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MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 19 Grafton Street, Chevy Chase
Resource: Outstanding Resource
Applicant: Joshua Bonnie
Review: HAWP
Case Number: 35/13-20HH
PROPOSAL: Building alterations

Meeting Date: 11/18/2020
Report Date: 11/11/2020
Public Notice: 11/04/2020
Tax Credit: NA
Staff: Michael Kyne

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC approve the HAWP application.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Outstanding Resource
STYLE: Shingle
DATE: c. 1892-1916

Fig. 1: Subject property.
PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes the following alterations at the subject property:

- Construction of a second story addition/expansion at the rear (north side) of the historic house.
- Alteration/extension of an existing dormer at the rear (north side) of the historic house.

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.

Sec. 24A-8. Same-Criteria for issuance.

(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; [emphasis added] 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 alterations 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.

**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 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:

- **Dormers** 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.

- **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.

**Second or third story additions** or expansions which do not exceed the footprint of the first story should be subject to moderate scrutiny, in view of the predominance of large scale houses in the Village. For outstanding resources, however, such additions or expansions should be subject to strict scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way.

**STAFF DISCUSSION**

The applicant proposes to construct a second story addition/expansion at the rear (north side) of the historic house. The proposed second story addition/expansion will be entirely within the footprint of the existing first floor structure at the rear. The proposed design includes a gambrel roof form and dormers with roof slopes to match the existing. The proposed materials include wood double-hung windows, painted cedar shake siding, and asphalt shingle roofing to match the existing.

The applicant also proposes to alter the leftmost (as viewed from the public right-of-way of Grafton Street) existing dormer at the rear (north side) of the historic house. As proposed, the dormer will be extended to connect to the proposed second story addition/expansion. The proposed new materials will match the existing (painted cedar shake siding and asphalt shingle roofing).

Staff notes that, while the existing one story structure at the rear (north side) of the historic house has experienced previous HAWP-approved alterations, including fenestration alterations (approved at the February 7, 2018 HPC meeting) and alterations to the attached rear porch (railing replacement, conversion to a screened porch, and removal of the rearmost cantilevered section of porch, which was subject to a preliminary consultation at the November 18, 2015 HPC meeting and approved via a HAWP at the February 10, 2016 HPC meeting), the 1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map indicates that it is original to the historic house (see Fig. 2 below).

![Fig. 2: Subject property, as depicted on 1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.](image)
The previous alterations were approved, in part, because of their general lack of visibility from the public right-of-way, due to their location at the rear, as well as the grading of the relatively steeply sloped lot. Likewise, staff finds that the proposed second story addition/expansion and dormer alteration/extension at the rear (north side) of the historic house will be negligibly visible, at best, from the public right-of-way. Accordingly, staff finds that, although the subject property is classified an Outstanding Resource, the proposed work items should be reviewed with moderate scrutiny rather than strict scrutiny (see the Guidelines regarding dormers and second or third story additions above).

In accordance with the Guidelines, the design and materials of the proposed second story addition/expansion and dormer alteration/extension are compatible with the historic house. Furthermore, the proposed second story addition/expansion is in the preferred location at the rear of the historic house. Staff also finds that, because the proposed second story addition/expansion does not exceed the footprint of the existing first floor structure, and its roofline is below that of the historic house, there is no potential for the proposal to overwhelm or detract from the historic house.

In accordance with Standards #2 and #9, the proposal will not remove or alter character-defining features of the historic house or surrounding streetscape. Per Standard #10, the proposed additions and alterations can be removed in the future without impairing the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment.

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, and #10, and the Chevy Chase Village Historic District Guidelines outlined above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b) (1), (2), and (d), 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.
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301.563.3400

APPLICANT:

Name: Josh Bonnie
Address: 19 Grafton Street
Daytime Phone: 301 718 8118

E-mail: jheller@musearchitects.com
City: Chevy Chase
Zip: 20815
Tax Account No.: 00456456

AGENT/CONTACT (if applicable):

Name: Jenn Heller
Address: 7401 Wisconsin Ave #500
Daytime Phone: 301 718 8118

E-mail: jheller@musearchitects.com
City: Bethesda
Zip: 20814
Contractor Registration No.: ______________

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISE: MIHP # of Historic Property

Is the Property Located within an Historic District? Yes/District Name
No/Individual Site Name

Is there an Historic Preservation/Land Trust/Environmental Easement on the Property? If YES, include a map of the easement, and documentation from the Easement Holder supporting this application.

Building Number: 19
Street: Grafton Street
Town/City: Chevy Chase
Nearest Cross Street: Cedar Parkway
Lot: 4
Block: 24
Subdivision: 009
Parcel: ___

TYPE OF WORK PROPOSED: See the checklist on Page 4 to verify that all supporting items for proposed work are submitted with this application. Incomplete Applications will not be accepted for review. Check all that apply:

☐ New Construction ☐ Deck/Porch ☐ Shed/Garage/Accessory Structure
☐ Addition ☐ Fence ☐ Solar
☐ Demolition ☐ Hardscape/Landscape ☐ Tree removal/planting
☐ Grading/Excavation ☐ Roof ☐ Window/Door
☐ Other: ____________________

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

Jennifer Heller
Signature of owner or authorized agent

10/28/2020
Date
WINDOW SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>B.O.</th>
<th>Light Cut</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Marvin Ultimate Wood</td>
<td>20&quot;x6&quot;</td>
<td>T.M.E.</td>
<td>Window to comply with glass requirements. 2.5&quot; thick, Factory painted,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operable Thru-Blue-Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Painted base interior color. Low-02 argon insulated glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Marvin Ultimate Wood</td>
<td>16&quot;x6&quot;</td>
<td>V.I.F.</td>
<td>Factory painted exterior T.M.E. window frame. Painted white interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operable Casement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>color. Low-02 argon insulated glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Fixed Curb Mounted Skylight</td>
<td>24&quot;x4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max glass per glaze. Must install detail at each Skylight shelf per HPC2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1. Contractor to verify all dimensions in field prior to placing order, typical.
2. Contractor shall provide shop drawings for architect's review prior to placing order.
3. All windows to have six mutual oxide bars - 0.75" minimum bar with interior spacer bar.
4. Window sills are indicated on elevations.
5. Provide sash tempered glass per IRC code.
6. Provide screens at operable windows to match exterior finish.
7. Contractor shall coordinate window & door rough openings with the architect.
8. Exterior facing shall be in rubbed bronze finish, typical. Interior facing hardware & hinges shall be white, typical.