MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 22200 Clarksburg Road, Clarksburg  Meeting Date: 6/23/2021
Resource: Master Plan Site #13/25  Report Date: 6/16/2021
Cephas Summers House  Public Notice: 6/9/2021
Applicant: Pulte Homes  Tax Credit: Partial
(Randall Rentsfro, Agent)  
Review: HAWP  Staff: Michael Kyne
Case Number: 956436  
Proposal: Demolition and reconstruction of house and outbuilding

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC approve with four (4) conditions the HAWP application.

1. Manufacturer’s specifications must be provided for all proposed windows and doors (including garage doors), with final review and approval delegated to staff. All windows and doors on the main house must be entirely manufactured of wood. The windows shall have true-divided lites on the façade, and exterior muntins on the remaining SDL throughout.

2. Profiles must be provided for the existing and proposed siding of the historic/reconstructed house, with final review and approval delegated to staff. The new siding must be constructed of wood for the main house throughout. Hardi-siding is permitted on the new outbuilding.

3. The proposed Decra Shingle XD (stone-coated steel shingles) roofing is not approved. The roofing of the reconstructed historic house must closely match the existing pressed metal shingles, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

4. Manufacturer’s specifications must be provided for the metal roofing of the proposed new garage, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:

SIGNIFICANCE: Master Plan Site #13/25, Cephas Summers House
STYLE: Greek Revival
DATE: c. 1850-60

Excerpt from Places from the Past:

One of the earliest houses from a Clarksburg area farm, the Cephas Summers House is a Greek Revival influenced house which retains many of its original features. The 3-bay house has a low-sloped, side-gable roof with cornice returns, 6/6 sash windows with wide frieze lintels, and classical porch columns. In 1850, Cephas and Mary Ann Summers acquired the 235-acre farm, which they owned until the early 1890s. The residence, as described in 1968, had eight rooms, including four bedrooms, no bathroom, a dirt floor basement, and was heated by coal stoves. The farmstead includes a frame corncrib and two sheds. The bank barn collapsed in the 1970s.
**BACKGROUND:**

The applicants previously appeared before the Commission for a preliminary consultation regarding rehabilitation of the Cephas Summers House at the May 27, 2020 meeting. The applicants subsequently appeared before the Commission for a preliminary consultation regarding reduction of the environmental setting of the subject property at the October 28, 2020 HPC meeting. The applicants then presented proposals for demolition and reconstruction of the Cephas Summers House at the January 27, 2021 and April 28, 2021 HPC meetings.¹

The applicants’ proposal is associated with a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (Plan Number: 120200050), which was approved by the Planning Board at their December 3, 2020 meeting. The approval included the following conditions, in accordance with the Commission’s recommendations in their letter dated October 29, 2020:

---

¹ Link to May 27, 2020 HPC meeting audio/video transcript: [http://mncppc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?publish_id=1e46bdf6-a0fc-11ea-9e08-0050569183fa](http://mncppc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?publish_id=1e46bdf6-a0fc-11ea-9e08-0050569183fa)
1. The Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) for the new construction of the Historic Cephas Summers House must be approved prior to approval of the Site Plan for the development; and,

2. The building permit for the reconstruction of the Historic Cephas Summers House must be filed prior to acceptance of any land disturbance permits for the new construction approved via the Site Plan.

PROPOSAL:

The applicants propose demolition and reconstruction of the historic Cephas Summers House and construction of a new garage at the subject property.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

In accordance with section 1.5 of the Historic Preservation Commission Rules, Guidelines, and Procedures (Regulation No. 27-97) ("Regulations"), in developing its decision when reviewing a Historic Area Work Permit application for an undertaking at a Master Plan site the Commission uses section 24A-8 of the Montgomery County Code ("Chapter 24A"), the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation ("Standards"), and pertinent guidance in applicable master plans. In this case, the Ten Mile Creek Area Limited Amendment (Amendment) should be used. This is a limited amendment to the 1994 Clarksburg Master Plan and Hyattstown Special Study Area amendment. The pertinent information in these documents, incorporated in their entirety by reference herein, is outlined below.

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.

**Ten Mile Creek Area Limited Amendment (Approved and Adopted July 2014)**

The Land Use and Zoning recommendations for the Pulte and King properties west of I-270 state the following regarding the Cephas Summers House:

The Cephas-Summers House, a locally-designated historic resource, is located on the property proposed for development along Clarksburg Road. The current environmental setting includes the whole property, but could be reduced to approximately five acres as part of the proposed development. The house should be restored and become part of the adjacent development.

The *Amendment* also states that the following should be addressed when implementing the Rural Open Space Design Guidelines as part of the development review process for these properties:

> Size and locate lots to preserve rural views from Clarksburg Road and ensure an environmental setting of five acres for the historic Cephas-Summers house. Include restoration of the Cephas-Summers house in a development plan.

**STAFF DISCUSSION:**

The applicants previously presented a proposal for demolition and reconstruction of the Cephas Summers House and construction of a new garage at the January 27, 2021 and April 28, 2021 HPC meetings. At the April 28, 2021 HPC meeting, the Commission expressed the following regarding the proposal:

- The majority found the revised proposed reconstructed house to be an improvement; however, they indicated that further revisions were required to match the existing details. The following details were specifically mentioned:
  - Eave depths.
  - Chimneys.
  - Window patterns.
  - Front porch columns footers/supports.
  - Corner/trim boards.
  - Arched gable windows.
  - Siding profiles (German lap siding).
  - Roofing materials (pressed metal).
- The majority found that the proposed one-story rear addition (left/south side) should be inset from the rear corner of the reconstructed historic house.
  - One Commissioner specifically stated the inset should be a minimum of 3”, but staff finds that the inset should be a minimum of 6” to adequately preserve the rear corner of the historic house.
- The majority recommended exploring the addition of fenestration to the right/north side of the telescoping addition, where there is currently a blank wall.
• The majority recommended reintroducing the rear/left second floor window to the reconstructed historic house.
• Two Commissioners indicated that they would approve the current proposal without further revisions.
• One Commissioner recommended salvaging existing materials during demolition to ensure that the new materials match in style and dimensions (pressed metal roofing and German lap siding were specifically mentioned).
• One Commissioner stated that the proposed garage needs to be more characteristic of a traditional farm building; however, they also stated that if the currently proposed garage was located entirely behind the house and was minimally visible, it would be approvable.
• One Commissioner supported the proposed demolition but opposed reconstruction. They indicated that they would not vote in favor of any proposal for reconstruction.

The applicants have returned with a HAWP application, which responds to the Commission’s April 28, 2021 comments with the following revisions:

• The details of the proposed reconstructed house have been revised. Specifically:
  o The eave depths have been revised to match the existing.
  o Two (the two on the main/front portion of the historic house) of the three existing chimneys will be rebuilt using the existing bricks.
    ▪ The chimneys will not be functional, as they will only be built above the roof, with structural supports in the attic.
  o All proposed windows have been revised to be 6-over-6 (the previous proposal included a mix of 6-over-6 and 9-over-9 windows, and the head heights have been raised to be consistent with the existing.
  o The applicants confirmed that the existing front porch columns do not have stone footers/supports, so they have not been added to the revised proposal.
  o The corner trim boards have been revised to match the dimensions of the existing.
  o The arched openings in the gables of the main/front portion of the proposed reconstructed house have been revised, going from louvered vents to 4-lite fixed windows to match the existing.
  o In an effort to match the existing siding profile of the historic house, the proposed siding of the reconstructed house has been revised to be Dutch lap fiber cement siding.
  o The applicants propose Decra Shingle XD (stone-coated steel shingles) roofing for the reconstructed historic house in lieu of the previously proposed architectural asphalt shingles.
• The proposed one-story rear addition (left/south side) has been inset 1’ from the rear corner of the reconstructed historic house.
• Two 8-lite casement windows have been added to the right/north side of the telescoping addition, where there was previously a blank wall.
• A false window has been added to the second floor on the rear/left elevation of the reconstructed historic house, recalling the existing window.
  o The applicants have stated that a real window is not practical in this location, as a closet is proposed in this area on the interior.
• The proposed new garage has been relocated to be in the same approximate location as the previously existing garage, and its design has been revised to take more visual cues from rural outbuildings. Specific design changes include:
  o Barn-style doors are proposed in lieu of the previously proposed carriage style doors.
The roof has been revised to include exposed rafter tails.
- Metal roofing (specific type – ribbed, standing seam, 5V crimp, etc. – has not been specified) is proposed in lieu of the previously proposed architectural asphalt shingle roofing.
- The cultured stone veneer has been removed from the foundation.
- Louvered vents have been added to the gables.

Staff is supportive of the revised proposal, finding that it responds appropriately to the Commission’s previous concerns and recommendations. However, staff recommends the following four (4) conditions of approval to ensure that the proposal is consistent with Chapter 24A-8 and the Ten Mile Creek Area Limited Amendment:

1. Manufacturer’s specifications must be provided for all proposed windows and doors (including garage doors), with final review and approval delegated to staff. **All windows and doors on the main house must be entirely manufactured of wood. The windows shall have true-divided lites on the façade, and exterior muntins on the remaining SDL throughout.**

2. Profiles must be provided for the existing and proposed siding of the historic/reconstructed house, with final review and approval delegated to staff. **The new siding must be constructed of wood for the main house throughout. Hardi-siding is permitted on the new outbuilding.**

3. The proposed Decra Shingle XD (stone-coated steel shingles) roofing is not approved. The roofing of the reconstructed historic house must closely match the existing pressed metal shingles, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

4. Manufacturer’s specifications must be provided for the metal roofing of the proposed new garage, with final review and approval delegated to staff.

Staff finds the proposal, as modified by the recommended conditions, to be generally consistent with the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8 (b) (2), having found that the proposal is compatible in character with the resource. Additionally, staff finds that the proposal will enhance the preservation of the resource, in accordance with Chapter 24A-8 (b) (3), as it will result in the reconstruction of a historic building that has been determined to be deteriorated beyond repair and rehabilitation.

The proposal is also generally consistent with the Ten Mile Creek Area Limited Amendment, as it ensures an environmental setting of more than five acres and the restoration/reconstruction of the historic Cephas Summers House.

Finally, The Master Plan for Historic Preservation notes on page 3 that, “Historic preservation provides a sense of continuity in time, of stability and durability, while familiar landmarks instill a loyalty to place and thus a commitment to the community and the County.” While the Cephas-Summers House has greatly deteriorated, staff finds that this reconstruction plan is in the best interest of furthering the wider preservation goal of fixing the history of this farming community in place. The newly reconstructed house and its environmental setting will be prominently placed on its lot adjacent to the new development to the north, and it will be an enduring reminder of the rural legacy of 19th century farmsteads in this area.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Commission **approve the HAWP application with the four (4) conditions specified on page 1** under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b) (2) and (3), having found that the proposal is consistent the purposes of Chapter 24A;
and with the *Ten Mile Creek Area Limited Amendment*;

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.
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT APPLICATION
Application Date: 6/15/2021

Application No: 956436
AP Type: HISTORIC
Customer No: 1356861

Comments
Per Michael Kyne with Historic Preservation this application for new construction is to accompany previous application #937125 for demolition. Both of these applications to be reviewed at the 6/15/21 historic preservation commission meeting.

Affidavit Acknowledgement
The Contractor is the Primary applicant authorized by the property owner
This application does not violate any covenants and deed restrictions

Primary Applicant Information
Address 22200 Clarksburg RD
Boysd, MD 20841
Other contact Rentfro (Primary)
Homeowner David

Historic Area Work Permit Details
Work Type CONST
Scope of Work 22200 Clarksburg Road, Boysd (Master Plan Site #13/25, Cephas Summer House), Pulte Homes for demolition and reconstruction of house and outbuilding.
EXISTING FRONT ELEVATION

James Hardie
Trim - Smooth finish

James Hardie
Colonial Smooth - historic dutch lap

Decra Shingle
XD - Metal Shingle

PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION

Decra Shingle
Brick - Re-use from current home

Anderson - E Series - Wood window w/Alum cladding

Poured concrete wall w/Eldorado - Autumn Leaf stone

Anderson - Wood - Straightline glass panel
EXISTING RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

PROPOSED RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

Decra Shingle
XD - Metal Shingle

Certainteed -
Landmark -
Architectural shingle

36" Vinyl Rail - color match
to exterior trim
Perspective View #2
Anderson Front Entry Door
James Hardie - Board and Batten
James Hardie - Colonial Smooth - Historic Dutch Lap
Anderson Windows
Clopay Coachman
Certainteed Roof Shingles
Foundation Stone

Historic Plaque

“Cephas Summers House
circa 1850-60
This home sits on the original location of
the Cephas Summers House but is not a
historic reconstruction”

Decra Shingle XD - Metal Shingles - Old Hickory
Mr. Casey Anderson  
Chair, Montgomery County Planning Board  
2425 Reedie Drive, 13th Floor  
Wheaton, Maryland 20902  

RE: 22200 Clarksburg Road, Boyds (Master Plan Site #13/25, Cephas Summers House); Reduction of the Environmental Setting Associated with the Pending Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (Plan Number: 120200050)  

Dear Chairman Anderson and Members of the Planning Board:  

On October 28th, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) heard a preliminary consultation regarding the reduction of the environmental setting of 22200 Clarksburg Road, Boyds, a historically designated Master Plan Site known as the Cephas Summers House. The HPC supports a recommendation to the Planning Board that the environmental setting be reduced from 66.42 acres to 10.21 acres as part of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for the property (Plan Number: 120200050). This recommendation was undertaken at the request of the property owner. It includes the following conditions:  

1) The Historic Area Work Permit (IIAWP) for the comprehensive rehabilitation of the Cephas Summers House, including any new construction or additions as required, must be approved by the HPC prior to the Planning Board’s approval of the Site Plan for the first phase of the development; and,  

2) The building permit associated with said IIAWP shall be filed with the Department of Permitting Services prior to the acceptance of any land disturbance permits associated with the new construction approved by the Site Plan.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Marc Elrich
County Executive

Sandra I. Heiler
Chairman

With the stipulated conditions, the proposed reduction of the environmental setting conforms with the intent and purpose of the Ten Mile Creek Area Limited Amendment. Further, the creation of the 10.21-acre lot and subsequent plans to completely rehabilitate the historic Cephas Summers House conforms with the purpose and goals of the Master Plan for Historic Preservation. The HPC makes this recommendation pursuant to its designated Powers and Duties under Chapter 24A-5 (j).

Very Sincerely,

Sandra I. Heiler, Chairman
Historic Preservation Commission

cc. HPC Members