MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 8 Quincy St., Chevy Chase  
Meeting Date: 7/10/2019

Resource: Contributing Resource  
Report Date: 7/3/2019
Chevy Chase Village Historic District

Applicant: James Cassidy  
Public Notice: 6/26/2019

Review: HAWP  
Tax Credit: N/A

Case Number: 35/13-19BB  
Staff: Dan Bruechert

Proposal: Demolition and New Construction

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the HPC approve the HAWP application.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION
SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District
STYLE: Dutch Colonial
DATE: 1930

The subject property is a Dutch Colonial house, five bays wide, with stone and shingle siding, and a gambrel roof. The windows throughout the house are all six-over-six sash windows.

Figure 1: A non-historic addition connects the garage to the historic house.
**PROPOSAL**
The applicant proposes to remove the existing non-historic rear addition and construct a new addition in its place, to construct a new rear deck, and to make modifications to an existing enclosed porch.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES**
When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the historic preservation review guidelines in the approved and adopted amendment for the Chevy Chase Village Historic District (Guidelines), *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.

*Chevy Chase Village Historic District Guidelines*
The Guidelines break down specific projects into three levels of review - Lenient, Moderate and Strict Scrutiny.

“**Lenient Scrutiny**” means that the emphasis of the review should be on issues of general massing and scale, and compatibility with the surrounding streetscape, and should allow for a very liberal interpretation of preservation rules. Most changes should be permitted unless there are major problems with massing, scale or compatibility.

“**Moderate Scrutiny**” involves a higher standard of review than “lenient scrutiny.” Besides issues of massing, scale and compatibility, preserving the integrity of the resource is taken into account. Alterations should be designed so that the altered structure still contributes to the district. Use of compatible new materials, rather than the original building materials, should be permitted. Planned changes should be compatible with the structure’s existing design, but should not be required to replicate its architectural style.

“**Strict Scrutiny**” means that the planned changes should be reviewed to insure that the integrity of the significant exterior architectural or landscaping features and details is not compromised. However, strict scrutiny should not be “strict in theory but fatal in fact” i.e. it does not mean that there can be no changes but simply that the proposed changes should be reviewed with extra care.

HAWP applications for exterior alterations, changes, and/or additions to non-contributing/out-of-period resources should receive the most lenient level of review. Most alterations and additions should be approved as a matter of course. The only exceptions would be major additions and alterations to the scale and massing of the structure, which affect the surrounding streetscape and/or landscape and could impair the character of the district as a whole.

- **Decks** should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not.
- **Doors** should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not.
Dormers should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not.

Exterior trim (such as moldings on doors and windows) on contributing resources should be subject to moderate scrutiny if it is visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if it is not. Exterior trim on Outstanding resources should be subject to strict scrutiny if it is visible from the public right-of-way.

Garages and accessory buildings which are detached from the main house should be subject to lenient scrutiny but should be compatible with the main building. If an existing garage or accessory building has any common walls with, or attachment to, the main residence, then any addition to the garage or accessory building should be subject to review in accordance with the Guidelines applicable to “major additions.” Any proposed garage or accessory building which is to have a common wall with or major attachment to the main residence should also be reviewed in accordance with the Guidelines applicable to “major additions.”

Gutters are not currently subject to review and should not be reviewed.

Lot coverage should be subject to strict scrutiny, in view of the critical importance of preserving the Village’s open park-like character.

Major additions should, where feasible, be placed to the rear of the existing structure so that they are less visible from the public right-of-way.

Porches should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not. Enclosures of existing side and rear porches have occurred throughout the Village with little or no adverse impact on its character, and they should be permitted where compatibly designed.

Roofing materials should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not. In general, materials differing from the original should be approved for contributing resources. These guidelines recognize that for outstanding resources replacement in kind is always advocated. For example, replacement of slate roofs in kind is usually required. However, the application should be reviewed with consideration given to economic hardship. Furthermore, as technology continues to change and improve, other building materials may become available to provide an appropriate subsite for replacement in kind, and the reviewed agency should be open to consideration of these alternative solutions.

Shutters should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way.

Siding should be subject to moderate scrutiny if it is visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if it is not.

Skylights should be subject to strict scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not.

Tree removal should be subject to strict scrutiny and consistent with the Chevy Chase Village Urban Forest Ordinance.

Windows (including window replacement) should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not. Addition of compatible exterior storm windows should be encouraged, whether visible from the public-right-of-way or not. Vinyl and aluminum windows (other than storm windows) should be discouraged.
The Guidelines state five basic policies that should be adhered to, including:

- Preserving the integrity of the Chevy Chase Village Historic District. Any alterations should, at a minimum, perpetuate the ability to perceive the sense of time and place portrayed by the district.
- Preserving the integrity of contributing structures. Alterations to should be designed in such a way that the altered structure still contributes to the district.
- Maintaining the variety of architectural styles and the tradition of architectural excellence.
- Design review emphasis should be restricted to changes that will be visible from the front or side public right-of-way, or that would be visible in the absence of vegetation or landscaping.
- Alterations to the portion of a property that are not visible from the public-right-of-way should be subject to a very lenient review. Most changes to the rear of the properties should be approved as a matter of course.

Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8(b)
A HAWP permit should be issued if the Commission finds that:
1. The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of a historic site or historic resource within a historic district.
2. The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical archaeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which a historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto of to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, space and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
4. Changes to a property that has acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
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 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 proposes to demolish the c.1991 rear addition to the house and construct a new
addition in its place. The applicant further proposes to construct a rear deck and to make modifications to an existing enclosed porch. Staff finds that the proposal will reduce the visual impact of construction and recommends approval of this HAWP.

**Building Addition**

The existing rear building addition is two stories tall with an exposed basement and has a side gambrel that projects beyond the existing historic wall plane. This addition was constructed c.1991 and was likely permitted before the establishment of the Chevy Chase Historic District. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing addition. This addition is not historic and while the form is compatible with the historic house, it does not contribute to the historic character of the house or surrounding district. Staff supports approval of the demolition under 24A-8(b)(2).

In place of the existing addition, the applicant proposes to construct a new, full-width addition to the rear. In place of the side-projecting, two story, gambrel, the applicant proposes to construct a one-story, sunroom with a hipped, copper roof. The exposed basement level of this addition will be clad in stone veneer to match the appearance of the historic house. The side projecting addition is being built over the existing foundation and will not expand beyond the existing construction. The new addition will also allow more of the garage roof to be visible from the public right-of-way, providing a visual separation between the house a garage roof lines. Staff finds that the new design will have less visual impact than the existing two-story construction, and is compatible in size, scale, massing, and materials with the existing building. Staff additionally finds the use of a copper roof consistent with the district Design Guidelines policy of promoting architectural excellence.

At the rear, the applicant proposes to construct a nearly, full-width addition with a pair of rear facing gambrel roofs covered in synthetic slate roofing. The addition will be inset from the historic wall planes by approximately 2’ (two feet). The basement level of the proposed addition will be clad in a stone veneer to match the historic house, with the first and second floor clad in painted cedar siding. Staff finds the proposed exterior material sufficient to differentiate the new construction from the historic (per Standard 9). The proposed roof at the rear will have an EcoStar Majestic Slate, synthetic roofing material. This roof will be partially visible from the right-of-way and subject to “moderate scrutiny.” The Design Guidelines go even further, stating, “in general, materials differing from the original should be approved for contributing resources.” Staff finds that the proposed material for the roof over the proposed addition is compatible with the historic building for two primary reasons. First, because Staff finds the appearance of the proposed replacement material is an appropriate substitute for replacement on new construction or additions (per the Design Guidelines); and second, because the addition roof will only be minimally visible from the public right-of-way (see the submitted perspective drawings), limiting its impact on the historic resource and surrounding historic district.

The applicant proposes to install Loewen Wood casement windows (specifications attached in the application) in a variety of lite configurations. Staff finds the windows are an appropriate material and configuration to be compatible with the six-over-six wood sash windows found throughout the historic house (per 24A-8(b)(2) and the Design Guidelines review of replacement windows under “Moderate Scrutiny”). The window configuration at the rear has a much higher ratio of glazing-to-solid wall than would be appropriate on a street-facing or side elevation,
however, the Design Guidelines dictate that the rear of properties are to be subject to a “very lenient review” and that “most changes at the rear of the properties should be approved as a matter of course.” Staff finds that the proposed massing will be less visible from the public right-of-way than the existing configuration and finds the proposed addition to be appropriate under the guidance referenced above.

There are two additional elements proposed for the rear addition that warrant discussion. The first is a proposed shed dormer at the rear. This dormer will have a low-sloped shed roof in a membrane roof, with a skylight and three rear-facing casement windows. Staff finds this feature will not be visible from the public right-of-way and, per the Design Guidelines, should be reviewed under lenient scrutiny. Staff finds that the scale and massing of the proposal is appropriate and will not impact the surrounding streetscape and recommends approval for the proposed dormer. The other new feature proposed for the rear addition is the introduction of a new chimney on the right (west) elevation. The chimney will be clad in a veneer to match the existing house foundation. The Design Guidelines do not provide guidance on what level of scrutiny to review chimneys, however, they do state that review should be undertaken in a manner that is consistent with the two paramount principles for the district, “fostering the Village’s shared commitment to evolving eclecticism” and “maintaining the open, park-like character.” Staff finds that the proposed chimney will not negatively impact either of these principles and recommends approval of the chimney under the Design Guidelines 24A-8(b)(2).

Staff finds that the proposed rear addition demolition and new rear addition are consistent with the Design Guidelines, Standards 9 and 10, and 24A-8(b)(2) and recommends approval.

**Rear Deck Construction**
To the rear of the proposed addition, the applicant proposes constructing a deck off of the first floor. Due to the rearward slope of the lot, the porch will be one full floor above grade. The proposed decking will be wood (ipe, specifically), with a 36” (thirty-six inch) tall wood railing with 2” (two inch) pickets. The applicant proposes to support the deck with PVC wrapped deck post. The stairs for the deck will project to the west, but due to the change in grade, and enclosed porch, the stairs and deck will not be visible from the public right-of-way. Under the Design Guidelines decks not visible from the right-of-way are to be reviewed under lenient scrutiny. Staff finds that the size and massing of the proposed stairs are appropriate for the house and surrounding district and recommends approval of the proposed deck.

**Side Porch Alteration**
On the right (west) side of the house there is a one-story porch. Based on the placement, materials and the Sanborn map, it appears as though this porch is a historic feature of the house.
At some point, the porch was filled in with six-over-six sash windows with solid panels below. The applicant proposes to remove the existing windows and panels and to install a new wood guardrail, in a Chippendale pattern, and install screens above. Porches that are visible from the public right-of-way are to be reviewed under “moderate scrutiny.” Staff finds that the proposed treatment of the side porch is appropriate and will not impact the integrity of the historic house. Staff additionally, finds the materials to be consistent with a historic side porch and the house. Staff recommends approval of the porch reconfiguration as being consistent with the Design Guidelines and 24A-8(b)(2) and recommends approval.

**Garage Door Replacement**

Finally, the applicant proposes to remove the existing garage doors and install new doors in new openings and to install new windows. As the garage is attached to the house, and will remain attached under the work proposed, these changes are to be reviewed under “Moderate Scrutiny.” The existing garage doors are roll-up wood or fiberglass doors facing east. The doors are not historic, and their removal will not impact the historic character of the property. The applicant proposes to remove the first-floor sash window, and re-center the two garage doors and install two new, wood, carriage-style doors. Details and specifications for the proposed doors is included on page T7 of the application materials. Staff finds that the alteration proposed will reconfigure the openings of the garage, but finds that the location is sufficiently removed from the streetscape so as not to have a significant impact on the historic character of the garage. Additionally, Staff finds that even with the alteration, the garage still contributes to the character
of the house. The simply detailed doors are compatible in both design and material, per the Design Guidelines, and Staff recommends approval.

In addition to the replacement garage doors, the applicant proposes to remove several windows and install several new windows in the garage. Staff has been unable to determine if the existing windows are historic based on their condition and placement, plus some are inaccessible, but finds that the windows work proposed will not impact the historic character or contribution of the garage to the character of the surrounding district. On the east (left) elevation, the applicant proposes to remove the single first floor, six-over-six window and the pair of six-over-six sash windows in the gambrel. In place of the paired windows, the applicant proposes installing a triple set of nine-lite, wood casement windows. These windows will be placed to the center of the east elevation and will introduce (or re-introduce) symmetry to the east elevation. Staff finds that the garage will still contribute to the historic character of the house and surrounding district; and that in this location the retaining the massing of the garage is more important than retaining individual architectural details.

On the south (rear) elevation of the garage, the applicant proposes removing the existing six-over-six sash window and installing two nine-lite, wood casement windows. The windows will be placed on either side of the existing chimney. Staff finds this alteration to be appropriate and while the garage is to be reviewed under “moderate scrutiny” this work will not be visible from the right-of-way, and Staff finds it should be approved as a matter of course.

On the west elevation of the garage the applicant proposes removing the existing door, the three casement windows and the small four-over-four sash window in the gambrel. While Staff cannot make a determination on the age of the four-over-four sash window, the existing casement window is assuredly not historic. In place of these windows, the applicant proposes to install a triple set of nine-lite, wood casement windows to mirror the windows proposed on the east elevation. The existing door will be replaced with a new wood door. Staff finds this proposed work will not significantly alter the historic character of the garage and, as this is not visible from the right-of-way, finds that it should be approved as a matter of course.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
Staff recommends the HPC 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.
# Application for Historic Area Work Permit

**Contact Email:** derek@thomsoncooke.com  
**Contact Person:** Derek Binsted  
**Daytime Phone No.:** 202-674-8234  
**Tax Account No.:** 00457187  
**Name of Property Owner:** James P Cassidy  
**Daytime Phone No.:** 202-686-6583  
**Address:** 8 Quincy Street, Chevy Chase, MD 20815  
**Contractor:** TBD  
**Contractor Registration No.:**  
**Agent for Owner:** Thomson & Cooke Architects  
**Daytime Phone No.:** 202-686-6583

## Location of Building Project

- **House Number:** 8  
- **Street:** Quincy Street  
- **Town/City:** Chevy Chase  
- **Nearest Cross Street:** Connecticut Ave  
- **Lot:** PT 13  
- **Block:** 58  
- **Subdivision:** Chevy Chase Village  
- **Lot:** 50452  
- **Foliot:** 093  
- **Parcel:**

## Part One: Type of Permit, Action and Use

1A. **CHECK ALL APPLICABLE**

- (X) Construct  
- (X) Alter/Renovate  
- ( ) Move  
- ( ) Install  
- ( ) Wreck/Raze  
- ( ) Rebuild  
- ( ) Repair  
- ( ) Add/Remove

1B. **Construction cost estimate:** $500,000

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

## Part Two: Complete New Construction and Extensive Additions

2A. **Type of sewage disposal:**  
- ( ) WSSC  
- ( ) Septic  
- ( ) Other:

2B. **Type of water supply:**  
- ( ) WSSC  
- ( ) Well  
- ( ) Other:

## Part Three: Complete/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 property line/property line  
- ( ) Entirely on land of owner  
- ( ) On public right of way/assentement

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:** 06-17-2019

Approved: For Chairman, Historic Preservation Commission

Disapproved: Signature: Date:

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

**SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS**

---

**Editor: 6/21/99**
THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MUST BE COMPLETED AND THE
REQUIRED DOCUMENTS MUST ACCOMPANY THIS APPLICATION.

1. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
   a. The existing single family home, built in 1930, occupies an interior lot in the Chevy Chase Village Historic District. The original 2-1/2 story stone house with gambrel roof exhibits identifying features of the Dutch Colonial Revival style. A presumed originally detached garage exists in the rear yard in a similar style. This garage has since been connected to to main house in an addition circa 1991, and records show alterations made to the garage in 1996. There is an enclosed porch on the right side of the house, which appears to have been unenclosed in its original form. This property fronts on Quincy Street.

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

      Demolish existing addition that connects main house and garage, down to the foundation. Construct new 1-story addition over that existing footprint/foundation. Demolish rear deck and existing rear addition, and construct new 2 rear story addition and deck with flagstone terrace below. Remove the non original fenestration and paneling on the existing enclosed porch on the right side of the house. Enlarge non-contributing rear attic dormer.

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 8.5" 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 (facades), with marked dimensions, clearly indicating proposed work in relation to existing construction and, when appropriate, contact. All materials and features proposed for the exterior must be noted on the elevations drawings. Any 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 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 drip line 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 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.
## HAWP APPLICATION: MAILING ADDRESSES FOR NOTIFYING
[Owner, Owner’s Agent, Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's mailing address</th>
<th>Owner's Agent’s mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Cassidy</td>
<td>Thomson &amp; Cooke Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Quincy Street</td>
<td>5155 MacArthur Blvd NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD 20815</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Quincy Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Quincy Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Quincy Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quincy Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Quincy Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Quincy Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/04/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- **Extension Notes:**
  - All windows to be framed with black frame material.
  - All doors to be framed with black frame material.
  - All windows to be framed with black frame material.
  - All doors to be framed with black frame material.

**Schedule:**

See spec on 15.

4/8 SOL 33% SPEC ON 15.

**Note:**
- All doors to be framed with black frame material.
- All windows to be framed with black frame material.
- All doors to be framed with black frame material.
- All windows to be framed with black frame material.

**Exterior Door Schedule:**

See spec on 15.
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**Note:**
- All doors to be framed with black frame material.
- All windows to be framed with black frame material.
- All doors to be framed with black frame material.
- All windows to be framed with black frame material.
Lowen Wood Window Spec

Details

1. Head & Sill Details

Lowen Engineering Results in Uncommon Strength and Durability

Lowen Windows Are Designed to Provide a High Level of Energy Efficiency and Comfort.

Simulated Divided Lites & Grilles

Sources

Cassidy Residence

HAWP Application

Thomson Cooke Architects

© Thomson Cooke Architects
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