Address:	11 Hesketh Street, Chevy Chase	Meeting Date:	10/25/2023
Resource:	Contributing Resource Chevy Chase Village Historic District	Report Date:	10/18/2023
Applicant:	Meredith & Gordon Griffin (Adele O'Dowd, Agent)	Public Notice:	10/11/2023
Review:	Historic Area Work Permit	Tax Credit:	n/a
Case Number:	1044886	Staff:	Dan Bruechert
Proposal:	Hardscape Alterations, new fencing, and deck alterations		

MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC approve the HAWP.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:

SIGNIFICANCE:Contributing Resource within the Chevy Chase Village Historic DistrictSTYLE:Colonial RevivalDATE:1908



Figure 1: The subject property is located mid-block in the Chevy Chase Village Historic District.

PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to revise the hardscaping, install a small section of fencing, and replace the deck fencing.

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.

- <u>*Decks*</u> should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-of-way, lenient scrutiny if they are not
- <u>Driveways</u> 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.
- *Fences* should be subject to moderate scrutiny if they are visible from the public right-ofway, lenient scrutiny if they are not.
- *Lot coverage* should be subject to strict scrutiny, in view of the critical importance of preserving the Village's open park-like character.
- The *Guidelines* state five basic policies that should be adhered to, including:
 - 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 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
- (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.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

#2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will 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 proportion, 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 subject property is a two-story Colonial Revival with a stucco exterior and slate roof. All of the work proposed in this HAWP is in the rear yard and includes:

- Removing 62' (sixty-two linear feet) of asphalt driveway and replacing it with lawn and stepping stones;
- Rebuilding the existing fence and gates;
- Removing the existing Trex decking and installing wood decking; and,
- Installing a new bluestone patio.

Staff find the impact of the proposed changes will not have a significant impact on the historic character of the house or surrounding district and recommends the HPC approve the HAWP.

Staff notes the application proposes to remove a magnolia from the rear yard. This tree is narrower than 6" (six inches) d.b.h., and does not require an approved HAWP for its removal.

Driveway Removal

The existing asphalt driveway extends from the street to the garage behind the house. The applicant proposes to remove the section of the driveway beginning approximately 5' (five feet) forward of the front wall plane to the garage. In place of the asphalt, the applicant proposes to install a combination of lawn, large stepping stones, and additional plantings.

Staff finds the existing asphalt in the rear does not contribute to the character of the property or surrounding district and its removal should be approved as a matter of course. The new materials and features are all consistent with gardens and, aside from a proposed tree, will not be at all visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the driveway removal and replacement is appropriate and recommends the HPC approved it under the *Design Guidelines;* 24A-8(b)(1), (2), and (d); and Standard 2.

Existing Fence and Gate

Currently, there is an approximately 4' (four foot) tall wood fence and gate that extends from the sunroom to the east (left) property line. The applicant proposes to remove this fence and gate and install a new cedar fence and gate, 4' (four feet) tall, approximately 7' (seven feet) forward of the existing location. Additionally, the applicant proposes to construct a wood trash enclosure behind the existing fence in matching height, materials, and design.



Figure 2: Proposed fence and gate.

Staff finds the existing fence is not historic and its removal should be approved as a matter of course. The HPC typically limits fences forward of the historic rear wall plane to 48" (forty-eight) inches tall and requires an open picket design to retain the sense of openness found in the district. Staff finds the proposed fence satisfies that requirement and the fence will align with the existing fence installed at 9 Hesketh Street next door. Staff recommends the HPC approve the new fence and gate as consistent with the *Design Guidelines*, 24A-8(b)(2) and (d), and Standards 2, 9, and 10.

Decking Surface

The existing rear deck has a wood structure and is covered in Trex decking. The applicant proposes to remove the existing Trex and install wood decking – the application identified either cedar or ipe. No changes are proposed for the porch structure. The porch is not at all visible from the public right-of-way.

Staff finds the existing Trex is not historic and its removal should be approved as a matter of course. Additionally, Staff finds installing wood decking over the existing deck is appropriate and would have approved this at the Staff-level had it been applied for as a stand-alone HAWP. Staff finds the proposed porch alterations are appropriate under the *Design Guidelines*, 24A-8(b)(2) and (d), and Standard 2.

Gravel and Bluestone Patio

Between the existing rear deck and garage is a rear yard. The applicant proposed to expand an existing rain garden in this location; however, Staff finds this will result in no visual change and a HAWP is not required for this work. A HAWP is required for the proposal to construct a $15' \times 21''$ (fifteen foot by twenty-one foot) bluestone patio sent on a gravel base. Additional gravel is proposed to the south and east of the patio, totalling 570 ft² (five hundred seventy square feet). No trees will be impacted by the proposed patio and gravel.

Staff finds the proposed patio and gravel will not have a significant impact on the chacater of the house and will not be visible from the surrounding district. Staff finds the bluestone is an appropriate material that is consistent with a significant number of contemporary hardscape alterations. The gravel will help with drainage on site and while it is a significant amount, Staff finds it will not detract from the character of the site or historic district. Staff would not, however, support additional paving or gravel in the rear. Staff recommends the HPC approve the patio and gravel under the *Design Guidelines*, 24A-8(b)(1), (2) and (d), and Standards 2, 9, and 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission **approve** the HAWP application; under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b)(1), (2) and (d), and the *Chevy Chase Village Historic District Guidelines*, 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 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 <u>contact the staff person</u> assigned to this application at 301-563-3400 or <u>dan.bruechert@montgomeryplanning.org</u> to schedule a follow-up site visit.

GOMERY			1044886	
	PLICATION FC	N R	IGNED	
	C AREA WORK			
HISTORY	301.563.3400	1351014		
APPLICANT:				
Name:	E-mail:			
Address:	City:		Zip:	
Daytime Phone:	Tax Acc	count No.:		
AGENT/CONTACT (if applicable):				
Name:	E-mail:	E-mail:		
Address:	City:		Zip:	
Daytime Phone:	Contrac	ctor Registration No	D.:	
LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISE	MIHP # of Historic Proper	'ty		
Is the Property Located within an His		rict Name idual Site Name		
Is there an Historic Preservation/Lar	,			
map of the easement, and documen			•	
Are other Planning and/or Hearing E (Conditional Use, Variance, Record P supplemental information.		• •		
Building Number:	Street:			
Town/City:	Nearest Cross Street:			
Lot: Block:	Subdivision:	Parcel:		
TYPE OF WORK PROPOSED: See t for proposed work are submitted	_	-		
be accepted for review. Check all			e/Accessory Structure	
- New Construction	Deck/Porch	Solar	, , ,	
Addition	Fence	Tree remova	al/planting	
Demolition	Hardscape/Landscape	Window/Do		
Grading/Excavation	Roof	Other:		
I hereby certify that I have the auth		• •		
and accurate and that the construct				
agencies and hereby acknowledge a Meredith Griffin	and accept this to be a con		•	

Signature of owner or authorized agent

6

HAWP APPLICATION: MAILING ADDRESSES FOR NOTIFING [Owner, Owner's Agent, Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners]				
Owner's mailing address	Owner's Agent's mailing address			
Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses				
	Gabriella and Colin Goddard 12 Hesketh St Chevy Chase MD 20815			
18 West Irving Street, Chevy Chase MD 20815	14 Hesketh Street, Chevy Chase MD 20815			
20 West Irving Street, Chevy Chase MD 20815	16 Hesketh Street, Chevy Chase MD 20815			
	18 Hesketh Street, Chevy Chase MD 20815			

ſ

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:

Work Item 1:					
Description of Current Condition:	Proposed Work:				
Work Item 2:					
Description of Current Condition:	Proposed Work:				



WORK ITEM 4 Patio Description of Current Condition



Work Proposed

Add Bluestone Patio 15' x 21' Select Bluestone flagstone, set on concrete base Surrounded by 1/S''Delaware River Gravel, 570sf with pervious gravel specification (see plan)

WORK ITEM 5 Renovate Rain Garden Description of Current Condition



EAST REAR YARD

Work Proposed

Renovate rain garden with new plantings and increased depth.

Increased planting for water absorption include 2 trees, many shrubs, perennials and ground cover (see plan).

Existing storm water swale to be renovated as dry stream bed for increased percolation, increased depth by 4% width by 12' for minimum of 25 linear feet.

Increased riverjack and gravel set with naturalistic curves to slow flow.

Renovated existing stream bed to maintain existing path east to west.

ADDITIONAL PAGE GRIFFIN PROJECT

WORKITEM6 Remove M. virginiana Description of Current Condition



WORK ITEM 7 Add Native Perennial Bed Description of Current Condition NO plantings, currently



Work Proposed

Remove small, damaged Magnolia virginiana at corner of garage.

Work Proposed

Add native sun perennial bed 12'x15' near house (see plan)







TREE SURVEY 11 Hesketh St, Chevy Chase, MD 20815



Municipality Letter for Proposed Construction Project

Subject Property:11 Hesketh Street, Chevy Chase, MD 20815Property Owner:Gordon and Meredith GriffinProject Manager/Contractor:Pruning By DesignProposed Work:Fence, Deck, and Landscaping Project

9/13/2023

Rabbiah Sabbakhan, Director Department of Permitting Services of Montgomery County 255 Rockville Pike, 2nd floor Rockville, MD 20850

Dear Mr. Sabbakhan,

This letter is to inform your department that the above homeowner/contractor has notified Chevy Chase Village that he or she plans to apply for both county and municipal permits for the above summarized construction project. Chevy Chase Village will not issue any municipal building permit(s) for this proposed project until Montgomery County has issued all necessary county permits and the applicant has provided Chevy Chase Village with copies of county-approved and stamped plans. We have advised the homeowner/contractor that a permit from Montgomery County does not guarantee a permit from this municipality unless the project complies with all our municipal rules and regulations.

If this homeowner/contractor later applies for an amended county permit, please do not approve that application until you have received a Municipality Letter from us indicating that the homeowner/contractor has notified us of that proposed amendment to the permit.

If you have any questions about this proposed project and the municipal regulation of it by Chevy Chase Village, do not hesitate to have your staff contact my office. The Village Permitting Coordinator can be reached by phone at 301-654-7300 or by e-mail at ccvpermitting@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

Shana R. Davis-Cook Chevy Chase Village Manager

CHEVY CHASE VILLAGE 5906 Connecticut Avenue

Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815 Phone (301) 654-7300 Fax (301) 907-9721

ccv@montgomerycountymd.gov www.chevychasevillagemd.gov

BOARD OF MANAGERS

ELISSA A. LEONARD Chair

ROBERT C. GOODWIN, JR. *Vice Chair* LOU MORSBERGER

LOU MORSBERGER Secretary

LINDA J. WILLARD Assistant Secretary GARY CROCKETT Treasurer

NANCY E. WATTERS Assistant Treasurer

DAVID L. WINSTEAD Board Member

VILLAGE MANAGER Shana R. Davis-Cook

LEGAL COUNSEL SUELLEN M. FERGUSON



GATE DETAIL

NEW FRONT FENCE DETAIL