic district.
  - Staff asks the Commission to provide feedback regarding the preferred option, if any.

- **Architectural variety and materials:**
  - Has the applicant responded appropriately to the Commission’s previous comments and concerns?
Do the proposed houses demonstrate sufficient architectural variety, and are the proposed designs compatible with the streetscape and surrounding historic district?

Are the proposed materials appropriate and compatible? One of the character-defining features of the Brookeville Historic District is the prevalence of traditional building materials, especially roofing materials (i.e., cedar shingles and standing seam metal roofing). Are alternative materials and asphalt roofing appropriate for the proposed houses at the southern entrance of the historic district, or do they have the potential to detract from the character of the streetscape?

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Staff recommends that the applicant further explore site plan Option B, finding that it would result in less driveway/parking area and fewer curb cuts adjacent to the public right-of-way at the southern entrance of the historic district.

- Staff recommends that the applicant further explore Option B for the proposed house on Lot B, finding that it is a more traditional design, which would be more compatible with the historic district.

- Staff finds that, due to the prevalence of traditional building materials in the Brookeville Historic District and the location of the proposed houses at the southern entrance of the historic district, alternative materials have the potential to detract from the character-defining features of the streetscape and surrounding historic district. Staff recommends that traditional roofing materials (i.e., traditional field-turned standing seam metal roofing or cedar shingles, as opposed to asphalt shingles) be used and that traditional building materials be used where PVC composite is currently proposed; however, staff finds that smooth-faced or beaded smooth-faced fiber cement siding with a 4”-5” exposure may be appropriate. Where shutters are proposed, staff recommends that they be operable and functional in relation to the fenestration (i.e., shutters with paired windows should have operable double shutters).

- When the applicant submits a HAWP application, full details should be provided to ensure that the proposed materials and details are compatible with the historic district. Specific required details include a complete site plan with materials, features, and dimensions labeled, scaled plans and elevations (as have been provided for the third preliminary consultation), and section details for all significant architectural features, such as trim and fenestration.

- Staff recommends that the applicant make revisions based upon the HPC’s comments and return with a revised proposal for a fourth preliminary consultation or HAWP application, per the HPC’s recommendation.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301/563-3400

APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: LARSON@GMAIL.COM
Contact Person: LUKE OLSON
Daytime Phone No.: 240-333-2021

Tax Account No.: 0714-28

Name of Property Owner: 19301 GEORGET LLC
Daytime Phone No.: 

Address: UNADDRESS 3682 ST 
STREET NUMBER: BROADVILLE MD 20833
CITY: SUBURB
STREET: NEAREST CROSS STREET:
ZIP CODE: 20833

Contractor:

Contractor Registration No.:

Agent for Owner: LUKE OLSON
Daytime Phone No.: 240-333-2021

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREmise

House Number: UNADDRESS 3682 ST 
STREET: NEAREST CROSS STREET:
TOWN/CITY: BROADVILLE SUBDIVISION:
NEAREST CROSS STREET: CHANTILLY ST
LOT: 53317 BLOCK: 37 SUBDIVISION:
PURCHASE:

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT/ACTIVITY AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE

☐ Construct ☐ Alter/Remodel ☐ Add ☐ Ext. ☐ Add/Remodel ☐ Build ☐ Ext.
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Acquire/Remodel ☐ Repair ☐ Revitalize
☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☐ Revitalize ☐ Replace ☐ Repair
☐ Other: 

1B. Construction cost estimate: $ 2,000,000

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

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND ADDITIONS

2A. Type of sewage disposal: 01 SEVSSC 02 SEPT 03 Other:

2B. Type of water supply: 01 SEVSSC 02 Well 03 Other:

PART THREE: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCE/RETAINING WALL

3A. Height: 5 Feet 0 Inches

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

☐ On party line/property line ☐ Entirely on land of owner ☐ On public right of way/assessment

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

Signature of owner or authorized agent: 
Date: 8/26/18

Approved: For Chair, Historic Preservation Commission

Disapproved: Signature: 
Date: 

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

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS
(UNADDRESSED) HIGH STREET, BROOKEVILLE MD PARCEL 770

SCOPE OF WORK: SUBDIVIDE EXISTING UNDEVELOPED LOT AND BUILD FOUR NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSES
STREET VIEW OF EXISTING SITE

PROPOSED STREETSCAPE

BROOKEVILLE FARMS
BASED ON THE FEEDBACK PROVIDED BY THE COMMISSIONERS, THE BROOKEVILLE LAP, AND HPC STAFF WE HAVE PROPOSED A NEW HOUSE FOR LOT B WITH A NARROWER 2-STORY FRONT MASS AND A TELESCOPING REAR ADDITION TO PROVIDE FURTHER DIFFERENTIATION IN THE HOUSE MASSINGS AND TO BETTER REFLECT THE VARIETY OF HOUSES IN THE HISTORIC DISTRICT. THE NEW HOUSE IS PROPOSED TO HAVE A BRICK MAIN MASS TO RESPOND TO THE HOUSES ACROSS THE STREET AND IS FURTHER DIFFERENTIATED FROM THE NEIGHBORING HOUSES BY IT'S DETAILING. WE HAVE FURTHER REVISED THE ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS AND MATERIALS OF THE FLANKING HOUSES TO PROVIDE UNIQUE ARCHITECTURAL STYLES FOR EACH HOUSE. WE'VE DETACHED THE GARAGE FROM THE HOUSE ON LOT D AND PUSHED BOTH THE HOUSE AND THE GARAGE FURTHER BACK ON THE LOT AT THE SUGGESTION ON THE BROOKEVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION. WE'VE ALSO PROVIDED FOUR UNIQUE DESIGNS FOR PROPOSED DETACHED GARAGES.
HOUSES RECENTLY APPROVED FOR INFILL DEVELOPMENT IN THE DISTRICT ENCOMPASS A VARIETY OF STYLES AND SIZES, REFLECTING THOSE FOUND IN THE HISTORIC DISTRICT. THE SIZES OF THE HOUSES WE ARE PROPOSING FALL IN THE MIDDLE OF THE RANGE PROVIDED ABOVE AT BETWEEN 3,099-3,400 SF.
SITING CONCEPT OPT A: WE'VE SITED THE HOUSES TO ADDRESS HIGH STREET, TO MINIMIZE THE AMOUNT OF DRIVEWAY, TO PROVIDE A BUFFER BETWEEN THE CEMETERY AND THE DEVELOPMENT, TO MATCH THE RHYTHM AND SPACING OF THE HOUSES ACROSS THE STREET, AND TO MINIMIZE THE VISIBLE IMPACT OF THE HOUSE ON LOT D, OPT A LAYS OUT DRIVEWAYS WITH THE FUTURE BYPASS IN MIND.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT</th>
<th>LOT AREA</th>
<th>COVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>1624+84=2,108=4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>1624+84=2,108=4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>1624+84=2,108=4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>1624+84=2,108=4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>13,880 SF</td>
<td>1787+92=2,380=0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITING CONCEPT OPT B: IN RESPONSE TO HPG STAFF FEEDBACK WE'VE DEVELOPED AN ALTERNATIVE OPTION WITH A SINGLE CURB-CUT OFF OF HIGH STREET FOR A PRIVATE DRIVE PROVIDING ACCESS TO THE DETACHED GARAGES ON ALL FOUR SITES. THIS SITE PLAN ALSO SHOWN AN ALTERNATIVE FOOTPRINT FOR THE HOUSE ON LOT B ALSO DEVELOPED AT HPG STAFF'S REQUEST AND FURTHER DETAILED IN THE FOLLOWING PAGES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT</th>
<th>LOT AREA</th>
<th>COVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT A</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>4,840.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT B</td>
<td>15,000 SF</td>
<td>12,072.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT C</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>4,266.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT D</td>
<td>133,830.62</td>
<td>123,830.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Capitol View Historic District House**

**No. 3 Brighton Dam Road (3,770 SF)**
Brookeville Woodmill and House

**1. Precedent Images - Lot A**

**2. Images of Houses Across High Street**

Design characteristics: Craftsman-style bungalows with front-facing gables over covered porches, cedar shingle siding and cottage style windows. The majority of the second floor footprint is hidden within the roofline of the structure, reducing the perceived massing of the house.
DESIGN CHARACTERISTICS: 2-STORY SIDE SABLE HOUSE WITH A 2-3 BAY WIDE FRONT MASS, A 1-1/2 STORY SIDE ADDITION SET BACK FROM THE FRONT OF THE HOUSE, AND A FRONT PORCH OR PORTICO AT THE ENTRY. EXTERIOR MATERIALS INCLUDE BRICK VENEER AND LAP SIDING, 6 OVER 6 DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS, PTD WOOD SHUTTERS, AND ASPHALT AND STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFS.
**PRECEDENT IMAGES - LOT C**

**DESIGN CHARACTERISTICS:** 1.5-2 STORY HOUSE WITH A CROSS-GABLE ROOF AND A FRONT PORCH TO THE SIDE OF THE FRONT GABLE MASS. EXTERIOR MATERIALS INCLUDE LAP SIDING, 2 OVER 2 WINDOWS, A BRICK OR STONE BASE, AND ASPHALT OR STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING.

**IMAGES OF HOUSES ACROSS HIGH STREET**
BROOKEVILLE FARMS LOT D

PROJECT #18.0302
DATE: 08/07/2018
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BROOKEVILLE FARMS  GARAGE D
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