

Falkland Apartments Determination of Eligibility Planning Board, 12/6/07

Transcript of Worksession and Vote CLK Transcript: Complete recording available at MontgomeryPlanningBoard.org

Royce Hanson: Thank you. Questions?

John Robinson: The pool and the water features; I'm a little confused. Are they like on actual natural ground or they on top of the parking lot?

Nelson Leenhouts (owner): On top of the parking garage.

Hanson: Could we go back to either an aerial photograph or plan of all three parcels. I think I would really like to get back to the question that is at hand.

Clare Kelly (staff): If you switch to the laptop you have an aerial there.

Allison Bryant: Summarize please, what the decision that we have to make tonight in light of, everything that was said. And again going back to staff, what the impact of the decision would be, because as I understand it, you're asking for all three parcels to be designated as historical. And then you talked about the other options. Would you just repeat that again.

Kelly: Yes. What's before you tonight is a determination of eligibility. So it's not designating anything, it's determining what of the resource that is before you is eligible for designation.

Bryant: If it's eligible for designation it goes on which book? What happens?

Kelly: Excuse me? If you determine that some or all of this resource is eligible for designation, then it would go back to the Historic Preservation Commission as an amendment to the Master Plan for Historic Preservation. The HPC would review that amendment and make a recommendation, it would come to the Planning Board. The Planning Board would review it, make a recommendation that would go to the County Executive, and then the County Council makes the final decision about an amendment to the Master Plan.

Bryant: And that is how long a time period, approximately?

Kelly: Approximately, it could be done in six months. Sometimes it takes up to a year.

Bryant: up to a year. But if in fact that designation is made, that means that, anything that could occur on these parcels will be limited because of the fact that they had that designation, is that correct?

Kelly: Once it's designated, then any development plans would be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Bryant: Then historically, if something is designated, and you're talking about designated because of the historicity of the whole site, nine times out of 10, or maybe 10 times out of 10, that means that in terms of the physical structures, probably nothing will be allowed to happen to the physical structures.

Kelly: That's not true.

Bryant: What would be allowed?

Kelly: Well, there have been sites that have been designated as historic sites that have allowed development. An example is the Bethesda Theatre was a designated historic site and there was development that was constructed. A high-rise was constructed.

Bryant: That was the Bethesda Theatre itself was designated, but if I recall correctly, the land in back of it, where the high-rise was built, was not designated.

Gwen Wright (staff): No, well. Just for clarification, Gwen Wright acting planning director. In that situation there was a parking lot behind the theater, and some of the development occurred on that parking lot. But it also occurred overtop of the designated historic site.

Gene Lynch: Also, the Armory, and the shopping center are examples of sites which have been taken down completely. The shopping center had additional density placed on top of the existing site. So there are examples of it happening.

Wright: Yes I mean I think there is a provision in the historic preservation ordinance that does allow for a balancing and a weighing of historic preservation interests and public interests. And frankly that was the criteria that was used when the HPC voted to approve demolition of the Armory. But I think the most immediate, sort of decision here is you know if you all don't feel the North parcel is eligible, it would allow the project plan that has been discussed, to sort of move forward on an upcoming agenda for you all to discuss that, and evaluate it based on its merits.

Hanson: Seems to me the critical question, for us, is whether the North parcel is eligible. Now the owner's experts argue that it is not. We've had other experts here argue that it is. Is Mr. Rotenstein still here? David, would you come on up, because I'm interested in the thinking of the Historic Preservation Commission when it looked at this situation. And is Dr. Gourney or Dr. Longstreth still here. I think they've gone.

David Rotenstein (HPC): I would like to commend the property owners for bringing in the credible and defensible consultants that they have had testify this evening. I do have some issues however, with the historical argument that they made, and it would have been beneficial to the HPC at the time we heard this case in August, to have this information available to us. But nonetheless, return to the staff report and the testimony provided by professors Gourney and Longstreth, in that they used primary historical documents, written at the time that these parcels were developed by the people who were using the parcels, by the people who were involved in the development. And the testimony that I heard this evening was impressionistic, based solely on their evaluation of the funding of the development projects and on their assessment of the integrity of these resources. What I look for, as an historian, is primary documents showing either that there was some effort to collaborate between the various development efforts, or some effort to take into account what the impact of one or more subsequent development efforts would have on the community. What I see with the Falkland Apartments is a very natural, organic progression; sure it's not a highly organized master plan process we are accustomed to today, but it is a very organic development within a suburban context. Certainly, the first phase was developed with FHA funding and financing, but if you look at the development of...redevelopment projects throughout the country you see these joint venture, publicly intervening entities that provide a stimulus to subsequent development, create a development engine, an incubator. This is precisely what I see in the development of the Falkland Apartments. Certainly, we are not going to see a cookie cutter approach that shows one parcel recapitulating line for line, window for window with the previous development. But we do see a very organic, constrained, perhaps even the word planned could be used, not master planned we are accustomed to, but I do see an organic, cohesive unity in all of the parcels.

Robinson: Mr. Chairman can I pursue that for a moment? First of all, could the staff give me the dates of which each of the parcels; the rough construction period of each parcel. Give me the dates. I want to make sure I have them right.

Kathryn Kuranda (Goodwin Assoc): '36 and '37 for the East parcel. Thirty-nine for the rest of it.

Kelly: We have '36, '37 for the first parcel. '37, '38 for the second two parcels. Again, and we don't have the primary sources in front of us to know exactly when they broke ground, and when those properties open to the public, but those are the dates. They were done basically within a two-year period. [comments by Robinson and Lynch marveling that it only took two years.] You also have in your packet, that was issued tonight, a primary source from a 1937 publication by William Blair who describes both projects in 1937. He describes FHA funding for the project, a connection with the FHA for both phases one and two, and he describes the design of both phases of the project in 1937.

Kuranda: I think the difference is all three parcels had FHA mortgage guarantees. The East parcel was the only one that was completely federally funded. So it's,... I'm not disputing the primary source documentation that was presented earlier. My dispute is with its application on the analysis of this particular project. It applies to the East. The East is the popular image of this property. It is the one that illustrates all of the Garden City elements—low-scale residential buildings, the central interior courtyards, the definition between public and private spaces, the limiting of vehicular access to the interior of the site, as well as minimizing your on-street site parking. The other two parcels are apartment complexes that take fully into consideration the automobile and its impact. The traffic circulation is a major organizing element of the North parcel....

Robinson: If we could pursue that point. Say its '36 when you start the first parcel. Somewhere around about 1938, they bring the second parcel online. In 1936 most people didn't have an automobile. (Kuranda: "Well that's true...") Then in '38 and '39, if I could continue, there's more money around, so to pursue the argument from the other side, wouldn't it be logical, if there was more cars around, that the next stage of the development would be to provide more accommodation of the cars.

Kuranda: You are underscoring my point that there is a distinct difference between the initial development and the other two. The first one is a Garden City design. The other two are focusing on density of units, as well as accommodation to vehicles. Those are your character delineations.

Robinson: I want the other gentleman to speak to that, because there's an issue here you haven't discussed; which is the role of topography here. I don't see much role of topography on the West section, but I see a symmetry in the role of topography between the East section and the North section. (Hanson: um hm) With an accommodation towards the greater prosperity that would have come in '38 and '39 because the United State's economy was beginning to benefit from the situation in Europe. So, why wouldn't it been, and I'd like both sides to speak. Why wouldn't it be natural, consistent with the concept of topography and relative open space for the have in this market and this project to develop more in the direction of being automobile oriented, but still respecting the concept of preserving the trees and topographical alignment, particularly that Dr. Parish spoke to?

Kuranda: I think the difference is between the no build zone and using a traffic court as being your major organizing element of the plan, as opposed to reinforcing a natural landscape to create a domestic...

Hanson: I'm curious of your characterization of the streets and transportation system as being the organizing principle for the North sector. What I see is a reflection on the North side of the East side. In fact the alignment of the central buildings in the central space is a direct reflection of the East parcel on the North.

Rotenstein: Mr. Chairman if I may speak to that. You are absolutely right in that observation and one thing that has been brought out by the staff, and by the other architectural historians who have testified today, is there was no break in the architectural style or in fact the attempt to delineate distinctions between the individual parcels. There are affinities that cross over from the so-called South or East parcel to the North parcel to the West parcel. You can see a continuity of these design affinities in all three of the clusters of buildings, and again the point that you made about the alignment of the buildings is absolutely correct. And the point that Commissioner Robinson made about the automobile. Not having the people here to interview to get their opinions about what influenced their design principles, perhaps it's entirely possible that maybe there was more money floating around, but perhaps that they started to take occupancy of these buildings and realized that they needed to take into the account of the necessity for automobiles. [Lynch: That's right.] But we don't have the people here to interview that point, but we do have is the primary documentation which does in fact link all of these projects together as a unified whole even though it is not a master plan unified whole.

Goodwin: Actually we have more than that; we have the facts. We have the physical dimensions, the physical scale, massing and design of the East vs. the North parcels. And I bring your attention to the aerial photographs that you have in front of you. The East parcel captures the Garden City design principals, its low scale and massing. It faces this wonderful open space that has the woods that everyone has spoken so highly of, and that are to be treasured. And if you look at the aerial photo of the North parcel, you see it's a completely different kind of architectural design that is institutional in scale. And instead of the central, if you will, plaza of wooded feature, that is public open space, you've got parking lots. And if you look at it a little bit further, to the right in

that photo you can see where the large garages were built, half of which have been torn down, and parking expanded later in the history. So you've got the fossils as well.

Lynch: Frankly, I've really got to tell you, though, you are really overstating the case that you are making. You were doing fine up until this point, but I think that's really stretching it. At the end of the day it really comes down to this: Are all three, or only part of one, two, or three of these parcels eligible for designation? That's the question that's before us. And we have some testimony that says they're not. And then we have, and when I read, Barbara, your letter the other night, as usual a very competent job, and I read the attachment that came with it. And I said hum, knowing these buildings, and I know them pretty well, and knowing it was built in phases, is where you lose me because, as someone who has done buildings in phases, you change and adapt to what you hear your customers saying, and I think that's exactly what happened here. In the absence of the opposite evidence to the contrary, I would say that's what happened. So people showed up to rent and said where am I going to put my car. So in a later phase the guy said I'd better figure out where they going to put a car. Be that as it may, we also have evidence from a whole bunch of other people; Longstreth, McGrath, Rodney Little, the National Trust, go on and on and on that say all three of these parcels are eligible for historic preservation. So making a judgment just on the question of eligibility for the Master Plan or the Atlas or what ever the term is that we use, for me, the clear weight of evidence is that all three of these parcels are eligible. Clearly that's the case. But then there's elephants, as people have said. You know, some of my best friends are elephants. And whether out of the three parcels, do the three pieces of it have more or less value. And that is a judgment that could be made. And it might very well be that this goes forward as eligible and it gets designated. But you come and say: yeah but we want to tear this down in order to build this, and here is a list of benefits. That is the balance equation. That is one way it could happen. The other way that it could happen, is by the Council, when it ultimately gets to the Council, or when it comes back to us a second time, making the decision that we believe that on the North parcel, the benefits we could gain from an alternative use of the property, a high-rise development, or what have you, exceeds that. If I had to decide that balance question tonight, which I don't think I do, I think I have to decide the first question tonight, but if I had to decide the second question tonight, frankly, I would decide to keep it as it is. So I would decide against what you want. I don't know what I might decide once I had a more full presentation understanding of that balance question. I might decide something different. You know it has been a long day. We have heard a lot... I, maybe we need to put a motion on the table to bring this to conclusion. Mr. Chairman you tell me if that's not right... I'm prepared to put a motion on the table that declares all three properties eligible, because I think that's the question before us.

Barbara Sears: May I speak to one issue Mr. Lynch. And I know it's been a long night and I don't want to delay you, but really I feel as though that isn't the question that's before you. When we were here back in 2005, with the Atlas, that I really feel that there would have been a different decision on this board if that had been the question, if they knew that two years or three years hence, we'd be sitting here and we'd have that question. Because what we were told in writing and don't worry about it. When you come forward with a development proposal we will make that balance before, before, not after, we initiate a Master Plan amendment. And we know that the Master Plan calls for this. We know that it's always, you know, in recent times called for this. It's in the CBD, it's next to Metro. Don't tell us that we shouldn't at least put a placeholder here, so that we can look at it. And what you're doing, in effect, is saying, let's say they're all eligible, let's not make that balancing which we said, not you, but which the board said we would make. And let's let the HPC do it if it gets in the Master Plan. And that's, I don't think that's a very...

Hanson: Well, we've got a bit of a bouncing ball here.

Lynch: And that's why I said I have to make that choice tonight, based on what I have heard. A lot of people have said this is smart growth. Well, smart growth is not always more density close to transportation. Smart growth also includes the preservation of the fabric of an area, and the Falklands as they are today, is a pretty important part of that. And I understand the provision of affordable housing whether it's MPDU level, whether it's lower than MPDU level, or workforce housing. I have supported high densities near, close to places like Metros. In some cases more densities than what developers have wanted, in front of me in order to achieved or accomplish that. So I understand the two values you're potentially putting on the table. With all due respect to Harris-Teeter that's useful, but there are a lot of places where you could put a Harris-Teeter. But the owner of this property, if you want a balancing test, is saying I'm going to give you affordable housing, and I'm going to give you more housing in total near a Metro stop. Those of the two great things I'm giving you.

Sears: Well I'm also giving you 15 acres of historically designated, um... We are giving you 71 percent of the project for what you want. You're saying it has to be 100 percent, and I don't think that's, with all due respect, a good balance. When we've got all the things we have on the table-- the Purple Line, the Metro, the affordable housing. Just looking at an average of what it would cost to build that...

Hanson: There's a problem here. I guess I'm where Commissioner Lynch is. If you want me to make that decision tonight, I would say keep all three. Partly because where the stage of the decision process here, where we are focused on whether or not these parcels are eligible for designation. You've shown me enough of your development plan to interest me, but from what I saw, there are things about the development plan that I have a good number of questions, just on what you have shown us thus far. We don't have that development plan here, in that sense. It seems to me that the appropriate thing to do is to present that plan in the context of, depending on what the board decides, if the board decides that all three parcels should be designated. Present it in the context of we've got a better use than historic preservation for one parcel.

Sears: You will never see it again. Under law you will not see it again. Because if it gets in the Master Plan, the sole decision of whether or not it can be demolished will be with the HPC. So you will never see it again. You will never be able to make that balance, which we understood you would make tonight. And we asked to have the project plan heard with this decision. And we were asked to please not do that, that you would balance these interests and it would be about whether there would be a Master Plan Amendment initiated. And if so, what part would be initiated. So you will not have that opportunity again. If you want to defer it on the North to hear the project plan, that would be fine, you know as far as we're concerned, but you won't have the opportunity to do what you said again.

Bryant: Now I know that, I can't speak for Mr. Robinson, but Mr. Robinson was there, and I was there and I do recall, and it's part of the record, that essentially one of the reasons that the cupaler [Cupola] was looked upon was agreed to be designated as historical is because that was looked upon as a way of looking at what was designated, and you correct me if I'm wrong, Gwen, because I think this was under your tutelage at the time, and this was when I was trying to learn as much as I could from you. But I remember that being the basis for trying to preserve essentially what was looked upon as being the most historic of the aspects of the whole site, in terms of what definitely defined what was historical about the site. That is as I remember it. Now, I also understood, yes that there would be a coming back at some point, unfortunately, however, you are absolutely correct a different board and there's nothing that I can do about that, but I do remember that. And I'm depending on John to remember that also, from that standpoint.

Robinson: I think since the commissioners asked, I will give an honest answer. I'm not sure that the board at the time, maybe Gwen has a different impression, so I think that all I focused on as a commissioner at the time was putting the property on the Historical Atlas so that we would have greater control. First of all, we could prevent demolition because it's on the Historical Atlas. You would have to come back for a demolition permit and we could have more control, possibly over the ultimate development of the project. I'm not sure at the time whether we focused on the issue of whether there would actually be designation, and I'll explain where I think that ambiguity arose. I think that we were following Canada Dry model, which your firm, Barbara, also quite familiar with. Your colleague did a very good job there. That was going to be put the Canada Dry building or portions of it on the Historical Atlas, and we'll negotiate, we'll come in with a deal, and I think we were following that model, and I think perhaps in retrospect, neither the Board nor the property owner was well served by applying that model here because it seems pretty clear from the testimony here, and the way that this matter has come up from the HPC, this is a zero sum gain. It seems to be all or nothing and so maybe in that sense the analysis, I think it was correct to put it on the Historical Atlas to kind of preserve the status quo until the issue could be looked at more closely. I do not think, perhaps that we as a board, in terms of coming back, I think that characterization is correct by my memory. But I don't think we fully focused on what coming back meant and I think that we were pursuing the Canada Dry analogy or model, and I think that that was a false model since I've seen...

Wright: I can add maybe two pieces of information. One is, actually the Cupola building was designated back in the 1980s. It was the effort of the County Council in the 1980s to find their compromise on this property, because there was a big debate about historic designation in the '80s, about this and the County Council at that time found their compromise to be just designate the Cupola. And then after that, a portion of the property was chopped off, the Draper Triangle portion for the high-rise, and there was discussion about it over the years. When it came back through the Silver Spring Central Business District Survey that was done in the early 2000s,

in response, actually as mitigation for the demolition of the Armory. That's why we did that survey. This was one of several apartment complexes that was mentioned as being important. And another was St. Charles, I think as was mentioned earlier, the one that used to be on Cameron Street. And the board, again at that time my perception was they sort of said well you know this is important, you can't do both, the St. Charles and this, that would be too much, but this one we'll put on the Atlas and we'll talk about it when a development plan comes in. Perhaps in the hopes there would be a development plan that wouldn't completely involve obliterating a whole quadrant. Perhaps in the hopes if there was a development plan that could propose infilling some additional new buildings between the existing buildings or something like that. I had the impression maybe the board was hoping for that kind of a compromise. I think that's turned out to be not the direction it's gone.

Robinson: I think in fairness to the property owner, I should revisit what I said at the time, and why I voted to have it on the Historical Atlas. I think the best thing is for me is to speak from memory rather than being prompted. I think what moved me, is two things. First of all I would like to ask the staff a historical question, before I go further. I think there has always been the division between the Board and the Council. I think we have been pretty consistent as a board over the years, that we think it should be designated, and I think the Council is pretty consistent in saying no.

Sears: That was in error. This board, not you, this Board has voted consistently not to designate it. Eileen McGuckian was absolutely wrong on that.

Robinson: That's an important clarification. I think where I moved, was because, I was looking at the South at the time, then I looked at the North and I looked at the continuity of the stream Valley, and the protected plants, and the fact that clearly between the North and the South is characterized here the symmetry of design. See I thought, so that's what motivated me to move towards putting it on the Historical Atlas, because I see the symmetry of the design and I just have had that reinforced quite frankly tonight and to the extent that there's more automobiles there. I have made my position pretty clear like commissioner Lynch I just think that was a response to the market. If you wanted to say that any of the three parcels was outside that symmetry of design, organizing around a particular bunch of vegetation, some of which is really rather unique at this point, the West parcel would be outside the scope of historicity in terms of the symmetry that I see between the North and South. So that's why I voted the way I did and I'm having a hard time, quite frankly, to speak for myself, moving off that position.

Bryant: I'd like to make a motion, Mr. Chair.

Hanson: We have a motion on the floor.

Bryant: What's the motion?

Lynch: I made a motion that we would adopt the staff report. I believe well reasoned. And you know, I realize you don't own the properties so it doesn't mean a whole for you, but for us. For me, you have to look at the whole CBD. I would much sooner see high-rise development on some other sites. The 16th Street Expressway where you have the 7-11. What a terrible waste of a site, have one-story retail. But all that as it may, the question before us is designate one, two or three. I move we designate as eligible, that's technically what we do, all three.

Cryor: I want to say something if I could. You know I wasn't here before and so tonight's argument I heard in just one way. And the argument was that the North was different from the East and West. And that's of interest, but frankly the thing that links them together, as far as I was concerned, was it had the same architect. It had the same kind of vision that he would have presented. And the changes that the time made him think about are simply part of what one does. And I couldn't help but think that this would be like looking at a family that would have three children. They would not be duplicates of each other unless they were triplets, and you wouldn't say, well this one's.., you would understand as time goes on, the same vision that put this together is the vision that I'm still looking at. And that to me is the link that makes all the rest of this, not getting into... I think you have shown us great treasures tonight that would be available, but the fact is this is one project, one man built it. He built it over a certain amount of time, but not a long time. He built it as you see it. You say to yourself, there is just no getting around, it is one project, like one family. It may not look alike, it wasn't; each one look like the other. It shows, frankly what I think makes it more valuable, the evolution of time is part of it. So I could not imagine not recognizing this as one piece despite the grandeur of what you have talked about and how much

better it would make a lot of people's lives. That's not the question we're facing tonight. I think it's a tough call, but the question is tonight is about the historic value of it all and I don't see it coming any other way, that it was one person, one vision, and in a short amount of time this is what we had.

Hanson: That's a second second.

Bryant: I am going to speak against the motion. I believe that we could achieve a more equitable and, if we were to separate out the North, defer that decision as it relates to the three, vs. the two etc, because I thought there were enough questions asked, enough challenges had occurred on both sides that it still left room for further clarification. But more importantly, I think it would give the staff, without a doubt you've done a whole lot of work, but perhaps give staff even additional opportunity to look at a little more in-depth at the decision made in 2005, in reviewing the record. Because that would help to bring back some of the cells in my brain as well as Mr. Robinson's brain in terms of: why the decision was made as it was made, at that particular period of time. And, although I sort have been, not reassured, but told that it might be a year while we go through this process, the fact that if a vote occurs, and it is a majority vote, it will certainly hamper what can happen in terms of this parcel and what we're trying to do in terms of the redevelopment of that area, from that standpoint. And that's a part of the decision too as far as I'm concerned, and that's looking at the economics of the situation, looking at the housing relationship of the situation, looking at all the benefits that could accrue to us as a result. So in fact, I believe that what's being offered in terms of the benefits supersede the idea of that one parcel remaining as historically preserved, because to take it out does not destroy the entranceway to Silver Spring, by leaving the West and South intact. You still have that. And more importantly if we were to handle the North parcel separately there's nothing that says that we could not have more influence in terms of how it could be tied in to the remaining parcels, so that there is a greater degree of satisfaction on the part of all those who are concerned, also.

Robinson: I would like to ask my question to my staff. I realize it is late. So we vote, the motion goes back to HPC. If they vote to designate it comes back to us. We go through this hearing again with any refinements, whatever refinements...sophistication's that people choose to present. Then it goes to the Council. If they vote to designate, then practically, thereafter lies in the hands of the HPC solely, or are there provisions to undesignate which this Board would also...

Wright: Well we never actually undesignated anything. But we have worked on a number of historically designated properties in Silver Spring and elsewhere which have had to undergo both HPC and Planning Board review, through project plan and site plan. So it's not necessarily true that HPC would have suddenly total control. We have tried to do, frankly I think downtown Silver Spring is the best example, we have tried to do compatible review of project and site plans that involve designated historic sites, so that the HPC review and decision-making is tied in with the planning board review and decision-making. I don't want to portray that it is a situation that is immediately at odds. It is true there would be two different parts of the County Code that would apply to the property and two different decision-making bodies or entities that would have the ability to take votes on a particular project, but it's not that one suddenly supersedes the other.

Robinson: And so to pursue that, only to speak hypothetically just so I understand the law, if it turned out that the majority of the Board or the HPC thought that the focus was principally toward the center of the North parcel, where you have the trees and the stream, and to the right you know...well that's going to be hit by the Purple Line anyway. And maybe to the left, that's just kind of flat and blah, and I'm not saying that's the reality. Let's say that after investigation it's possible that the central features could be preserved and something could be done on the flats. But it wouldn't be at the level of the density that the property owner presents, because they propose to level the whole area.

Wright: Let me just say, I think that is accurate. And if you look at National Park Seminary there's an example. That was a 24 acre complex of buildings, and the HPC did not require absolute preservation and restoration of every stick and every building on that site. There were buildings that were demolished for some of the new construction. There are very historic parts of the building that had to be demolished because of their condition. They're being rebuilt in a substantially similar form, but it is new construction. So you know that does happen through the review process.

Leenhouts: Could I just speak to that? The primary problem is the underground parking issue. When we started out, we did try to save a couple of the existing buildings. We spend a considerable amount of time and money just trying to do that, and we were not able to come up with an economically viable solution.

Hanson: I'm going to, as I've already indicated, support the motion. And I think that there are a couple of things that are important here. One is, this is an important project designed by an important architect as a whole project, certainly in phases. It is a very good example of the design and architecture for suburban apartment complexes. The idea of preserving historically and architecturally important communities, even in dense urban areas may be as important, if not more important, than preserving them somewhere else. The...I can recall very well when Metro was first being built in Montgomery County. The first Master Plan that I had the exquisite joy of working on was for Takoma Park, which was going to get one of the first Metro stations in Maryland. And a private plan had been developed, which would have produced a lot of very dense development, along Carroll Avenue up to the Metro station. We looked at that, and looked at the character of that community and, after a lot of interesting discussion, including musical accompaniment, we ultimately made the decision that protection and preservation of the community was more important than the density that we would achieve in doing so. And I think that turned out to be a good decision. We have an extraordinary number of opportunities throughout Silver Spring to substantially increased density. We may even have some opportunity on this property to make some changes. I wouldn't exclude that, but I think this is a rare case, and a rare opportunity to preserve something of real value, and I am very much persuaded by the testimony that we've received from some imminent architectural historians and, particularly from the National Trust which has gone out of its way and taken an unusual position in its support of this project. And I think we should respect that. I think this is the way to go. Any further discussion on the motion? All those in favor of the motion say aye.

Aye.

Hanson: Nay?

Bryant: Nay.

Hanson: The motion is carried.