MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 14601 Berryville Rd., Germantown  
Meeting Date: 6/24/2020

Resource: Master Plan Site #24/24  
Report Date: 6/17/2020
(Montanverde)

Applicant: Tucker and Meakin Bennett  
Public Notice: 6/10/2020
(Thomas Taltaulv, Architect)

Review: HAWP  
Tax Credit: N/A

Case Number: 24/24-20A  
Staff: Michael Kyne

PROPOSAL: Exhaust pipe enclosure

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

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:

SIGNIFICANCE: Master Plan Site #24/24 (Montanverde)

STYLE: Federal

DATE: c. 1806-1812

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

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

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

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

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

Fig. 1: Subject property.

BACKGROUND:

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission at the March 13, 2019 HPC meeting for a preliminary consultation regarding a proposed second-story addition above the existing one-story east wing and a two-story ell addition adjacent to the east wing.¹ The applicants returned at the May 7, 2019 HPC meeting for a 2nd preliminary consultation, where they proposed a one-story addition adjacent to the existing c. 2014 mudroom at the east side of the house. ² The applicants returned again at the August 14, 2019 HPC meeting with a proposal for a two-story addition adjacent to the existing c. 2014 mudroom at the east side of the house. ³ The applicants’ proposal was approved with one condition at the September 11, 2019 HPC meeting. ⁴

³ August 14, 2019 HPC meeting Recording: http://mncppc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?publish_id=9a9748eb-bf66-11e9-b703-0050569183fa
⁴ September 11, 2019 HPC meeting Recording: http://mncppc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?publish_id=88b51f16-d56f-11e9-b703-0050569183fa
The applicants returned to the Commission for revisions to their approve HAWP at the October 23, 2019 HPC meeting. The Commission approved the proposed revisions, which included construction of a below grade egress areaway with 3’ high painted steel safety railing and steel basement door at the east side of the previously approved two-story addition.5

The applicants submitted further revisions to their previously approved HAWP, which were reviewed as a Staff Item at the May 27, 2020 HPC meeting. The proposed revisions included the addition of an exhaust pipe on the eastern roof slope of the previously approved building addition, serving a previously approved interior fireplace insert on the first floor of the addition, and construction of a fiber cement siding-clad enclosure for the proposed exhaust pipe. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the proposed exhaust pipe but deny the proposed exhaust pipe enclosure.6

PROPOSAL:

Construction of a fiber cement siding-clad enclosure for the approved exhaust pipe on the eastern roof slope of the previously approved building addition.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

When reviewing alterations and new construction to Master Plan Sites several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A), and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). The pertinent information in these documents is outlined below.

Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8

(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

6 May 27, 2020 HPC meeting Recording: http://mncppc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?publish_id=1e46bdfa-a0fc-11ea-9e08-0050569183fa
manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or

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

(5) The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship; or

(6) In balancing the interests of the public in preserving the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district, with the interests of the public from the use and benefit of the alternative proposal, the general public welfare is better served by granting the permit.

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

(Ord. No. 9-4, § 1; Ord. No. 11-59.)

Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

The Secretary of the Interior defines rehabilitation as “the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.” Because the property is a Master Plan Site, the Commission’s focus in reviewing the proposal should be the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The relevant Standards are as follows:

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

STAFF DISCUSSION:

Revisions to the applicants’ previously approved HAWP for a building addition (see BACKGROUND on Pages 2-3) were reviewed as a Staff Item at the May 27, 2020 HPC meeting. The proposed Staff Item revisions included the addition of an exhaust pipe on the eastern roof slope of the previously approved building addition, serving a previously approved interior fireplace insert on the first floor of the addition, and construction of a fiber cement siding-clad enclosure for the proposed exhaust pipe. Staff recommended that the Commission approve both proposed revisions; however, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the proposed exhaust pipe but deny the proposed exhaust pipe enclosure.

The applicants have elected to submit a formal revision to their previously approved HAWP application, seeking further discussion regarding the proposed exhaust pipe enclosure. The proposed exhaust pipe enclosure has not changed since the Commission reviewed the Staff Item revision at the May 27, 2020 HPC meeting.

Staff continues to support the proposed exhaust pipe enclosure, finding that it is above the roofline and far removed from the historic house, where it is unlikely to detract from character-defining features of the historic house, in accordance with Standards #2 and #9. Additionally, staff finds the proposed fiber cement siding to be an appropriate and compatible new material, which will match the previously approved siding for the building addition.
Fig. 2: Proposed north elevation, with proposed exhaust pipe enclosure circled in red.

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 and #9 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 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 and #9.

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.