STAFF REFORT				
Address:	14601 Berryville Rd., Germantown	Meeting Date:	3/13/2019	
<b>Resource:</b>	Master Plan Site #24/24	<b>Report Date:</b>	3/6/2019	
	(Montanverde)	Public Notice:	2/27/2019	
Applicant:	Tucker and Meakin Bennett (Thomas Taltavull, Architect)			
Review:	Preliminary Consultation	Tax Credit:	N/A	
		Staff:	Michael Kyne	
PROPOSAL:	Partial Demolition and building addition			

### Preliminary Consultation <u>MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION</u> STAFF REPORT

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the applicant make revisions based upon the HPC's comments and return for a second preliminary consultation.

#### **PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:**

SIGNIFICANCE:	<i>Master Plan</i> Site #24/24 (Montanverde)
STYLE:	Federal
DATE:	c. 1806-1812

### *The following was excerpted from Places from the Past: The Tradition of Gardez Bien in Montgomery County, Maryland,* and amended as necessary:

Montanverde is an important resource for its association with Major George Peter, an influential figure in both military and political spheres. In addition, the early-19th century house is architecturally significant for its outstanding integrity and noteworthy details. George Peter was appointed Second Lieutenant in the 9th Infantry, in 1799, by President John Adams, receiving his commission from George Washington at Mt. Vernon. Serving in the Missouri Territory, he was said to have fired the first salute upon the return of the Lewis and Clark expedition. He was assigned to watch the movements of Aaron Burr, serving later as a witness at Burr's trial, in 1807. He was made a Captain in the Artillery and then promoted in 1808 to major.

Peter established Montanverde between 1806 and 1812 as a summer estate, with an inheritance from his prominent father, Robert Peter, first mayor of Georgetown. With this fortune and a new bride, in 1809, Peter resigned from distinguished military service and began a well-acclaimed political career. Over the following fifty years, Peter served in both the U.S. Congress and the Maryland General Assembly.

In the 1820s, Major Peter became a permanent Montgomery County resident, making Montanverde his year-round home. During this period he served as the County delegate to the first two sessions of the C&O Canal Convention. Peter held a well-documented political rally at Montanverde in 1848 that was attended by freshman Congressman Abraham Lincoln. Some sources note that Lincoln stayed overnight at the house

in the west wing room still referred to as the Lincoln Room.

The two-story, five-bay Federal-style house is remarkable in its high level of architectural integrity. In plan, the dwelling is one room deep with a center passage. Noteworthy details typical of this era include half-round molding that frames six over six sash windows, a three-light transom over the front door, and exterior brick chimneys. Covered with clapboard siding, the house is said to be of brick construction, possibly brick nogging, a material not uncommon in this era.



Fig. 1: Subject property.

# **PROPOSAL:**

The applicants propose to construct a second-story addition above the existing one-story east wing and a two-story ell addition adjacent to the east wing.

# **APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

When reviewing alterations and new construction to *Master Plan* Sites several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include 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.

# Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A

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

- (b) The commission shall instruct the director to issue a permit, or issue a permit subject to such conditions as are found to be necessary to insure conformity with the purposes and requirements of this chapter, if it finds that:
  - (1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or
  - (2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or
  - (3) The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or
  - (4) The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or
  - (5) The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship; or
  - (6) In balancing the interests of the public in preserving the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district, with the interests of the public from the use and benefit of the alternative proposal, the general public welfare is better served by granting the permit.
- (c) It is not the intent of this chapter to limit new construction, alteration or repairs to any 1 period or architectural style.

(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." Because the property is a Master Plan Site, the Commission's focus in reviewing the proposal should be the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. The *Standards* are as follows:

- 1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
- 2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
- 3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
- 4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
- 5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

- 6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- 7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
- 8. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
- 9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- 10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

### **STAFF DISCUSSION:**

### Architecture

The subject property is a narrow single-pile Federal-style house, which was constructed c. 1806-1812. The house consists of the main two-story five-bay massing with center passage, a single-story east wing, dating from the 1930s, with adjacent single-story mudroom that was approved by the Commission at the May 21, 2014 HPC meeting, and a single-story west wing dating from the 1830s, which is known as the Lincoln Room (see excerpt on Circle 1). As noted in *Places from the Past*, the house exhibits a high level of architectural integrity, as it retains many Federal-style details. The house is accessed via a long gravel drive on the north side, although, historically, the south side overlooking Seneca Creek and the Potomac River may have been considered the front.



Fig. 2: 1974 photograph, south elevation.



Fig. 3: 2014 photograph, south elevation.



Fig. 4: Current photograph, south elevation.

The applicants propose to construct a second-story addition above the east wing and a two-story ell addition adjacent to the east wing. The proposed ell addition will be positioned perpendicular to the historic house and will project to the south. To accommodate the ell addition, the c. 2014 one-story mudroom adjacent to the east wing will be removed. The additions are being proposed to create three additional bedrooms on the second-floor for the applicants' growing family, which will allow them to continue to reside in the historic house.



# Fig. 5: Proposed south elevation.

As proposed, the additions take visual cues from the historic house, with clapboard siding, standing seam metal roofing, and multi-lite double-hung windows; however, the applicants propose to differentiate the new construction with subtle differences, such as 4-over-4 double-hung windows, as opposed to the historic 6-over-6 double-hung windows. A first-floor overhang with standing seam metal roofing is proposed on both the north and south elevations of the east wing, and a first-floor wrap around porch with standing seam metal roofing is proposed on the south and west elevations of the ell addition.

Staff conducted a site visit and met with the applicants and their architect on December 10, 2018. At that time, the applicants were considering several different options, which are included in this application for the HPC's benefit. In a preliminary review of the application, staff opposed an ell addition from the original two-story central massing, as it would negatively affect character defining features of the design and plan. The proposed addition and alternatives, however, still diminish the architectural hierarchy and proportions of the two-story central massing flanked by one-story wings. While the current proposal does not call for a long telescoping addition or for an ell that projects directly from the original two-story central massing, staff is concerned that the proposal will disrupt the visual balance of the house and that the additions may compete with or overwhelm the original massing.



Fig. 6: Alternative Two, south elevation, as revised February 18, 2019.

The original federal-style house is elegantly proportioned and balanced. Any new addition, whether one or two-stories, should complement and reinforce the original house. The existing one-story additions on either side of the two-story central massing reinforce the classical proportions of the house as a whole. Altering these proportions may have a detrimental effect on the integrity of the architecture of the entire house. Both staff and the applicants concur that no additions should occur on top of or adjacent to the one-story west wing (the Lincoln Room), which dates to the property's period of significance. Accordingly, the applicants are proposing additions to the east wing of the house, which dates to the 1930s.

Staff has the following preliminary findings on the current proposal:

- Staff finds that any proposed alterations and/or additions should be clean and symmetrical to preserve the character of the historic house, in accordance with *Standard* #2.
- Staff finds that the proposed wraparound porch, first-floor overhangs, and wall dormers are incompatible features that have the potential to detract from the character-defining features of the historic house, and they should be removed from the proposal, in accordance with *Standard* #2.
- Staff is concerned that the current proposal may dictate the location and form of future additions (i.e., similar additions to the west wing), removing or altering original materials and/or features of the west wing, which dates to the property's period of significance. Such additions would be inconsistent with *Standards* #9 and #10.
- Staff finds that the two-story addition adjacent to the main block is detrimental to the preservation and architectural character of the house. While an addition in this area is the least destructive of historic building fabric, any two-story addition in this location presents as overwhelming to the narrow and finely proportioned details of the federal style house. Any two-story addition in this area is challenging under *Standard #9*, specifically that, "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."

Staff asks for the Commission's guidance regarding the following, grouped by topic:

### Size, Scale, Massing

• Is a two-story addition, or one-and-a-half story addition, adjacent to the two-story central massing of the historic house, compatible under *Standard* #9—either in this proposed design, or with alterations?

- Does the current proposal have the potential to detract from or overwhelm the historic house?
- If the ridge of the proposed second-story addition over the east wing was lowered, would the proposal be more compatible with the historic house?
- Is an addition perpendicular to the massing of the original house appropriate and/or preferable to a telescoping addition to the east? Should a perpendicular massing project towards the river (traditional façade) or towards the rear (towards the current driveway)? How much of a projection in either direction could be acceptable?
- In reviewing the current proposal and the previous alternatives, does the Commission have a preference, finding that one of the options has the most potential to be compatible with the character-defining features of the historic house?
- Does the massing, scale, materials, and details sufficiently differentiate the new construction from the historic building, in accordance with *Standard* #3?

### Other Details

- If the chimney was removed from the proposed ell addition, would it be less likely to compete with the historic house?
- Does the HPC agree with staff's assessment of the porch, overhangs, and wall dormers?
- Are there other revisions recommended to the current proposal or alternatives that could make it compatible with the historic house?

### Archaeology

There have been no archaeological studies undertaken at this property. This land has been occupied and cultivated for nearly two hundred years and the Peter family kept people enslaved at this property for an unknown period of time. None of the extant outbuildings date to the period of significance for the property. The historic kitchen was located in approximately the same footprint as the one-story east wing of the historic house. There would have been numerous additional outbuildings and evidence of human occupation scattered throughout the property. Areas immediately adjacent to the historic house and further in the limitations of disturbance for this project must be evaluated by a professional archaeologist to uncover, catalogue, and document any archaeological features. Potential features of interest could include middens associated with the period of significance, former building foundations, pathways or other remains that could illuminate the evolution of the building and associated landscaping. The historic preservation program archaeologist will work with the applicants to develop a scope of work for archaeological investigations, up to and including feature identification, evaluation, and data recovery, as appropriate for this project. Any features uncovered have the potential to contribute important information on the history of the County, the Peter family, and the enslaved population of Montanverde.



Fig. 7: Lidar image of the subject property, with extant structures and some below grade features identified.

# **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

• Staff recommends that the applicant make revisions based upon the HPC's comments and return for a second preliminary consultation.



1/4" = 1'-0"















Thomas J. Taltavull, Architect 2014 All Rights Reserved







Thomas J. Taltavull, Architect 2014 All Rights Reserved

N



A1.1

14





	2nd FLOOR













# Evolution of Montanveral for MCHPC Board



# PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE ONE



Thomas J. Taltavull, Architect 2014 All Rights Reserv

 $\odot$ 



# PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE TWO





# PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE TWO

Revised February 18, 2018



Thomas J. Taltavull, Architect 2014 All Rights Reserved

















