STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends the HPC approve the HAWP application.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION
SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing to the Woodside Locational Atlas District
STYLE: Traditional
DATE: c.1980

The existing house located at 8712 2nd Avenue is a two-story, front gable house, with vinyl siding, and a small one-story front porch. All of the historic windows have been replaced with vinyl windows. It appears as though the fenestration pattern has been heavily altered as there is a single window to the left of the central, front door and two windows to the right; the second floor has a paired window on the left side and a single window to the right. This appearance is not consistent with any building style from the first quarter of the 20th century.
There is a one-story, detached garage on the right side to the rear of the house. It is difficult to
determine a date of this structure, due to the vinyl cladding and overgrowth of vegetation around
the foundation, but it does not appear to be historic.

BACKGROUND
On October 11, 2015 the HPC approved the demolition of the existing structure on the site. The
existing house is c.1980s construction and has been condemned. It is a hazard due to toxic mold
throughout the house.

On November 15, 2015 the HPC held a preliminary review of the proposal to construct a single-
family home on the property. Several concerns were raised by the HPC and several members of
the public. Many of the comments expressed the view that the proposed house was too wide for
the site and was incompatible with the character of the surrounding district.

Several other concerns were expressed about the potential for an increase in site drainage and
runoff issues associated with the increase of impervious surfaces on the property.

On December 20, 2017 the HPC approved a HAWP for new construction at the subject address.

The applicant has returned with a revision of the previous proposal for a smaller house of similar
architectural details on the site.

PROPOSAL
The applicant proposes to construct a new house on this site.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES
Proposed alterations to resources listed in Locational Atlas Districts are given a lenient review
under Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A) and the Secretary of the Interior’s
Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). 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 Historic Resources Preservation
(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
   (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
In balancing the interests of the public in preserving the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district, with the interests of the public from the use and benefit of the alternative proposal, the general public welfare is better served by granting the permit.

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

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

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

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

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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 applied for and was granted a HAWP for a new house with an attached garage at 8712 2nd Ave. The applicant proposes to revise the previously approved HAWP to make the house smaller, to center the house on the lot, and to remove the approved detached garage. As the architectural materials and proposed house form have already been reviewed and approved by the HPC, this Staff report will focus primarily on an analysis of the new size, placement, and elimination of the new garage.

The architectural design of the proposed house retains the ‘farmhouse style’ of the approval with the gable-L form and most of the architectural details (i.e. the fiber cement siding, the two-over-two windows, and the half-width front porch). Staff finds that this modern interpretation of a traditional house form is appropriate and recommended approval for the prior HAWP. The primary architectural detail that has been revised in this submission is the front-facing gable (see below). The projecting bay was removed from the first floor and the board and batten siding has been removed in favor of the fiber cement clapboards found throughout the house. Staff finds these changes simplify the design and are compatible with the features of the surrounding houses (consistent with 24A-8(b)(2)), most of which were constructed from c.1890-1930.
The revised house design has been reduced in size from 3470 ft\(^2\) to 2745 ft\(^2\). Both the length and width have been reduced, but the width is the most significant visual reduction from the right-of-way. The prior approval was 38’ (thirty-eight feet) wide at the front elevation and has been reduced to 31’6” (thirty-one feet, six inches wide) at the front of the house (see Fig 2 above). Additionally, the 10’ (ten foot) bump out at the right elevation toward the rear of the house has been eliminated. This has the practical effect of narrowing the house by more than 18’ (eighteen feet) in total. Staff finds the narrower house is more compatible with the houses found throughout the Locational Atlas District (24A-89(b)(2). The revised proposal does contain a number of additional projecting forms. On the south (left) elevation, there is a 1’ (one foot) rear bump out and a vent for a gas fireplace on the first floor. On the right elevation, there is a side entrance with a portico near the front; and at the rear on the second floor, there is a small bump out in the master bathroom. Staff finds that these embellishments do not have a significant impact on the visual character of the house when viewed from the right-of-way, as only the side entrance is in near the front of the house.

The narrowing of the house also allows the house to be placed closer to the center of the lot. The approved HAWP was only setback 7’ 6” (seven feet, six inches) from the property to the south. Now, the house is setback 12’ 2” (twelve feet, two inches) from the property boundary. This larger setback should satisfy some of the criticism that the house was placed too close to the 8710 2\(^{nd}\) Ave., which is placed on the northern side of its lot.

Staff finds the alteration in size, minor modification in design, and placement of the previously approved house are appropriate under 24A-8(b)(2), 24A-8(c), 24A-8(d), and Standard 9 and 10.

**Garage Alteration**

In addition to the reduction in size, the applicant proposes to eliminate the proposal to demolish the existing garage and expand the driveway and construct a new two-car garage. In Staff’s analysis, Staff came to the conclusion that the garage was not historic. However, as only repair work is proposed for this accessory structure, it does not require HPC review and approval. Any work on the garage that is not an in-kind repair requires submission to HP Staff for a determination if the work is a ‘substantial alteration’ under 24A-10 to determine the proper procedure.
Staff finds that these proposed changes are in keeping with the character of the lot and surrounding Locational Atlas District and recommends approval. Staff has received a letter from the Woodside Civic Association in support of the revisions. This letter is included with the application materials.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
Staff recommends that the Commission approve the HAWP application; 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.
Rebecca Ballo  
Historic Preservation Office  
8787 Georgia Avenue  
Silver Spring, MD 20910 

Dear Rebecca: 

On behalf of the Woodside Civic Association, I write to express support for the renovation plans of Kong Chui and Kristen Kenausis at 8712 2nd Avenue in Woodside. 

After reviewing the plans, it is clear that they have taken great care to propose a new house that would significantly improve the current structure, which has fallen into disrepair since its last sale in February 2018. Kristen and Kong have invested in a plan that stylistically fits and complements neighboring houses on 2nd Avenue. It will add value to Woodside as a whole on a core street that runs through our neighborhood. 

Based on the most recent plans, we urge the Historic Planning Commission to approve their application. 

Best Regards, 

Bill Scanlan  
President  
Woodside Civic Association
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301/563-3400

APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: mark@studio22dc.com
Contact Person: MARK GIARRAPUTO
Daytime Phone No.: 301-951-4391

Tax Account No.: 
Name of Property Owner: WEXFORD HOMES
Daytime Phone No.: 301-580-3181
Address: 2400 TOWER OAKS BLVD. #100 ROCKVILLE, MD. 20852
City: Silver Spring
State: MD
Zip Code: 20852

Contractor: WEXFORD HOMES
Phone No.: 301-580-3181
Contractor Registration No.: 
Agent for Owner: MARK GIARRAPUTO
Daytime Phone No.: 301-951-4391

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISE
House Number: 8712
Street: 200 AVENUE
Town/City: Silver Spring, MD.
Nearest Cross Street: NINES DRIVE
Lot: 7
Block: 12
Subdivision: WOODSIDE

PART I: INFORMATION AND GENERAL

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
☐ Construct ☐ Extent ☐ Alter/Retracte ☐ A/C ☐ A □ 
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Wreck/Raze ☐ Solar ☐ Fireplace ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Single-Family
☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☐ Revocable ☐ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☐ Other: New Home

1B. Construction cost estimate: $SEE LAST APPLICATION

1C. If this is a revision of a previously approved active permit, see Permit # REVISION TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED HAWP.

PART II: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTENSIONS/ADDITIONS

2A. Type of sewage disposal: 01) WSSC 02) Septic 03) Other: 
2B. Type of water supply: 01) WSSC 02) Well 03) Other: 

PART III: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCE/RAGING 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/alignment

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.

Mark L. Giarraputo, Studio II Design Group LLC 6/20/2019
Signature of owner or authorized agent

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

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS
Mr. Dan Bruechert  
Senior Planner/Historic Preservation  
Montgomery County Planning Department  
8787 Georgia Avenue  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

June 12, 2019

Regarding Project: Modification to Approved Plans for  
8712 Second Avenue  
Silver Spring, Maryland

Dear Mr. Bruechert,

Here are the major design modifications made to this already approved residence located at 8712 Second Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland. This should not be considered a Substantial Alternation to the Originally Approved plans. Hopefully only a Staff Review is required for this approval.

The proposed house has been redesigned and is being sold to a current resident on Second Avenue.

They desire a smaller home with less square footage as compared to the originally approved home submitted in 2018. Square footages were reduced from 3470 down to 2745.

The home is now sited much further away from the Southern property line when compared to the original. Please see the Site Plan submitted that shows this new 12.2’ offset versus a 7.6’ previously approved offset. The southern elevation also has a newly proposed offset in it which effectively breaks down the massing of the building. Also please note that the new home is more centered on the property when compared with the original.

There will not be a need for a new garage building to be built in the rear yard. The existing garage will be modified and cosmetic changes will be made. (Neighbors shed to the North will no longer need to removed.)

The originally approved home and the newly proposed home have similar Architectural Styles. This “Farmhouse” style is found already on the adjoining streets.
Please don't hesitate calling on me if you have any additional comments or concerns. We look forward to receiving a favorable approval from you and your team.

With appreciation,  

Mark L. Giarraputo, AIA.  
Principle Architect  
Studio Z Design Concepts, LLC.  
301-951-4391 ext 306
This record drawing accurately and completely represents the stormwater management practices and tree canopy plantings as they were constructed or substantially completed, as shown on the drawing. This information is based on field verification of existing underground utilities and conditions on the site. All stormwater management practices were constructed per the approved Sediment Control / Stormwater Management plans or subsequent amendments.

The constructed Rooftop Disconnections meet the conditions specified on the approved plans.

If this project is subject to a tree canopy requirement, the plans must include the number and location of all trees proposed to be planted to comply with the Tree Canopy Law.

A record set of approved Sediment Control/Stormwater Management plans must be maintained onsite at all times. In addition to stormwater management items, these plans must include the number and location of all trees proposed to be planted to comply with the Tree Canopy Law. Any approved plan will be reviewed by a MCDPS inspector.

A record set of plans, including the signed Record Drawing Certification, must be completed and submitted to the MCDPS inspector. In addition to this Record Drawing Certification, a formal Stormwater Management As-Built submission is required.

Experience you can build on.

The constructed Non-Rooftop Disconnections meet the conditions specified on the approved plans.

The following steps must be verified by the MCDPS Inspector or the Owner/Developer:

1. Excavation for Dry Well conforms to approved plans
2. Placement of backfill, perforated inlet pipe and observation well conforms to approved plans
3. Placement of geotextiles and filter media conforms to approved plans
4. Connecting pipes, including connection to downspout, constructed per the approved plans
5. Final grading and permanent stabilization conforms to approved plans

If exempt under Section 55-5 of the code, please check OFF the applicable exemption category below.

EXEMPT:
- FEMA LOMR - (Letter of Map Revision)
- MDE Dam Safety
- N.P.D.E.S. - Notice of Intent
- MDE Water Quality Certification
- MDE "STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SOIL WITHIN THE LIMITS OF DISTURBANCE PRIOR TO PREPARATION, TOPSOILING, AND SOIL AMENDMENTS"

The street tree requirements must be met for the following:

Required Number of Shade Trees:
- Shade Trees Proposed
- Shade Trees Required
- Street Tree Removal Fee
- Street Tree Replacement Cost

TOTAL NUMBER OF DRY WELLS INSTALLED PER THIS PERMIT: APPROVED CONSTRUCTED

RECORD DRAWING CERTIFICATION

DATE

OWNER/DEVELOPER SIGNATURE

UTILITY INFORMATION

DATE FILED

PROJECT REVISION

INITIALS/DATE

MCDPS

PREPARATION, TOPSOILING, AND SOIL AMENDMENTS"
MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 8712 2nd Avenue, Silver Spring  
Meeting Date: 12/20/17

Resource: Contributing Resource  
Woodside Locational Atlas District

Report Date: 12/13/17

Applicant: Wexford Homes, LLC  
Public Notice: 12/06/17

Review: HAWP  
Tax Credit: n/a

Case Number: 36/04-17B  
Staff: Dan Bruechert

Proposal: New Construction

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends the HPC approve with three (3) conditions the HAWP application.

1. Specification of the roofing shingles needs to be submitted for review and approval with final approval authority delegate to Staff.

2. Specifications for the windows were not provided with the application materials. The windows must be wood or wood clad with fixed exterior grills and need to be submitted for review and approval with final approval authority delegated to Staff.

3. Material specifications for the driveway material need to be provided for review and approval with final approval authority delegated to Staff.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION
SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing to the Woodside Locational Atlas District
STYLE: Traditional
DATE: c.1915

The house is a two-story, front gable house, with vinyl siding, and a small one-story front porch. All of the historic windows have been replaced with vinyl windows. It appears as though the fenestration pattern has been heavily altered as the is a single window to the left of the central, front door and two windows to the right; the second floor has a paired window on the left side and a single window to the right. This appearance is not consistent with any building style from the first quarter of the 20th century.

There is a one-story, detached garage on the right side to the rear of the house. It is difficult to determine a date of this structure, due to the vinyl cladding and overgrowth of vegetation around the foundation, but it does not appear to be historic.
BACKGROUND
This property has been reviewed by the HPC at two separate meetings recently. On October 11, 2015 the HPC approved the demolition of the existing structure on the site. On November 15, 2015 the HPC held a preliminary review of the proposal to construct a single-family home on the property (see attached transcript). The HPC and several members of the public raised concerns about the design and massing. Many of the comments expressed the view that the proposed house was too wide for the site and was incompatible with the character of the surrounding district.

Several other concerns were expressed about the potential for an increase in site drainage and runoff issues associated with the increase of impervious surfaces on the property. The applicant is required by code to minimize and/or eliminate the runoff on-site, however, the treatments employed by this applicant will be subterranean and, as they will not result in a visible change to the site or surrounding district, are not under the purview of the HPC. The review and approval of these plans are required before the Department of Permitting Service will issue a residential building permit.

PROPOSAL
The applicant proposes to construct a new single-family house and a detached garage on this site.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES
Proposed alterations to resources listed in Locational Atlas Districts are given a lenient review under Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A) and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). 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 Historic Resources Preservation
(a) The commission shall instruct the director to deny a permit if it finds, based on the evidence and information presented to or before the commission that the alteration for which the permit is sought would be inappropriate, inconsistent with or detrimental to the preservation, enhancement or ultimate protection of the historic site or historic resource within an historic district, and to the purposes of this chapter.
(b) The commission shall instruct the director to issue a permit, or issue a permit subject to such conditions as are found to be necessary to insure conformity with the purposes and requirements of this chapter, if it finds that:
(1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or
(2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or
(3) The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or
(4) The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or
(5) The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship; or
(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 period or architectural style.
(d) In the case of an application for work on an historic resource located within an historic district, the commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historical or design significance or for plans involving new construction, unless such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding historic resources or would impair the character of the historic district. (Ord. No. 9-4, § 1; Ord. No. 11-59.)

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

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

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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 is proposing to construct a single-family house with a detached garage. (*Note: the plans submitted by the applicant indicate that they are 'preliminary,' however, they are for full consideration for a HAWF from the HPC.*) The two-story house draws from a traditional architectural vocabulary and is the siding is typical of the Folk Victorian style. A gable-L to the left with a partial-width front porch. The windows on the front elevation are all two-over-two sash windows. The gable-L portion has a tripled set of windows on the first floor with a paired set above. The remaining windows on the front façade are single sash windows. Twenty feet behind the front wall plan, projecting 10’ (ten feet) to the right, is a small covered porch that provides access directly into a mudroom. The proposed house is L-shaped with an 8’ (eight foot) setback on the left side and an approximately 17’ (seventeen foot) setback from the right property boundary. The front wall plane of the house is proposed for the same plane as the existing house.
The rear of the property will have a walkout basement with two pairs of French doors. There is a deck off the rear. This deck will be constructed using wood and will not be visible from the public right-of-way and Staff believes it should be approved as a matter of course. The plans indicate there is an optional screened porch on the rear façade. Not enough details were provided for Staff to effectively evaluate this element (if the applicant did in fact seek approval for this element). Staff encourages the HPC to not extend any approval of this proposal to include a rear screened-in porch.

The front foundation of the house will have a brick foundation. Drawings do not show an exposed foundation for the rest of the house. The house will be clad in horizontal clapboard Hardi panel siding, with a section of board and batten in the front projection of the L and under the front-facing gable. In discussion with the Staff, the applicant indicated that the roof will be clad in asphalt shingles. Application materials do not specify whether those shingles will be a three-tab or an architectural shingle. Staff believes that either type of shingle would be acceptable, however, recommends that the HPC condition approval on the review and approval of the specific material prior to final approval. The applicant proposes to use a standing seam metal roof over the front porch and the bay window in the front-facing L. In discussion with Staff the HPC has determined that the ridge/hip caps of modern metal roofs can be incompatible in historic context. Because these two sections of metal roofing will only be shed roofs, the construction will not require these ridge caps. Staff believes that the siding and roofing materials are appropriate for the design of the house and for the surrounding Locational Atlas district.

The windows on the house are a combination of two-over-two sash windows and four-lite casement windows. The application did not identify materials for the windows, but due to the prominent location within the district, Staff supports the approval of either a wood or wood clad, simulated or true divided lite window. During the Prelim in November, the HPC indicated that the window placement on the side elevations was done in an apparent haphazard manner. The design has been altered so that the windows on the side elevation are now stacked in a generally rational manner. Some of the windows on the right side do not line up, however, this is at the small projection and, given the distance from the street, these will not be highly visible from the public right-of-way.

Garage
The proposed detached garage is a two-bay garage, 20' × 20' (twenty feet by twenty feet) with a single door. Clad in Hardi installed in a board and batten pattern, the garage exterior will match the siding used in the projecting L on the house. The front-facing gable roof will be covered in asphalt shingles that match the house roof. The garage is situated so that a large part of the garage will be placed behind the garage will be completely obscured by the house when viewed from the street. Additionally, the negative slope of the site will place the garage approximately 6' (six feet) below the street grade. As shown in Circle ____ the proposed garage is placed further from 2nd Avenue than the existing garage, and will be less visible due to its placement behind the house. Staff supports approval of the garage.
Landscape/Hardscape
The applicant proposes to construct a driveway from the street curb cut to the proposed detached garage to the rear of the house. The driveway, which will be the full width of the existing curb cut, will narrow as it passes the house, then widens at the apron for the garage. In a meeting with Staff, the applicant indicated his desire to use either a pervious paver or a concrete with a large amount of exposed aggregate. Staff believes that either of these treatments would be acceptable and encourages the HPC to condition the approval of this project on the review and approval of the driveway material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends the HPC approve with three (3) conditions the HAWP application;

1. Specification of the roofing shingles needs to be submitted for review and approval with final approval authority delegated to Staff.
2. Specifications for the windows were not provided with the application materials. The windows must be wood or wood clad with fixed exterior grills and need to be submitted for review and approval with final approval authority delegated to Staff.
3. Material specifications for the driveway material need to be provided for review and approval with final approval authority delegated to Staff.

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 Email: phil@cas dc.com
Contact Person: Phil R Long
Daytime Phone No.: 240-418-3204

Tax Account No.: 13-0109-6973
Name of Property Owner: Westford Homes LLC
Daytime Phone No.: 301-580-3181
Address: 2600 Tower Oaks Blvd, #620, Rockville, MD 20852
City: Silver Spring Zip Code: 20852
Contractor: Westford Homes LLC - Doug Stein
Phone No.: 301-580-3181

Agent for Owner: ______________________ Daytime Phone No.: ______________________

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISES
House Number: 8712
Street: 2nd Avenue
Town/City: Silver Spring
Nearest Cross Street: Ballard Street
Lot: 7
Block: 12
Subdivision: Leighton Addition to Woodside
Parcel: ______________________

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT/ACTION AND USE

CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
☐ Construct ☐ Extend ☐ Alter/Remove ☐ A/C ☐ Slab ☐ Room Addition ☐ Porch ☐ Deck ☐ Shed
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Windows ☐ Fireplace ☐ Solar ☐ Fence/Wall ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Single Family
☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☐ Revocable ☐ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☐ Other: ______________________

19. Construction cost estimate: $ 500,000

10. If this is a revision of a previously approved active permit, see Permit # ______________________

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXISTING ADDITIONS

2A. Type of sewage disposal: 01 ☐ VSSC 02 ☐ Septic 03 ☐ Other: ______________________

2B. Type of water supply: 01 ☐ VSSC 02 ☐ Well 03 ☐ Other: ______________________

PART THREE: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCE/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/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 heretofore acknowledged and except to this as a condition for the issuance of this permit.

Signature of owner or authorized agent
Date: 10/20/17

Approved: ______________________ For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission
Disapproved: ______________________
Application/Permit No.: ______________________ Data Filed: ______________________ Data Issued: ______________________

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS

817649
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:

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

   Proposed construction of a new detached single family home.

   Demolition of existing non-historic home was approved at the October 11th, 2017 HPC meeting. Case #: 36109-A

2. SITE PLAN
   Site and environmental setting, drawn to scale. You may use your plat. 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 resources and the proposed work.
   b. Elevations (facades), with marked dimensions, clearly indicating proposed work in relation to existing construction and, when appropriate, context.

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 label 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 lots(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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's mailing address</th>
<th>Owner's Agent's mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Doug Stein - Wexford Homes  
2600 Tower Oaks Blvd  
Suite 620  
Rockville, MD 20852 | Phillip Long  
CAS Engineering  
10 S Beitz St  
Frederick, MD 21701 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Peter Murtha & Mary Andrews  
8710 2nd Ave  
Silver Spring, MD 20910 | Walter Plicher & Tasneem Hussain  
8714 2nd Ave  
Silver Spring, MD 20910 |
| Margaret Ann Donnelly Trust  
8717 2nd Ave  
Silver Spring, MD 20910 | Shaun Donnelly  
8715 2nd Ave  
Silver Spring, MD 20910 |
| Leonard Stamm  
8713 2nd Ave  
Silver Spring, MD 20910 | James Specht & Erin Kelly  
1610 Ballard Street  
Silver Spring, MD 20910 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's mailing address</th>
<th>Owner's Agent's mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners mailing addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>William &amp; Starr Sklarud</th>
<th>Kenneth Morris &amp; Terri Zall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1608 Ballard Street</td>
<td>1606 Ballard Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring, MD 20910</td>
<td>Silver Spring, MD 20910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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