Preliminary Consultation
MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 5906 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase
Meeting Date: 6/23/2021

Resource: Contributing Resource
(Chevy Chase Village Historic District)
Report Date: 6/16/2021

Applicant: Scott Talbott
(Luke Olson, Architect)
Public Notice: 6/9/2021

Tax Credit: N/A

Staff: Michael Kyne

Case Number: N/A

PROPOSAL: Demolition and new construction, driveway, and other alterations

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the applicant make any revisions based upon the HPC’s comments and return for a second preliminary consultation.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District
STYLE: Colonial Revival
DATE: c. 1916-27

Fig. 1: Subject property, as marked by the blue star.
PROPOSAL:

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing three-car garage and construct a new 2 ½-story house and one-car detached garage on Parcel 2 of the subject property. A new curb cut and driveway are also proposed for the existing house on Parcel 1.

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 Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A), the historic preservation review guidelines in the approved and adopted amendment for the Chevy Chase Village Historic District (Guidelines), 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 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.)

**Chevy Chase Village Historic District Guidelines**

The *Guidelines* state that the following five basic policies should be adhered to:

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 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.

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 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:

**Driveways** should be subject to strict scrutiny only with regard to their impact on landscaping, particularly mature trees. In all other respects, driveways should be subject to lenient scrutiny. Parking pads and other paving in front yards should be discouraged.

**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 wall 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 attachment to the main residence should also be reviewed in accordance with the Guidelines applicable to “major additions.”

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

**New Construction**

The goal of new construction within the proposed historic district is to be sympathetic to the traditional street and building patterns in the district, while allowing for creative and new building designs. In addition to the approach of recalling earlier architectural styles in new buildings, it is appropriate for new structures to reflect and represent that period in which they are built. It is not the intention of these guidelines to inhibit or exclude creative design solutions that may be developed for new buildings in the district. Unique designs, reflecting architectural excellence, which do not adhere strictly to traditional
neighborhood practices, but are sensitive to and compatible with the fabric of the community should be supported.

The key considerations in reviewing new construction should be the two paramount principles identified above -- fostering the Village's shared commitment to evolving eclecticism while maintaining its open park-like character.

**Secretary of the 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.” The Standards are as follows:

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

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.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

8. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

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.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.
III.A

STAFF DISCUSSION:

The subject property is a c. 1916-27 Colonial Revival-style Contributing Resource within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District. The property consists of two parcels – Parcel 1 (northernmost), where the historic house is located, and Parcel 2 (southernmost), an open side yard with driveway and three-car garage at the rear (west) property line. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing three-car garage and construct a new 2 ½-story house and one-car detached garage on Parcel 2. The existing driveway will serve the proposed new house on Parcel 2, and a new curb cut and driveway are proposed for the existing house on Parcel 1.

While the applicant has submitted plans and elevations for the proposed new house, staff recommends that the proposal be subject to two separate preliminary consultations. The first preliminary consultation should focus on demolition of the existing garage, the proposed new driveway, the siting and location of the proposed new house, and the compatibility of the proposed infill construction with the rhythm and spacing of the surrounding streetscape and pattern of open space.

Garage Demolition

According the 1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (see Fig. 2 below), the existing garage to be demolished is original to the historic house. However, the garage appears to have experienced previous alterations, and its location and relationship to the historic house is atypical within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District. Accordingly, staff finds that the removal of the garage will not remove or alter character defining features of the historic district or surrounding streetscape, per Standards #2 and #9.

![Fig. 2: 1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, depicting the subject property. The garage to be demolished is circled in red.](image-url)
**New Driveway and Curb Cut**

The proposed new driveway will be approximately 50’ long by 10’ wide, and it will be located in front of the historic house at the northeast side of property. According to the *Guidelines*, “[d]riveways should be subject to strict scrutiny only with regard to their impact on landscaping, particularly mature trees. In all other respects, driveways should be subject to lenient scrutiny.” As no tree are proposed to be removed to accommodate the proposed new driveway, staff finds that it should be subject to lenient scrutiny. Although the *Guidelines* also state that “[p]arking pads and other paving in front yards should be discouraged,” the preceding statement demonstrates that this does not apply to driveways. Staff finds that the proposed new driveway is generally compatible with the existing driveways within the historic district, and it will not remove or alter character-defining features of the district or surrounding streetscape, in accordance with *Standards #2* and *#9.*

**Proposed New House Location and Siting**

**Lot Requirements**

The applicant has provided a letter from the Montgomery Planning Development Applications and Regulatory Coordination (DARC) Division, stating that the two subject parcels are exempt from the platting requirements of the County’s Subdivision Regulations, and the two parcels are not required to be recorded by record plat prior to issuance of a building permit for a new single-family detached dwelling. However, Section 8-16 (d) & (e) of the Village’s regulations stipulate that “[e]very building should be located on a recorded lot” and “[t]here should not be more than one (1) single-family dwelling on one (1) lot.” Staff contacted the Village on June 14, 2021, and the Village confirmed that their requirement supersedes the County’s exemption, and the lot must be recorded. The applicant is required to meet building and lot requirements for both the Village and Montgomery County separate from the review requirements of the Historic Area Work Permit process.

**Frontage**

The applicant has also provided a letter from Chevy Chase Village, stating that the Village’s requirement for lots to have a minimum frontage of 75’ does not apply to these two parcels (each measuring approximately 70’), and subdivision of the property and construction of a new dwelling would be in compliance with the Village’s frontage requirements. In consultation with the Montgomery Planning GIS team, staff determined that 117 (or approximately 36%) of the 327 properties within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District have a frontage of 70’ or less. Four properties on Cedar Parkway have a frontage of less than 70’, including nearby 5808 (62.69’) and 5810 Cedar Parkway (53.52’). A partial image from the GIS map showing properties with a frontage of 70’ or less is below (Fig. 3). The full map is also available at the following link: https://arcg.is/1Wu8r5
Fig. 3: Partial GIS map, showing properties within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District with a frontage of 70’ or less (historic district boundary defined by the red line, properties with a frontage of 70’ or less shaded in yellow, 5808 and 5810 circled in blue, and the subject property circled in green).

Setbacks

The following table outlines the County (R-60 Zoning) and Village setback requirements, based upon the applicant’s preliminary determination of setbacks, as well as the proposed setbacks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COUNTY REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>VILLAGE REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>31’</td>
<td>25’</td>
<td>25’ to front porch; 31’ to front wall plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>8’</td>
<td>7’</td>
<td>Left: 9’-2” to 10’-2”; Right: 13’-6” to 17’-2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Side Setbacks</td>
<td>18’</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>Left: 20’-7” to 21’-7”; Right: 33’-9” to 37’-5”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>&gt; 20’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessory Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt; 60’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>6’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lot coverage

The proposed new lot size will be 9,435 sf. The following table outlines the County and Village lot coverage requirements, as provided by the applicant, as well as the proposed infill lot coverage:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY REQUIREMENTS (MAIN HOUSE)</th>
<th>VILLAGE REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>PROPOSED (Total Lot Size: 9,435 sf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.565%, or 2,506.4 sf</td>
<td>35%, or 3,302.2 sf</td>
<td>County’s calculations: 20.34%, or 1,919.3 sf; Village’s calculations: 28.7%, or 2,705.9 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Streetscape and footprint study**

The applicant has provided a footprint study of the immediate surrounding area and a streetscape study of the proposed house and adjacent houses to the north and south (see Figs. 4 & 5 below). These studies demonstrate the variety in scale and massing of the existing buildings in the district, as well as the atypical condition of the subject property (5906 Cedar Parkway), with its large open side yard. However, staff does note that the adjacent property to the south (5904 Cedar Parkway) has a similarly large side yard.

![Fig. 4: Building footprint study of the immediate surrounding area, as provided by the applicant.](image_url)
Regarding scale and massing, staff’s GIS estimates indicate that the adjacent 2½-story house to the south (5904 Cedar Parkway) is approximately 58’ wide by 60’ deep (at its deepest point), and the existing 2½-story subject property house (to the north of the proposed new house) is approximately 47’ wide by 45’ deep (beginning at the covered front porch). This, along with the submitted streetscape study, demonstrates the general compatibility in scale and massing of the proposed 2½-story, 35’-11” wide by 53’-3” deep (not including projecting bays or porches) house. This is further supported by the footprint study of the immediate surrounding area, which depicts an even greater variety in scale and massing.

### Previous infill/new construction

Staff also worked with the Montgomery Planning GIS team to determine the number of houses constructed within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District since 1988. Of the 13 identified properties, four were constructed prior to the 1998 designation of the historic district, resulting in nine examples of new construction/infill post-designation. Most of these examples were demolition of existing non-contributing resources and construction of new houses in their place. However, there are two examples of infill construction on previously vacant lots, similar to the current proposal. The full GIS map showing post-1988 construction can also be found at the above-posted link (https://arcgis/1Wu8t5).

The 2½-story house at 2 West Melrose Street (see Fig. 6 below) was constructed via an approved HAWP in 1999 on a historically vacant corner lot (corner of West Melrose Street and Connecticut Avenue), which was associated with the Outstanding Resource at 6000 Connecticut Avenue. A non-historic pool house and swimming pool on the vacant lot were demolished prior to construction of the new house. Staff’s GIS estimates indicate that the infill house is approximately 66’ deep (at its deepest point) by 53’ wide. The records for this case can be found at the following link: https://mcatlas.org/tiles/06_HistoricPreservation_PhotoArchives/Padlock/HAR60640002/Box002/35-13-38G_Chevy%20Chase%20Village%20Historic%20District_2%20West%20Melrose_07-08-1998.pdf
Similarly, the 2½-story house at 1 Newlands Street (see Fig. 7 below) was constructed via an approved HAWP in 2001 on a historically vacant lot associated with the Contributing Resource at 3 Newlands Street. As in the current proposal, the existing driveway at 3 Newlands Street was utilized to access a proposed new garage at the infill property, with a new driveway later approved at 1 Newlands Street. Staff’s GIS estimates indicate that the infill house is currently approximately 46’ deep by 56’ wide at its deepest and widest points. The records for this case can be found at the following link: https://mcatlas.org/tiles/06_HistoricPreservation_PhotoArchives/Padlock/HAR60640002/Box002/35-13-001_Chevy%20Chase%20Village%20HD_One%20Newlands%20Street_12-01-1999.pdf
**Findings/Compatibility**

As discussed at length above, the proposed new house is consistent with the frontage, setback, and lot coverage requirements of both the County and the Village. Additionally, the information provided by the applicant, the Montgomery Planning GIS team, and previously approved infill proposals demonstrates the general compatibility of the proposal, in terms of footprint, scale and massing, and rhythm and spacing within the district. Accordingly, staff finds the proposed new house’s location and siting to be generally consistent with the Guidelines regarding lot coverage, which state “Lot coverage should be subject to strict scrutiny, in view of the critical importance of preserving the Village’s open park-like character.”

Additionally, the proposal is generally consistent with the Guidelines regarding new construction, finding:

- The proposed new house’s location and siting is sympathetic to the traditional street and building patterns in the district;
- the proposal is sensitive to and compatible with the fabric of the community; and
- in being compatible with the existing rhythm and spacing of the historic district and surrounding streetscape, the proposal maintains the open park-like character.

Staff also finds the proposed new house’s location and siting to be generally consistent with Standards #2 and #9, as the compatible footprint, scale and massing, and rhythm and spacing ensure that the proposal will not alter or remove character-defining features (in this case, the open park-like character) of the historic district and surrounding streetscape.

However, staff seeks additional guidance from the Commission regarding the appropriateness of the proposal and how it could be improved to further ensure that it does not detract from the open park-like character of the district and surrounding streetscape – the primary concern when dealing with infill construction within the district.

Of specific concern, staff asks for guidance regarding the following:

- Given the side setback requirements, should the proposed new house be moved closer to the existing subject property house (to the north)?
  - Based upon the proposed setbacks, staff finds that the proposed new house could be moved up to 5’ to the north and still be compliant with both County and Village requirements. This could improve the resulting rhythm and spacing between the proposed and existing houses, as the house at the adjacent property to the south (5904 Cedar Parkway) is built near its north property line (see Fig. 8 below). However, staff notes that this may require a slight shift/relocation of the existing driveway, which is to be utilized for the proposed new house and garage.
- Based upon the provided streetscape study, the proposed new house will be deeper than the two adjacent property houses, when accounting for the front and rear porches. Although the proposed house’s depth remains generally consistent with the scale and massing of the historic district and surrounding streetscape, should it be reduced to ensure that the new building is deferential to and does not overwhelm/detract from the neighboring historic buildings?
- Similarly, although generally consistent, should the proposed new 2 ½-story house’s height be reduced to ensure that it is deferential to and does not overwhelm/detract from the neighboring 2 ½-story historic buildings?
  - Consideration should be given to grade changes and side setbacks which may increase or reduce the perceived height of the proposed new house compared to the neighboring houses.
Fig. 8: Adjacent property to the south (5904 Cedar Parkway), with the house built near its north property line.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the applicant make any revisions based upon the HPC’s comments and return for a second preliminary consultation.
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301.563.3400

APPLICANT:

SCOTT TALBOTT ON
BEHALF OF JOHN TALBOTT

Name: ___________________________    E-mail: scotttal33@gmail.com

Address: ___________________________  City: CHEVY CHASE    Zip: MD

Daytime Phone: ________________________  Tax Account No.: ________________________

AGENT/CONTACT (if applicable):

Name: ___________________________    E-mail: lolson@gtmarchitects.com

Address: ___________________________  City: BETHESDA    Zip: 20814

Daytime Phone: ________________________  Contractor Registration No.: ________________________

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISE:

MIHP # of Historic Property: ___________________________

Is the Property Located within an Historic District?  Yes/District Name: CHEVY CHASE VILLAGE

No/Individual Site Name: ___________________________

Are other Planning and/or Hearing Examiner Approvals /Reviews Required as part of this Application? (Conditional Use, Variance, Record Plat, etc.?) If YES, include information on these reviews as supplemental information.

Building Number: ____________  Street: ___________________________

Town/City: ___________________________  Nearest Cross Street: ___________________________

Lot: ___________________________  Block: ____________  Subdivision: ____________  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:

[X] New Construction  [ ] Deck/Porch  [ ] Shed/Garage/Accessory Structure

[X] Addition  [ ] Fence  [ ] Solar  [ ] Tree removal/planting


[X] Grading/Excavation  [ ] Roof  [ ] 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.

Signature of owner or authorized agent

Date

For Staff only:

HAWP# ___________________________

Date assigned: ____________

Yes/District Name: ___________________________

No/Individual Site Name: ___________________________
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## 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Property: Please describe the building and surrounding environment. Include information on significant structures, landscape features, or other significant features of the property:

EXISTING PARCEL IS EMPTY APART FROM EXISTING 3-CAR DETACHED GARAGE AND DRIVEWAY FOR NEIGHBORING HOUSE ON PARCEL 1. PARCEL IS DEVELOPABLE WITHOUT REQUIRING SUBDIVISION PER DETERMINATION LETTER FROM MNCPPC PROVIDED WITH APPLICATION.

Description of Work Proposed: Please give an overview of the work to be undertaken:

DEMOLISH EXISTING GARAGE AND BUILD NEW 2-1/2 STORY SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE AND 1-CAR DETACHED GARAGE ON PARCEL 2. PROVIDE NEW CURB-CUT AND DRIVEWAY FOR EXISTING HOUSE ON PARCEL 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Current Condition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Work:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Current Condition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Work:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Current Condition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Work:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT
### CHECKLIST OF APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions/ Alterations</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck/Porch</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence/Wall</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway/ Parking Area</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading/Excavation/Landscaping</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Removal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siding/ Roof Changes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window/ Door Changes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry Repair/ Repoint</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCOPE OF WORK: REMOVE EXISTING GARAGE AND CONSTRUCT NEW 2 1/2 STORY SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE AND ONE-CAR GARAGE ON EMPTY PARCEL IN CHEVY CHASE VILLAGE
NOTE:
1. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS ZONED R-60.
2. MAX LOT COVERAGE IS 26.565% OR 2,506.407 SQ. FT.
3. PARCEL 2 AS DESCRIBED IN L. 60392 F. 202
4. THE SETBACKS AS SHOWN ARE 31" +/- FRONT, 7" SIDE & REAR 20'.
5. THE FINAL BUILDING ENVELOPE IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE BASED ON BOUNDARY SURVEY.
6. NO FIELD RUN SURVEY HAS BEEN PERFORMED.

GRAPHIC SCALE

SCALE: 1" = 30'

FEASIBILITY WORKSHEET
5906 Cedar Parkway
Parcel 2
Chevy Chase Section 2
Bethesda (7th) District
Montgomery County, Maryland
October 5, 2020

John D. Talbott
5906 Cedar Parkway
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Re: Parcel 728 (Parcels One and Two) – Tax Map Grid HN31

Dear Property Owner:

Planning staff has reviewed the deed history supplied to our office by Benning and Associates, Inc. in regard to the property shown on Tax Map Grid HN31 as Parcel 728 (2 distinct parcel descriptions therein). It is our finding that the two subject parcels do qualify for an exemption to the platting requirement pursuant to Section 50.3.3.B.4 of the Montgomery County Subdivision Regulations. The deed history provided indicates that these parcels (Parcel 1 containing 10,970 square feet and Parcel 2 containing 9,450 square feet) have existed in its present size and shape since prior to June 1, 1958 (circa 1909). Therefore, the properties will not need to be recorded by record plat prior to issuance of a building permit for single-unit living (single-family detached dwelling). This finding shall remain valid for a period of two (2) years from the date of this letter; any request for an exemption to the platting requirement for these parcels made subsequent to the validity date will be considered in accordance with the regulations in effect at that time.

This letter does not waive the authority of any governmental agency and does not guarantee issuance of a building permit or imply exemption status to any other statute. You may wish to contact the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services to understand any other limitations associated with the issuance of a building permit on this property. This office advises you to also consider the ultimate clearing and grading needed to accommodate a new permitted structure on the property with respect to the applicability of the forest conservation law. This office further advises that individual tax accounts for each parcel description will need to be established prior to any issuance of a building permit. If you have any questions regarding this transmittal, please contact me at 301-495-4522.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Stephen J. Smith
MNCPPC - DARC Division

cc: Jonathan Jones, MNCPPC - DARC Division
    Dave McKee, Benning and Associates (via email)
to me

Good afternoon Mr. Talbott,

My apologies for taking some time to respond, but I wanted to check with the Village Manager before I emailed you back to be sure I was giving you the correct answer.

The legal description you provided references two parcels each measuring about 70 in frontage, recorded in 1909. While regulations for new lots require a minimum frontage of 75 feet, Chevy Chase Village Code has a provision that the width provision does not apply to a property was "embraced in any subdivision of lots recorded prior to July 12, 1982", which these two parcels are. So you would be within compliance to subdivide the property and build a dwelling on the newly recorded lot.

This below italicized provision is the only regulation that Chevy Chase Village has pertaining to subdividing of parcels.

i) Frontage and area of lot. No permit shall be issued for the construction of any dwelling house upon a lot having a frontage of less than seventy-five (75) feet and an area of less than seven thousand five hundred (7,500) square feet; provided, however, that these limitations shall not apply to any lot having a frontage of less than seventy-five (75) feet and an area of less than seven thousand five hundred (7,500) square feet which is embraced in any subdivision of lots recorded prior to July 12, 1982.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions. Thank you!

Jessica Gebhart
Permitting and Code Enforcement Coordinator
Chevy Chase Village
Tele. 301-654-7300
FAX. 301-907-9721
as follows, viz:

1. That all houses upon the premises hereby conveyed shall be built and used for
   residence purposes exclusively, except stables, carriage houses, sheds or other out-
   buildings, for use in connection with such residences, and no trade, business, manufac-
   ture, or sales, or nuisance of any kind shall be carried on or permitted upon said
   premises.

2. That no structure of any description shall be erected within twenty five (25)
   feet of the front line of said premises, and that no stable, carriage house, shed, or
   outbuilding shall be erected except on the rear of said premises.

   In the case of corner lots any and all lines bordering upon a street, avenue, or
   parkway shall be considered a front line.

3. That no house shall be erected on said premises at a cost less than three
   thousand (3,000) dollars.

4. That any house erected on said premises shall be designed for the occupancy of
   a single family, and no part of any house or of any structure appurtenant thereto shall
   be erected or maintained within five (5) feet of the sides lines of premises hereby
   conveyed, nor within ten (10) feet of the nearest adjacent house.

5. That a violation of any of the aforesaid covenants and agreements may be en-
   forced and the same enforced at the suit of The Chevy Chase Land Company, of Montogmy
   County, Maryland, its successors or assigns (assigns including any person deriving ti-
   tle mediate or immediate from said company to any lot or square, or part of a lot
   or square in the Section of the Subdivision of which the land hereby conveyed forms a
   part).

And the said party hereto of the first part hereby covenants to warrant specially
the property hereby conveyed, and to execute such further assurances of said land as may
be requisite.

In testimony whereof, on the day and year first hereinafore written, the said The
Chevy Chase Land Company, of Montgomery County, Maryland, has caused these presents to
be signed with its corporate name by Edward J. Stillwagon, its Vice President, attested
by Herbert Claude, its Secretary, and its corporate seal to be hereunto affixed, and has
hereby constitute and appoint Harold K. Doyle its true and lawful attorney-in-fact
for it and in its name, place and stead to acknowledge these presents as its act and
deed before any person or officer duly authorized to take such acknowledgment, and to
deliver the same as much.

THE CHEVY CHASE LAND COMPANY, OF
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND,
By: Edward J. Stillwagon
Vice-President.

Att. Herbert Claude
Secretary.
said land records in liber T.B. No. 4, folio 450.

Witnesse our hands and seals.

[Signature]

James E. Garrett

Etha H. Walker

State of MARYLAND, Montgomery County, to wit:

I hereby certify that on this 6th day of December A.D. 1906 before the subscriber, a Justice of the Peace of the said State in and for the county aforesaid, personally appeared George H. Walker and Etha H. Walker, his wife, and did each acknowledge the aforesaid deed to be their respective act and deed.

James E. Garrett, J.P.

At the request of George H. Quattle the following deed was recorded February 22nd A.D. 1909 at 9 o'clock A.M. to wit:

THIS DEED, dated this 7th day of February in the year one thousand nine hundred and nine, by and between The Chevy Chase Land Company, of Montgomery County, Maryland (a corporation duly organized under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Maryland, party of the first part, and George H. Quattle, of the State of Maryland, party of the second part:

WITNESSETH, that the said party of the first part, for and in consideration of the sum of seventy two hundred and fifty dollars ($725.00) doth give, grant, and convey unto the said party of the second part, and of the covenants and agreements of the said party of the second part as hereinafter set forth, does hereby grant and convey unto the said party of the second part, in fee simple, the following described land and premises, with the improvements, easements, and appurtenances thereto belonging, situated in the County of Montgomery, State of Maryland, namely:

Part of an unsubdivided tract of land lying West of and immediately adjoining Section Two of the Subdivision made by The Chevy Chase Land Company, of Montgomery County, Maryland, as per plat of said Subdivision recorded in Liber J.A. No. 36, folio 61, of the Land Records of Montgomery County, Maryland, described by notes and bounds, as follows:

BEGINNING for the same on the West line of Cedar Parkway, as said Parkway is shown by the plat of subdivision aforesaid, at the intersection of said West line of said Parkway with a line drawn due east and west fifty (50) feet south of the Eastern line of same street; as said street is shown on the aforesaid plat of the subdivision, and running thence due West one hundred and sixty-five (165.27') feet to the boundary line between the land of The Chevy Chase Land Company, of Montgomery County, Maryland, and the land of The Chevy Chase Club, thence along said boundary line North two degrees, nine minutes (2° 9') West two hundred and fourteen hundredths (200.14') feet, thence due East two hundred and twenty three (223') feet to the Western line of said Parkway; thence southerly along said line of said Parkway two hundred and six and seventy-one hundredths (206.71') feet to the place of beginning, containing thirty eight thousand, one hundred and seventy six and seventy-five hundredths (38176.75) square feet of land, more or less.

To have and to hold the said land and premises, with the improvements, easements and
appurtenances, unto and to the use of the said George H. Combs, his heirs and assigns in fee simple.

In consideration of the execution of this Deed, the said party of the second part, for himself and for his heirs and assigns, hereby covenants and agrees with the party of the first part its successors and assigns (such covenants and agreements to run with the land), as follows, viz:

1. That all houses upon the premises hereby conveyed shall be built and used for residence purposes exclusively, except stables, carriage houses, sheds or other outbuildings, for use in connection with such residences, and that no trade, business, manufacture or sales, or nuisance of any kind shall be carried on or permitted upon said premises.

2. That no structure of any description shall be erected within twenty-five (25) feet of the front line of said premises; and that no stable, carriage house, shed, or outbuilding shall be erected except on the rear of said premises.

In the case of corner lots any and all lines bordering upon a street, avenue, or parkway shall be considered a front line.

3. That no house shall be erected on said premises at a cost less than three thousand (3000) dollars.

4. That any house erected on said premises shall be designed for the occupancy of a single family, and no part of any house or of any structure appurtenant thereto shall be erected or maintained within five (5) feet of the side lines of premises hereby conveyed, nor within (20) feet of the nearest adjacent house.

5. That a violation of any of the aforesaid covenants and agreements may be enjoined and the same enforced at the suit of The Chevy Chase Land Company, of Montgomery County, Maryland, its successors and assigns (assigns including any person deriving title directly or indirectly from said Company) to any lot or square, or part of a lot or square in the Section of the Subdivision of which the land hereby conveyed forms a part.

and the said party hereto or the first part hereby covenants to warrant specially the property hereby conveyed, and to execute such further assurances of said land as may be requisite.

In witness whereof, on the day and year first hereinafter written, the said The Chevy Chase Land Company, of Montgomery County, Maryland, has caused these presents to be signed with its corporate name by Edward J. Stellwagen its Vice-President, attested by Herbert Claus its Secretary, and its corporate seal to be hereunto affixed, and does hereby constitute and appoint Harold R. Doyle its true and lawful attorney in fact, for it and in its name, place and stead to acknowledge these presents as its act and deed before any person or officer duly authorized to take such acknowledgment, and to deliver the same as such.

The Chevy Chase Land Co.
Montgomery Co.
Maryland.

By: Edward J. Stellwagen
Vice President.
At the request of Elizabeth N. Hathaway the following Deed was recorded February 20th A.D. 1909 at 2 o'clock A.M. to wit:

This deed, made this fifteenth day of February in the year one thousand nine hundred and nine, by and between The Chevy Chase Land Company, of Montgomery County, Maryland (a corporation duly organized under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Maryland), party of the first part, and Elizabeth N. Hathaway, of the District of Columbia, party of the second part:

WITNESSETH, that the said party of the first part, for and in consideration of the sum of ten thousand and eighty dollars and 20/100 (20,080.20) dollars to it paid by the said party of the second part, and of the covenants and agreements of the said party of the second part as hereinafter set forth, does hereby grant and convey unto the said party of the second part, in fee simple, the following described land and premises, with the improvements, covenants, and appurtenances, heretofore belonging, certain, in the County of Montgomery, State of Maryland, namely:

Part of an unsubdivided tract of land lying West of and adjoining Section Two, of the subdivision made by The Chevy Chase Land Company, of Montgomery County, Maryland, as per plan of said subdivision recorded in Liber A, No. 36, folio 61, of the Land Records of Montgomery County, Maryland, described by metes and bounds, as follows:

Begun for the same, on the westerly line of Cedar Parkway, as said Parkway is shown on the plat aforesaid, at a point distant sixty and eighteen hundredths (60.18) feet northeasterly from the intersection of said westerly line of Cedar Parkway and the prolongation of the North line of Irving Street, as said Street is shown by the plat of the subdivision aforesaid, said beginning point being the north-east corner of the parcel of land conveyed to the party of the second part by the party of the first part by certain deed bearing date February 13th, 1909, and running thence due West one hundred and forty two and twenty-one hundredths (142.21) feet to the division line between the lands of The Chevy Chase Land Company, of Montgomery County, Maryland, and the land of The Chevy Chase Club; thence along said division line North two hundred and nine minutes, nine tenths (2° 9' 9") West seventy and five hundredths (50.05) feet; thence due East one hundred and fifty and eighty seven hundredths (150.87) feet to the westerly line of said Parkway; thence southerly along said line of said Parkway seventy and twenty three hundredths (70.23) feet to the point of beginning, containing ten thousand, two hundred and forty one (10,241) square feet of land, more or less.

To have and to hold the said land and premises, with the improvements, covenants and appurtenances, and to the use of the said Elizabeth N. Hathaway, her heirs and assigns, in fee simple.

In consideration of the execution of this Deed, the said party of the second part, for herself and for her heirs and assigns, hereby covenants and agrees with the party of the first part, its successors and assigns, that the said party of the second part, shall and will, during the term and for the purpose aforesaid, hold the said land and premises, with the improvements, covenants, and appurtenances, to the use and benefit of the said Elizabeth N. Hathaway, her heirs and assigns, in fee simple.