III.A

Preliminary Consultation

MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT

Address: 7305 Holly Ave., Takoma Park  
Meeting Date: 4/22/2020

Resource: Outstanding Resource  
Report Date: 4/15/2020

Takoma Park Historic District

Applicant: Chris and Molly Campbell  
Public Notice: 4/8/2020

Review: Preliminary Consultation  
Staff: Dan Bruechert

Proposal: Partial demolition, construction of a new rear addition, tree removal

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the applicant make any revisions recommended by the HPC and return for a HAWP.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Outstanding Resource to the Takoma Park Historic District.
STYLE: Craftsman
DATE: c.1910

Fig. 1: The subject property is on a narrow, deep lot near the edge of the Historic District (aerial photo, 2019).
PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing deck, remove a tree, and construct a rear addition.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

When reviewing alterations and additions for new construction to Contributing Resources within the Takoma Park Historic District, decisions are guided by the Takoma Park Historic District Design Guidelines (Guidelines) and Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A), and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). As this project is also in one of the two commercial districts in Takoma Park review of the project shall be guided by the Design Guidelines for Commercial Buildings in the City of Takoma Park, Maryland.

Takoma Park Historic District Design Guidelines

There are two very general, broad planning and design concepts which apply to all categories. These are:

- The design review emphasis will be restricted to changes that are at all visible from the public right-of-way, irrespective of landscaping or vegetation (it is expected that the majority of new additions will be reviewed for their impact on the overall district), and,

- The importance of assuring that additions and other changes to existing structures act to reinforce and continue existing streetscape, landscape, and building patterns rather than to impair the character of the district.

Outstanding Resources have the highest level of architectural and/or historical significance. While they will receive the most detailed level of design review, it is permissible to make sympathetic alterations, changes, and additions. The guiding principles to be utilized by the Historic Preservation Commission are the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

Specifically, some of the factors to be considered in reviewing HAWPs on Outstanding Resources:

- Plans for all alterations should be compatible with the resource’s original design; additions, specifically, should be sympathetic to existing architectural character, including massing, height, setback, and materials

- Emphasize placement of major additions to the rear of existing structures so that they are less visible from the public right-of-way

- While additions should be compatible, they are not required to be replicative of earlier architectural styles

- Preservation of original and distinctive architectural features, such as porches, dormers, decorative details, shutters, etc., is encouraged

- Preservation of original windows and doors, particularly those with specific architectural importance, and of original size and shape of openings is encouraged

- Preservation of original building materials and use of appropriate, compatible new materials is encouraged
All changes and additions should respect existing environmental settings, landscaping, and patterns of open space

_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

(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, space 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 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 the following work items:

- Demolition of the existing deck;
- Construction of a new rear addition;
- Tree removal;
- Construction of a new 12’ deck adjacent to the new rear addition.

The subject property is a c.1910 Sears Argyle Kit house that is categorized as an ‘Outstanding Resource’ due to its intact form and materials. Sometime c.1970 a rear addition with a deck was constructed, matching the building form and siding. The addition was constructed on piers and has windows that don’t match the historic in proportions. Staff finds that the existing deck is not a historic feature and is not visible from the surrounding historic district. Staff would recommend the HPC approve the demolition of the deck in a HAWP review.

Staff finds the size and design of the proposed addition is modest in size and scale, as well as being sited in the preferred location, per the _Design Guidelines_. While the general preference for new construction adjacent to an historic structure would be to inset any new building additions from the existing side wall...
planes, staff would make an exception in this case. Specifically, Staff finds that the proposed addition is being added onto non-historic construction and, due to the lot’s narrow width, the new addition will not be highly visible when viewed from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the form and placement of the proposed construction will not detract from the historic significance of the historic house and surrounding district, per 24A-8(b)(2).

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing deck and remove the 31” (thirty-one inch) d.b.h. white oak that projects through the rear deck, and construct a 15’ 4” (fifteen feet, four-inch) addition and a new 12’ deck. The subject tree is one of ten trees in the rear yard of the subject property that exceeds 10” (ten inches) d.b.h. Staff finds that while the tree contributes to the mature tree canopy on the property and the surrounding district, the loss of this tree will not significantly impact the heavily wooded character of either the rear yard or surrounding district.

The primary reason the applicants requested HPC review for a preliminary consultation is for assistance in determining if there are any other acceptable locations for new construction that would avoid removing the white oak that penetrates the rear deck. The white oak is 5’ (five feet) from the existing rear wall of the house. Informal discussion with the Takoma Park Arborists suggests that he is dis-inclined to approve the tree removal necessary to construct this addition (note, the applicants have not yet applied for the tree removal). Staff finds that if the HPC determines an addition to the subject property is acceptable, the proposed location appears to be the appropriate location. The proposal maintains the form, massing, and materials of the historic house. Staff finds that a second-story addition, which would be the only available option should a rear addition not be approved, while appropriate in certain ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ resources, is not appropriate for any ‘Outstanding’ resource. Staff additionally finds that a side-projecting addition would significantly alter the house massing when viewed from the public right-of-way; and that the Design Guidelines explicitly state that additions should be placed to the rear of existing construction. Regardless of the findings of the Takoma Park Arborists, Staff finds the proposal is architecturally compatible with the historic house and surrounding district.

Staff request HPC feedback on:
- The appropriateness of an addition on the existing house;
- The appropriateness of the proposed addition in materials, form, and placement;
- The placement and form of any other acceptable building addition.

While not required for the preliminary consultation, a complete the HAWP application needs to include:
- Window specifications;
- Door specifications;
- Deck railing and stair specifications.

Staff request HPC recommendations for materials configurations for these elements.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the applicant make any revisions recommended by the HPC and return for a HAWP.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
301/563-3400

APPLICATION FOR  
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: GregD@grossmuellers.com  
Contact Person: Greg Daltonzo  
Daytime Phone No.: (202) 537-0060

Tax Account No.: 

Name of Property Owner: Chris and Molly Campbell  
Daytime Phone No.: 

Address: 7305 Holly Ave  
Takoma Park  
Maryland Park  
20912  
Street Number  
City  
State  
Zip Code

Contractor: The Levine Group  
Phone No.: (301) 585-4848

Contractor Registration No.: 27455

Agent for Owner: Grossmueller's Design Consultants - Greg Daltonzo  
Daytime Phone No.: (202) 537-0060

LOCATION OF BUILDING PREMISE

House Number: 7305 
Street: Holly Ave

Town/City: Takoma Park 
Nearest Cross Street: Dogwood Ave

Lot: 
Block: 
Subdivision: 
Libre: 12854 
Folio: 272 
Parcel: 823

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT, ACTION 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: 

1B. Construction cost estimate: $ 285,000

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/assessment

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

__________________________  ____________________________
Signature of owner or authorized agent  Date

Approved: 
For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission

Disapproved: 
Signature: 
Date: 

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

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS

3/18/2020

Edit 6/21/99

5
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:

   The current property is a circa 1910 Sears Roebuck Modern Homes - The Argyle. Significant details include notched rafters and small pane glass. The existing kit home is in excellent shape, but has an addition dating from the 1970's in the rear. The addition continues the same material and plane of the side walls. The roof of the addition is the same pitch and plane, but the overhang steps inward.

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

   The project continues the existing addition rearward by 12 additional feet. The existing kit house will not be impacted at all. Materials, wall and roof planes, and window style will match the existing addition. The plan requires the removal of one healthy 31" white oak that is currently located within the existing deck.

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 resource(s) and the proposed work.
   b. Elevations (facades), with marked dimensions, clearly indicating proposed work in relation to existing construction and, when appropriate, context. All materials and fixtures proposed for the exterior must be noted on the elevations drawings. An 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 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 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.
The above drawings and specifications, and the ideas, designs and arrangements represented thereby are and shall remain the property of the architect: No part thereof shall be copied, disclosed to others or used in connection with any work or project or by any other person for any purpose other than for the specific project for which they have been prepared and developed without the written consent of the architect. Visual contact with these drawings or specifications shall constitute conclusive evidence and acceptance of these restrictions.
The above drawings and specifications, and the ideas, designs and arrangements represented thereby are and shall remain the property of the architect: No part thereof shall be copied, disclosed to others or used in connection with any work or project or by any other person for any purpose other than for the specific project for which they have been prepared and developed without the written consent of the architect. Visual contact with these drawings or specifications shall constitute conclusive evidence and acceptance of these restrictions.
NOTES
1. ALL TREES IN THE BACKYARD ARE MEASURED FROM A BASELINE PERPENDICULAR FROM CORNER OF WOOD DECK, AS SHOWN AS 'BASEPOINT' ON PLAN. ALL TREES IN FRONT YARD ARE MEASURED FROM BASEPOINT ON THE CORNER OF THE WOOD PORCH.
2. SURVEY FILE PROVIDED BY OWNER.
March 25, 2020

Re: 7305 Holly Lane Concept Review

Ms. Heiler,

I am writing on behalf of Christopher Campbell and Molly Crawford, owners of 7305 Holly Lane in Takoma Park. We are working on renovation plans to expand the house and understand that approval will be required by the Commission prior to starting construction. We have applied for a conceptual review because we understand that this property has the most restrictive guidelines for expansion. We believe that we have designed an addition that will meet the homeowners needs and best meet the Historic Preservation Commissions guidelines. We are looking for your support and approval.

A bit of history on our planning to date. The property has several large trees that we had to consider. The most prevalent one, a white oak that is within five feet of the rear of the existing house, would need to be removed to exercise our current plan. To understand what would be required to remove the tree, we set a preliminary meeting on site with Jan van Zutphen, Urban Forest Manager-City of Takoma Park Department of Public Works. While appreciative that we engaged him early in our process, he indicated that the tree that we would like to remove is in fact, a healthy white oak and that he would most likely not approve of its removal. We are planning to apply for the tree removal permit upon receipt and determination of the concept review from the HPC, pending work status of the Takoma Park offices. The owners took one further step and engaged in a tree survey to identify the location and species of each of the trees on the property. This is included in the drawings submitted.

While we understand that the trees are not under the Commission's jurisdiction, we can foresee a conflict between the Historic Preservation Commission and Takoma Park Department of Public Works-Urban Forest Manager when making applications on behalf of the owners to improve their property. We are hoping that we can establish that the Commission recommends and expansion to the
We expect that we will have to appeal a denial for the removal of this tree and would like to have the HPC’s recommendation to bring to that appeal. We would request that the Commission provide feedback in support of a rear addition stating that, given that this property is an “Outstanding Resource”, an expansion in any other direction would not be supported.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sincerely,

Cindy McClure
ASID, MCR, CKD, GCP
Grossmueller’s Design Consultants

CC: Christopher Campbell, Owner
    Molly Crawford, Owner
    Gregory Dalfonzo, Architect
    Jerry Levine, Contractor