

MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address:	21 Quincy St., Chevy Chase	Meeting Date:	12/21/2022
Resource:	Contributing Resource Chevy Chase Village Historic District	Report Date:	12/14/2022
Applicant:	Andrew and Jennifer Tulumello (Phillip Long, Agent)	Public Notice:	12/7/2022
Review:	HAWP	Tax Credit:	n/a
Case No.:	1014573	Staff:	Dan Bruechert
Proposal:	Alteration to columns on existing house and new addition.		

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the HPC **approve with one (1) condition** the HAWP revision:

1. The design of the proposed columns is appropriate, however, the new columns need to be constructed out of wood. Final drawings showing this condition has been met need to be submitted to Staff for final review and approval.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource to the Chevy Chase Village District
STYLE: Craftsman
DATE: 1916




Figure 1: The subject property is on a double lot mid-block.

BACKGROUND

The HPC approved a HAWP for an addition, swimming pool, and hardscape addition on January 27, 2021.¹ The HPC approved a hardscape and fence revision on October 12, 2022.²

PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to remove the non-historic round porch columns and install square columns.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Chevy Chase Village Historic District several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the historic preservation review guidelines in the approved and adopted amendment for the Chevy Chase Village Historic District (*Guidelines*), *Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A)*, and the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards)*. The pertinent information in these documents is outlined below.

Chevy Chase Village Historic District 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 or 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.

- *Exterior Trim* (such as moldings on doors and windows) on contributing resources should be subject to moderate scrutiny if it is visible from the right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if it is not.
 - *Porches* should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not.
- The *Guidelines* state five basic policies that should be adhered to, including:

¹ The Staff Report for the approved HAWP is available here: <https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/I.Q-21-Quincy-Street-Chevy-Chase.pdf>.

² The Staff Report for the approved HAWP revision is available here: <https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/II.M-21-Quincy-Street-Chevy-Chase-938097-Revised.pdf>.

- Preserving the integrity of the 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.
- Preserving the integrity of contributing structures. Alterations should be designed in such a way that the altered structure still contributes to the district.
- Maintaining the variety of architectural styles and the tradition of architectural excellence.
- 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 a very lenient review. Most changes to the rear of the properties should be approved as a matter of course.

Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8

- (b) The commission shall instruct the director to issue a permit, or issue a permit subject to such conditions as are found to be necessary to ensure 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 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 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 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 existing covered, wrap-around porch is supported by several columns. The existing columns are round with a simple capital; and are constructed out of fiberglass and the project architect suggests that the columns were installed as part of the 1980s rehabilitation and addition project. This occurred before the district was established, so there was no HPC review. Based on the material used, these columns are clearly not historic. The applicant proposes to remove the existing columns and install seventeen (17) fiberglass square columns in their place. Twelve (12) will be installed on the historic portion of the house and the remaining five (5) will be installed on the previously approved, but unbuilt addition.

The applicant argues that extant square pilasters on the front elevation suggest that the original columns on the house were square. Staff does not find that the pilasters alone are sufficient enough evidence to conclude the original columns were square. However, Staff *does* find that the existing columns are not historic and may be removed. The question this report is focused on is, “what is the appropriate replacement?”

The Field Guide to American Houses (McAlester, 1984/2015) identifies square and battered columns as characteristics of Craftsman architecture; especially when they are placed on low masonry piers (such as those found on the subject property). The proportion of the extant piers at this house appears to be too small to support narrow paired columns, so Staff finds a single column to be the most appropriate configuration. Staff finds that either a squared or battered column would be appropriate; and as the subject property retains a historic pilaster, Staff finds that to be a reasonable justification to utilize square columns. As remaining pilasters do appear to date to the period of significance of the house, and it is unlikely, from a design perspective, that the house would have employed a mix of pilasters and rounded columns—the latter being more of a defining characteristic of the Colonial Revival-style, while this house is clearly of the Craftsman style. Staff does not, however, find fiberglass to be an appropriate material for the new columns and recommends the HPC add a condition to the approval of this HAWP that the new columns need to be wood. “Moderate Scrutiny” as defined in the *Design Guidelines* allows for “compatible new materials” in place of original materials, however, Staff does not find fiberglass to be a compatible material due to its physical characteristics; especially when it’s being applied on the original, historic portion of the house. Staff finds the proposal is consistent with the guidance in the *District Guidelines* and 24A-8(b)(2) and (d) and recommends the HPC approve the HAWP revision.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission **approve with one (1) condition** the HAWP application

1. The design of the proposed columns is appropriate, however, the new columns need to be constructed out of wood. Final drawings showing this condition has been met need to be submitted to Staff for final review and approval;

under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b)(1), (2) and (d), 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 that the proposal is compatible with the *Design Guidelines* for the District;

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

and with the general condition that the applicant will obtain all other applicable Montgomery County or local government agency permits. After the issuance of these permits, the applicant must contact this Historic Preservation Office if any changes to the approved plan are made;

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

dan.bruechert@montgomeryplanning.org to schedule a follow-up site visit.



FOR STAFF ONLY:
HAWP# 1014573
DATE ASSIGNED _____

**APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT**
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301.563.3400

APPLICANT:

Name: _____

E-mail: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ Zip: _____

Daytime Phone: _____

Tax Account No.: _____

AGENT/CONTACT (if applicable):

Name: _____

E-mail: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ Zip: _____

Daytime Phone: _____

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.

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:

☐ 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.

Signature of owner or authorized agent

Date

Adjacent and Confronting Properties:

Chevy Chase, MD 20815

25 Quincy Street

19 Quincy Street

26 Quincy Street

24 Quincy Street

10 Quincy Street

Description of Property: Please describe the building and surrounding environment. Include information on significant structures, landscape features, or other significant features of the property:


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



TULUMELLO RESIDENCE
21 QUINCY STREET

SOUTH ELEVATION
 $\frac{1}{8}" = 1'-0"$

WOUTER BOER ARCHITECTS
30 NOV. 2022





TULUMELLO RESIDENCE
21 QUINCY STREET

EAST ELEVATION
 $\frac{1}{8}" = 1'-0"$

WOUTER BOER ARCHITECTS
30 NOV. 2022





TULUMELLO RESIDENCE
21 QUINCY STREET

WEST ELEVATION
 $\frac{1}{8}" = 1'-0"$

WOUTER BOER ARCHITECTS
30 NOV. 2022



WOUTER BOER

30 November 2022

Re: 21 Quincy St. / HAWP Case No. 35/13-20U

To the Commissioners of the Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission,

We have been approved under the HAWP for this house to extend the existing side porch, and add additional columns to match the existing, which we believed to be original fabric. In the process of repairing the stone pier caps beneath the columns, the architect and builder have determined that the existing round porch columns are not original to the house, and were likely replaced as part of the previous 1980's renovation. Two examples of evidence for this determination are:

1. The round columns are not architecturally correct in proportion to the entablature above; they are undersized, with the column neck significantly narrower than the entablature, rather than the same width. (exhibit a)
2. The round columns are fiberglass.

There do remain two square, wood half-columns on the walls of the original house, which we believe to be original (exhibit b). We believe the original porch columns to have been square as well. We seek permission to replace all of the existing round porch columns along the front and side porch with new square columns that are historically in keeping with the existing porch and house trim that remains. This includes (9) columns at the porches, and (8) at the porte-cochère, for a total of (17).

Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely,

Wouter Boer



EXISTING ROUND
COLUMN



EXHIBIT A

EXISTING SQUARE
PILASTER

EXISTING ROUND
COLUMN (NOT ORIGINAL)




EXHIBIT B



DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES

Marc Elrich
County Executive

Mitra Pedoeem
Director

HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT APPLICATION

Application Date: 11/30/2022

Application No: 1014573
AP Type: HISTORIC
Customer No: 1452721

Affidavit Acknowledgement

The Homeowner is the Primary applicant
This application does not violate any covenants and deed restrictions

Primary Applicant Information

Address 21 QUINCY ST
CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815

Homeowner Tumello (Primary)

Othercontact CAS Engineering

Historic Area Work Permit Details

Work Type ALTER

Scope of Work replacement of existing exterior columns