MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 6 East Melrose Street, Chevy Chase

Meeting Date: 4/22/2020

Resource: Outstanding Resource
Chevy Chase Village Historic District

Report Date: 4/15/2020

Public Notice: 4/8/2020

Applicant: Britt and Kelleen Snider
(Luke Olson, Architect)

Tax Credit: N/A

Staff: Michael Kyne

Review: HAWP

Case Number: 35/13-20M

PROPOSAL: Building addition, deck, patio, and areaway

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that HPC approve the HAWP application.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:

SIGNIFICANCE: Outstanding Resource within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District

STYLE: Shingle

DATE: 1892-1916

Fig. 1: Subject property.
PROPOSAL:

The applicants propose the following work items at the subject property:

- Construction of a one-story rear addition/extension of an existing attached two-car garage at the rear of the historic house.
- Construction of a deck at the right (west) side of the proposed addition.
- Construction of a new at-grade flagstone patio at the rear/right (southwest) side of the property.
- Construction of a new area way at the right (west) side of the proposed addition.

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**

The Guidelines define an Outstanding Resource as “A resource which is of outstanding significance due to its architectural and/or historical features. An outstanding resource may date from any historical period and may be representative of any architectural style. However, it must have special features, architectural details and/or historic associations that make the resource especially representative of an architectural style, it must be especially important to the history of the district, and/or it must be especially unique within the context of the district.”

The Guidelines state:

Additional basic policies that should be adhered to include:

1. Preserving the integrity of the proposed 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.
2. Preserving the integrity of contributing structures in the district. Alterations to contributing structures should be designed in such a way that the altered structure still contributes to the district.
3. Maintaining the variety of architectural styles and the tradition of architectural excellence.
4. 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.
5. 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.

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 and 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.

The Guidelines state three basic policies that should be adhered to, including:

Preserving the integrity of the contributing structures in the district. Alterations to contributing structures should be designed in such a way that the altered structure still contributes to the district.

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 very lenient review. Most changes to rear of the properties should be approved as a matter of course.

The Guidelines that pertain to this project are as follows:

**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. For outstanding resources, they should be subject to strict scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way. Addition of compatible storm doors should be encouraged.

**Exterior trim** (such as moldings on doors and windows) 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.

**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. Major additions which substantially alter or obscure the front of the structure should be discouraged but not automatically prohibited. For example, where lot size does not permit placement to the rear, and the proposed addition is compatible with the street scape, it should be subject to moderate scrutiny for contributing resources, but strict scrutiny for outstanding resources.

**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 substitute for replacement in kind, and the reviewing agency should be open to consideration of these alternative solutions.
**Siding** should be subject to moderate scrutiny if it is visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if it is not. Artificial siding on areas visible from the public right-of-way should be discouraged where such materials would replace or damage original building materials that are in good condition. Vinyl and aluminum siding should be discouraged.

**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. For outstanding resources, they should be subject to strict scrutiny. 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. Addition of security bars should be subject to lenient scrutiny, whether visible from the public right-of-way or not.

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

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

1. The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or

2. The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or

3. The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or

4. The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or

5. The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship; 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 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, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

#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 proportion, 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 subject property is a c. 1892-1916 Shingle-style Outstanding Resource within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District. The applicants propose the following work items at the subject property:

- Construction a of one-story rear addition/extension of an existing attached two-car garage at the rear of the historic house.
  - The proposed addition will be +/- 510 sf.
  - The proposed materials include a painted brick chimney to match the existing chimneys on the historic house and attached garage, asphalt shingle roofing to match the existing, wood trim and lap siding to match the existing, wood double-hung SDL windows to match the existing, wood SDL doors.
- Construction of a deck at the right (west) side of the proposed addition.
  - The proposed materials include wood decking and wood handrails.
- Construction of a new at-grade flagstone patio at the rear/right (southwest) side of the property.
  - The proposed patio will be +/- 400 sf.
- Construction of a new areaway at the right (west) side of the proposed addition.
  - The proposed areaway will replace Bilco doors in the location of the proposed addition. The Bilco doors currently provide access to the basement.
  - The proposed areaway treads and risers will be constructed from parged concrete.
  - Painted metal guardrails and handrails are proposed for the areaway.

Staff supports the applicants’ proposal, finding the proposed work items consistent with the Guidelines and Standards, as outlined above. In accordance with Standards #2 and #9, the proposed alterations will not remove or alter character-defining features of the historic house. Per Standard #10, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired, if the proposed additions and adjacent or related new construction are removed in the future.

After full and fair consideration of the applicant’s submission staff finds the proposal as being consistent with the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-(b) 1 and 2, having found the proposal is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation #2, #9 & #10 outlined above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b), having found that the proposal is consistent with the Chevy Chase Village Historic
District Guidelines identified above, and therefore will not substantially alter the exterior features of the historic resource and is compatible in character with the district and the purposes of Chapter 24A;

and with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation #2, 9, and 10;

and with the general condition that the applicant shall present the **3 permit sets of drawings, if applicable to Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) staff for review and stamping** prior to submission for the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS) building permits;

and with the general condition that final project design details, not specifically delineated by the Commission, shall be approved by HPC staff or brought back to the Commission as a revised HAWP application at staff’s discretion;

and with the general condition that the applicant shall notify the Historic Preservation Staff if they propose to make **any alterations** to the approved plans. Once the work is completed the applicant will contact the staff person assigned to this application at 301-563-3400 or michael.kyne@montgomeryplanning.org to schedule a follow-up site visit.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301/563-3400

APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: lolson@gtmarchitects.com
Contact Person: Luke Olson
Daytime Phone No.: 240-333-2021

Tax Account No.: 240-333-2021

Name of Property Owner: Britt & Kelleen Snider
Daytime Phone No.: 202.390.3725

Address: 4901 Montgomery Lane Apt 201 Bethesda MD 20814
Street Number: City: State: Zip Code:

Contractor: 
Contractor Registration No.: 
Agent for Owner: 
Daytime Phone No.: 240-333-2021

LOCATION OF BUILDING PREMISE

House Number: 6 Street: E Melrose Street
Town/City: Chevy Chase Nearest Cross Street: Connecticut Avenue
Lot: 10 & PT. 11 Block: 44 Subdivision: Chevy Chase Section 2

Lot:
Folio:
Parcel:

PART ONE: TYPE OF ALTERATION AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
☐ Construct ☐ Extend ☐ Alter/Renovate ☐ A/C ☐ Slab ☐ Room Addition ☐ Porch ☐ Deck ☐ Shed
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Wreck/Raze ☐ Solar ☐ Fireplace ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Single Family
☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☐ Revocable ☐ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☒ Other: Patio

1B. Construction cost estimate: $ 600,000

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

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTENSION ADDITIONS

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

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

PART THREE: COMPLETE ONLY FOR 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/association

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 03-31-2020

Approved: For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission
Disapproved: Signature: Date:

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

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Owner’s mailing address</strong></th>
<th><strong>Owner’s Agent’s mailing address</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britt &amp; Kelleen Snider</td>
<td>Luke Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4901 Montgomery Lane Apt 201</td>
<td>GTM Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
<td>7735 Old Georgetown Rd Ste 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Mellon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 E Lenox St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy &amp; Mark Aron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 E Melrose St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph &amp; Morgan Coffey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 E Melrose St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase MD 20815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman &amp; Jeanne Asher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCOPE OF WORK: 1-STORY ADDITION TO REAR OF EXISTING 2-STORY HOUSE