

**Local Advisory Committee (LAC) for the Old Town College Park Historic District
July 27, 2022
Via Teleconferencing through GoToMeeting**

Committee Members:	Present	Absent
Richard Biffel, Chair	X	
Katharine Bryant	X	
David Dorsch (d. 8:30pm)	X	
Gesine Pryor Azevedo, Co-chair	X	
Mary Marshall Levy (a. 7:06pm)	X	
Michael Meadow	X	
Kacy Rohn	X	
Bob Schnabel	X	
Holly Simmons (a. 7:05pm)	X	
Staff Members:		
Thomas Gross, Acting Planning Supervisor, M-NCPPC	X	
Miriam Bader, Senior Planner, City of College Park		X
Guests:		
John Peter Thompson, Chair, HPC, Prince George’s County	X	
Thomas H. Haller, Attorney	X	
Jack Chin, Quinn Evans Architect	X	
Kate Irwin, Quinn Evans Architect	X	
Mike Vandermeir, Director of Facilities and Construction, Evans Scholarship Foundation	X	
Jay Javors, Evans Scholarship Program Chair	X	

Also Present: Sheryl DeWalt, Contract Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Mr. Biffel, Chairman.

1. The agenda was reviewed. Mr. Dorsch made a motion to accept the agenda. Mr. Schnabel seconded. **Motion carries 7-0-0.**
2. The April 27, 2022, minutes were reviewed. Mr. Dorsch made a motion to accept the minutes. Mr. Schnabel seconded. **Motion carries 9-0-0.**
3. **Pre-application briefing: 4612 College Avenue/7501 Hopkins Avenue – Evans Scholars Foundation**

The briefing was presented by Thomas Haller, land use attorney, on behalf of the Evans Scholars Foundation. The house the foundation has purchased was previously the Pi Delta Gamma Fraternity house. It is a contributing structure, but the existing house is in need of repairs. Based on the presentation design concept, the Evans Scholars Foundation is aware that a variance will be needed for construction of an addition to the house. They have also researched that based on a January 1, 1982, law of Prince Georges County, an exception may be possible for parking and a loading area. This paperwork has already been filed with the City of College Park. Mr. Haller's firm is working on the Historic Area Work Permit application.

Mr. Vandermeir presented the history of the Evans Scholars Foundation. The Foundation has been in existence approximately 90 years. They have over 11,550 college graduates from 21 different universities and colleges. The Evans Scholarship is a full tuition and housing college scholarship for high-achieving golf caddies with limited financial means. To qualify, caddies must meet the requirements of having a strong caddie record, excellent academics (3.5 GPA), demonstrated financial need, and outstanding character. There are 315 new scholars for the upcoming school year. The scholarship house at the University of Maryland would be #18 for the Foundation. There is a 96% graduation record for foundation scholars.

The house at the University of Maryland will be designed to house 45 students in 2- and 3-bedroom units; it is co-ed living. There are plans for a chapter room for 50 people, board room, study room, limited pantry, and bathrooms on each floor. Currently the building is vacant. There are plans to build an addition on the back and the side of the existing building which will fit in the existing lot coverage. The current building will be completely renovated, and the back addition will have a more contemporary look. Roof lines and roof pitches will be respected. Dormers will be added to the existing roof line. The plans call for the attic area to be occupied for program area space. Windows will be replaced, and shutters will be added; all doors will be replaced. The design team is working on an ADA entrance for compliance. For safety and security, there will be one point of entrance to include the ADA entrance. The materials will be simple: Hardie plank – this will be vertical on the addition; metal and glass to allow more natural light.

Questions and comments from the committee:

- a. Why does the capacity of the house have to double? *The current house is in a lot of disrepair. The floors do not align. You cannot access the basement from outside. The renovations will fix and improve these issues.*
- b. If you only did renovations on the inside and not put on an addition, how many people would the house accommodate? *Maybe 30.*
- c. Will there be changing of the grade level to accommodate the extra-large windows? *The grade level changes shown in the renderings and elevation drawings have been removed and will not be shown on future plans.*
- d. The design seems to be very contemporary in nature and is not sensitive to the surrounding neighbors. *The LAC was assured that the guidelines are being followed and interpreted.*

- e. The west elevation (addition) is set back, but visible from Hopkins. There should not be aluminum siding and the horizontal Hardie plank looks awkward. Are there not other long-lasting materials that could be used? *Ms. Irwin stated she would provide options.*
- f. The existing roof is asphalt shingle. *The entire roof will be replaced.*
- g. The new structure will have a height change that does not seem consistent with the neighborhood.
- h. There does not seem to be a need for the window shutters since they are non-working shutters.
- i. The plan shows that the 26' tree is scheduled to be removed. Is the project committed to replanting trees, especially in light of the most recent storm that took many trees throughout College Park? *The goal is to try and maintain the tree, if possible.*
- j. Where will the service area be for dumpsters, etc.? *It will all be encompassed inside the building. There is no kitchen, just a limited pantry.*
- k. The high windows shown on the rear elevation appear awkward. *These windows light the bathrooms in the addition and are high to provide privacy.*
- l. The north elevation seems to have different kinds of materials. Should it not be the same material? *Brick is very hard to match colors; the foundation is willing to revisit the materials.*
- m. Metal is not appropriate for shutters.
- n. There does not seem to be a lot of space of landscaping. *There are no requirements for landscaping.*
- o. There needs to be two means of egress.
- p. There seems to be aesthetic design concerns. The east elevation – plainness of the addition is of concern. The aesthetic is uniform throughout the rest of the fraternity houses. The exterior should be attractive with spacious front lawns.

The foundation thanked the committee for their responses and look forward to presenting updated plans and drawings in the future.

Mr. Meadows made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Pryor Azevedo seconded the motion. **Motion carries 8-0-0.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:40p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Sheryl DeWalt, contract secretary.