MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 8012 Westover Road, Bethesda
Meeting Date: 5/26/2021

Resource: Contributing Resource
Report Date: 5/19/2021
(Greenwich Forest Historic District)

Public Notice: 5/12/2021

Applicant: John and Kate Wyckoff
Tax Credit: N/A
(Sharon Washburn, Architect)

Review: HAWP
Staff: Michael Kyne

Case Number: 951770

PROPOSAL: Building addition, construction of new garage, and hardscape alterations

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC approve the HAWP application.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource within the Greenwich Forest Historic District
STYLE: Colonial Revival
DATE: 1941

Fig. 1: Subject property, as indicated by the blue star.
BACKGROUND:

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission at the June 29, 2020 HPC meeting (continued from the June 24, 2020 HPC meeting).¹

PROPOSAL:

The applicants propose a building addition, construction of new garage, and hardscape alterations at the subject property.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Greenwich Forest 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 Greenwich Forest 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.

Greenwich Forest Historic District Guidelines

A. PRINCIPLES

The preservation of the following essential elements of Greenwich Forest is the highest priority in making decisions concerning applications for work permits. These Principles are not meant to stop or create unreasonable obstacles to normal maintenance, reasonable modifications, and the evolving needs of residents.

A1. Greenwich Forest was conceived of, built, and to a great degree preserved as a park-like canopied forest with gentle topographic contours, in which the presence of houses and hardscape are understated relative to the natural setting. The removal of mature trees and the significant alteration of topographic contours on private property, the Greenwich Forest Triangle, and the public right-of-way in Greenwich Forest should be avoided whenever possible. The Greenwich Forest Citizens Association (GFCA) will continue to support the replacement of trees. In order to protect mature trees and the natural setting of Greenwich Forest, and to limit runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, the creation of extensive new impermeable hardscape surfaces should be avoided whenever possible.

A2. The houses in Greenwich Forest create an integrated fabric well-suited to its forest setting. These Guidelines are intended to preserve this environment by ensuring that approved work permits include appropriate safeguards that protect the following three essential elements of this fabric.

   a. An array of revival American architectural styles that, taken together, make a significant statement on the evolution of suburban building styles (see Appendix 2).
   b. The scale and spacing of houses and their placement relative to adjacent houses and the public right-of-way. The original developers made decisions on these three elements to understate the presence of structures relative to the forest. For example, minimum side setbacks at the time were 7′ but placement and spacing produced distances between houses that far exceeded the minimum

14’. Additions and new houses have, in almost all cases, preserved generous space between houses and minimized visual crowding with plantings.

c. High quality building materials and high level of craftsmanship.

B. BALANCING PRESERVATION AND FLEXIBILITY

Greenwich Forest represents a period in the evolution of Montgomery County worthy of preservation, but it has also changed in response to the needs of residents since it was created in the 1930s. These Guidelines seek a reasonable compromise between preservation and the needs of residents in several ways.

B1. Most of the houses in the Greenwich Forest Historic District are designated “contributing” because they contribute to the architectural and historic nature of the district. Contributing structures are shown in the map of the districts. These Guidelines are more specific for contributing structures.

B2. Other houses in the district are designated non-contributing either because (1) they were built more recently than contributing houses with other architectural styles (see Appendix 3) or (2) their original features have been significantly altered by subsequent modifications. Non-contributing structures are shown on the map of the District. The Guidelines provide greater flexibility for owners of non-contributing houses.

B3. These Guidelines reflect the reality that nearly all houses in Greenwich Forest have been modified since their construction. Owners are not expected to return their houses to their original configurations. The modifications they are permitted to make under these Guidelines are based on the current reality in the neighborhood, provided that those modifications are consistent with the Principles in these Guidelines.

B4. Property owners have additional flexibility under these Guidelines to make more extensive changes to the parts of their houses that are less visible from the public rights-of-way in front of their houses. The Guidelines accomplish this by stipulating different levels of review for specific elements on different parts of houses.

The Guidelines that pertain to this project are as follows:

D4. Additions: Additions to contributing and non-contributing houses are allowed. The style of an addition must be compatible and in keeping with the prevailing styles of that house. The style of the addition must be compatible with the style of the original house, unless the owner wishes to change the architectural style of both the house and addition to another style of a contributing house in Greenwich Forest. Additions to contributing houses must preserve as a recognizable entity the outline of the original house (not including subsequent additions). Side additions to contributing houses are allowed, but the limits of the original façade must be demarcated by stepping back the front plane of the addition and by a change in the addition’s roofline. Rear additions to contributing houses are allowed within limitations on height and setbacks (see D5).

D5. Guidelines on dimensions: The total lot coverage of a house may not exceed 25% of the lot area, and accessory buildings may not exceed 5% of the lot area. The area of an accessory building may be increased by 2%, to 7% of total lot coverage, if the lot coverage of the house and the accessory buildings added together does not exceed 30% of lot area.

Additions should try to preserve ample spacing between houses (see Principle 2b). For example, visual crowding between houses could be minimized by placing an addition toward the back of a property, placing an addition on the side of a property with greater distance to the adjacent house (especially when a side lot abuts the rear setback of an adjacent corner house), or by screening additions with plantings.
The total of the two side lot setbacks must be at least 18’, with no less than 7’ on one side. Rear lot setbacks must be at least 25’, though decks no higher than 3’ from the ground may extend to an 11’ setback.

The elevation of the main or predominant ridgeline(s) of a contributing house as viewed from the front may not be increased. To avoid excessive increases in the visual mass of houses, the elevation of any separate ridgelines of an addition to the rear of the house may not be more than 3’ above that of the main ridgeline.

D7. Building materials: Replacement of roofs, siding, and trim with original materials is strongly recommended and is considered maintenance that will not require an application for a work permit. Use of non-original "like materials" such as architectural asphalt shingles requires a work permit to ensure that they match the scale, texture, and detail of the original materials and are consistent with the overall design of the existing house. For example, homeowners wishing to replace slate or tile roofs may use alternative materials that match the scale, texture, and detail of the roof being replaced. If an original slate or tile roof had been replaced with non-original material before July 1, 2011, the homeowner may replace the existing roof in kind or with another material consistent with the architectural style of that house.

D16. Walkways and patios: Reconfiguration and replacement of existing pathways and patios that would not result in a net addition of impermeable hardscape surfaces are considered landscaping and do not require an application for a work permit. The installation of new walkways and patios requires a work permit and should minimize the creation of new impermeable hardscape surfaces (see Principle 1).

D17. Windows, dormers, & doors: Door and window replacements are acceptable, as long as the replacements are compatible with the architectural style of the house. Replacement windows with true or simulated divided lights are acceptable, but removable ('snap-in') muntins are not permitted on front-facing windows of contributing houses. Front-facing dormer additions to third floors are permitted on non-contributing houses and on contributing houses, if such additions do not involve raising the main roof ridge line (as specified in DS) and if the addition is compatible in scale, proportion, and architectural style of the original house.
Fig. 2: Levels of Review Applicable to Contributing Properties from the Greenwich Forest Historic District Guidelines.

According to the Guidelines, the three levels of review are as follows:

Limited scrutiny is the least rigorous level of review. With this level, the scope or criteria used in the review of applications for work permits is more limited and emphasizes the overall structure rather than materials and architectural details. The decision-making body should base its review on maintaining compatibility with the design, texture, scale, spacing and placement of surrounding houses and the impact of the proposed change on the streetscape.

Moderate scrutiny is a higher level of review than limited scrutiny and adds consideration of the preservation of the property to the requirements of limited scrutiny. Alterations should be designed so the altered structure does not detract from the fabric of Greenwich Forest while affording homeowners reasonable flexibility. Use of compatible new materials or materials that replicate the original, rather than original building materials, should be permitted. Planned changes should be compatible with the structure’s existing architectural designs.

Strict scrutiny is the highest level of review. It adds consideration of the integrity and preservation of significant architectural or landscape features and details to the requirements of the limited and moderate scrutiny levels. Changes may be permitted if, after careful review, they do not significantly compromise the original features of the structure or landscape.
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 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

(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.)

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.” Because the property is a Master Plan Site, the Commission’s focus in reviewing the proposal should be the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. 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.

**STAFF DISCUSSION:**

The subject property is c. 1941 Colonial Revival-style Contributing Resource within the Greenwich Forest Historic District. The house has experienced previous alterations, including conversion of the original attached garage at the north side of the house to a family room, replacement of the original windows with vinyl windows, and replacement of the original lap siding and wood trim with vinyl shake siding and vinyl trim.

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission for a preliminary consultation at the June 29, 2020 HPC meeting (continued from the June 24, 2020 HPC meeting). The previous proposal included the following work items:

- Removal of the existing north (right) side attached garage/family room.
  - Construction of a new addition at the north (right) side of the house (two options).
The applicants have returned with the following revisions:

- Option A
  - A one-story addition with forward-sloping shed roof (similar to the existing).
  - As with the existing attached garage/family room, the front footprint projected beyond the front wall plane of the main house.
  - Option A included a centered second floor addition with side gable.
  - The front wall of the second floor addition was coplanar with that of the main house. The front roof slope was also coplanar and connected directly with that of the main house.
  - Materials were to match the existing.
- Option B
  - A one-story addition with front-facing gable.
  - As with the existing attached garage/family room, the front footprint projected beyond the front wall plane of the main house.
  - This option included a small second floor addition with side gable.
  - Unlike Option A, the front wall of the second floor addition was behind that of the main house, and the entire roof was lower than that of the main house.
  - Materials were to match the existing.
- Construction of a covered arbor walkway at the rear of the property (only a narrative and site plan were provided with the previous proposal).
- Construction of new one-story garage at the rear of the property (only a narrative and site plan were provided with the previous proposal).

At the preliminary consultation, the Commission provided the following comments/recommendations:

- The Commission supported the proposal to remove the existing attached garage, as it had previously been significantly altered.
- The Commission preferred a mix of Options A and B for the proposed side addition. Specifically, they preferred the shed roof of Option A, but a step back from the front corner and front roofline, as depicted in Option B. The general consensus was that the step back should be a minimum of 1’.
- The Commission expressed a preference for traditional materials, but the majority found that it would be appropriate to match the existing vinyl materials. The Commission did urge the applicants to explore the use of traditional materials as a way to distinguish the proposed additions from the existing.
- The Commission stated that more information was needed for the proposed covered walkway and garage.

The applicants have returned with the following revisions, in accordance with the Commission’s comments/recommendations:

- As revised, the side addition will have a shed roof and a 1’-4” step back from the front corner and front roofline of the main house.
- The proposed materials for the side addition will match the existing house materials (cedar shake vinyl siding, vinyl windows, architectural asphalt shingles, and stone veneer).
- The applicant has provided details regarding the proposed covered walkway.
  - The walkway will be located behind the house and side addition.
  - The covered walkway will be constructed from a wooden arbor with clear polycarbonate cover applied to the top.
- The applicant has also provided detailed regarding the proposed new garage.
  - The garage will be located behind the house and side addition.
  - The garage will be 21’ deep by 14’ wide.
The garage details (roof pitch, overhangs, rake board, etc.) will match the existing house and proposed side addition details.

The proposed materials will match the existing house and proposed side addition materials (cedar shake vinyl siding, vinyl windows, architectural asphalt shingles, and stone veneer).

Other proposed work includes:

- The extension of the existing driveway by 8’ to the new garage.
- New stone retaining walls and steps to the lawn at the rear of the property.
- Removal of one dying mulberry tree at the rear of the property.

Staff supports the applicants’ proposal, finding it consistent with the Guidelines for additions, dimensions/lot coverage, building materials, and walkways, as outlined on Pages 3 and 4. Additionally, staff finds that the proposal will not remove or alter character-defining features of the subject property, in accordance with Standards #2 and #9. Per Standard #10, the proposed 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 modified by the condition, consistent with the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-(b) 1 and 2, and (d), having found it consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation #2, #9, and #10, and the Greenwich Forest Historic District Guidelines outlined above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-(b) (1), (2), and (d), having found that the proposal, as modified by the condition, is consistent with the Greenwich Forest 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 an electronic set 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: **John & Kate Wyckoff**  E-mail: 
Address: **8012 Westover Road**  City: **Bethesda**  Zip: **20814**
Daytime Phone: **240-426-2473**  Tax Account No.: 

AGENT/CONTACT (if applicable):

Name: **Sharon Washburn, Architect**  E-mail: **sharonwashburneoutlook.com**
Address: **5410 Huntington Parkway**  City: **Bethesda**  Zip: **20814**
Daytime Phone: **301-657-6610**  **301-314-****  Contractor Registration No.: 

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISE: MIHP # of Historic Property **8012 Westover Road**

Is the Property Located within an Historic District? **Yes**  District Name: **Greenwich Forest**
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: **8012**  Street: **Westover Road**

Town/City: **Bethesda**  Nearest Cross Street: **Lambeth Road**

Lot: **B**  Block: **K**  Subdivision: **Greenwich Forest**

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
- [ ] Solar
- [ ] Tree removal/planting
- [ ] Window/Door
- [x] Addition
- [ ] Fence
- [ ] Hardscape/Landscape
- [ ] Other: **Arbor**
- [ ] Demolition
- [ ] Grading/Excavation
- [ ] Roof

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: **Sharon Washburn, FAIA**  Date: **5.5.2021**
## 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>8012 Westover Road</td>
<td>Sharon Washburn, Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
<td>5410 Huntington Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Kate Wyckoff</td>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8020 Lambeth Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael A. &amp; P. C. Hertzberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5510 Lambeth Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Moses &amp; Maura Ashton Connell-Lightfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8017 Hampden Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remy Andre Gericay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8008 Westover Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth &amp; Alexandra Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8021 Hampden Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8021 Hampden Lane, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c/o Hongyu Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5113 Manning Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8013 Westover Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Adrienne Deshmukh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8612 Westover Road is a 1941 2 story stone frame Colonial Revival home (Frederick G. Frost, Architects, N.Y., N.Y. with local architect Robinson Heap of Bethesda). The original house has a one story garage (now a family room) on the north/right side & one story glass enclosed porch on the rear of the house.

The house now has replacement vinyl windows with muntins that match the original pane configurations. Original lap siding was replaced with aluminum & is now covered with premium extra thick vinyl cedar shake siding & white trim that replicates the original trim. Original slate roof is replaced with slate look asphalt shingles.

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

Side Addition to original garage (now family room)
- Rebuild original 1st floor garage on same footprint with same style shed roof to front of house, raising roof by 2'-6" so entire room is usable (was s'ck)
- Extend 1st floor with addition 12'10" to rear, aligning with same setback as existing house.
- Add a 2nd floor addition (13'1"x14'-10") in middle of 1 story portion of work.
- 2nd floor addition is set back 1'-4" from present front facade and roof ridge is 4'-6" lower than main house ridge.
- Existing side yard is maintained; addition is to the rear.
- This proposed work has a preliminary concept review 6.29.2020. These plans reflect the input of the review.
- House style is not changed; original shed roof of 1st fl. garage that projects in front of the main house massing is being replicated in rebuilt structure.
- Exterior building materials & details are to match the present materials/details.

1 Story Gable Roof Garage - New Structure
- New garage is set in rear yard; extending present driveway 8' to new garage.
- Garage gable will match the present house: 7/12 roof pitch.
- Exterior Details, overhangs, rake board, etc. to match those on existing house.
- Exterior materials (cedar shake, vinyl siding, paneled vinyl windows, asphalt, architectural slate look shingles, local stone veneer) will match those on the existing house.

Arbor connecting House to Garage
- Wood arbor with 6x6 posts, 2x10 beams & 2x8 cross "rafters" with traditional decorative cut-edge profile
- Clear polycarbonate covering applied to cross "rafters".
Site Plan

see attached drawing #1 with additions on proposed plat

Applicant: John and Kate Wyckoff
8012 Westover Road, Bethesda, MD
Wyckoff Residence - Street Elevation

5.5.2021
1st floor portion rear elevation ↑
rear elevation main 2 story house, 1st portion to left ↓

8012 Westover Road, Bethesda, MD
Wyckoff Residence

5.5.2021