Historic Area Work Permit
5419 Mohican Rd., Bethesda
Standards of Review

• 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.
  • 8(b)(1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or
  • 8(b)(2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archaeological, 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
  • 8(b)(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

• Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
Project Background

• Subject lot is undeveloped within the environmental setting of the R.A. Charles Castle Master Plan Site.

• Because the lot was platted in 1891 and never developed, the applicant may elect to have the zoning requirements reviewed under the 1928 zoning ordinance.

• Applicant has received feedback from the HPC at 4 previous Preliminary Consultations: May 21st, August 14th, September 25th, and December 18th, 2019.
Roof Shingles GAF Timberline
40 year Williamsburg Slate
Trim - James Hardi (white)
Siding James Hardi - HardieShingle
Staggered Edge Panel (Navajo Beige)
Windows Anderson
400 Series Sandtone
Siding James Hardi - HardiePlank
Lapped Select Sawmill (Khaki Brown)
Proposed Garage
Tree Removal & Outstanding Materials

• Staff identified 2 trees that will likely need to be removed. Staff supports removing these trees under 24A-8(b)(2) and (5).

• Dry wells will be installed to address storm water. These are below ground features and are not subject to HPC review and approval.

• No material was submitted for regrading or earth moving on the site. Any proposed grading needs to be submitted for review and approval by the HPC as an amended HAWP.
Staff Findings

• At the prior Preliminary Consultations, the HPC provided guidance and recommendations to reduce the size and mass of the proposal.
  • A section of the roof was eliminated and turned into a virtually flat roof, which does result in a reduction in mass;
  • The width of the house has been reduced from 50’ to 34’
• Typical infill construction requires the new to be subservient to the historic. Staff finds that a house larger than typically allowed can be compatible due to the site’s development history and the long, narrow lot configuration.
Staff Findings

• Staff finds the proposed location is appropriate for infill construction on the site.

• Staff finds that the Contemporary Craftsman design palate is appropriate for infill construction on the site.

• Staff finds the proposed materials (i.e. fiber cement siding, aluminum clad windows, architectural shingles, etc.) are compatible materials for infill construction on the site.

• Staff finds the massing has only seen minimal revisions.
Staff Findings

• Staff finds that many of the design and massing revisions were made without consideration of the impact on the overall construction and have created an incongruous, incompatible architectural design and form.

• Staff finds the proposed house contravenes Standards 2 and 9 of the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and recommends the HPC deny the proposed HAWP under 24A-8(a).
Questions for Staff?