

APPROVED: 10/16/80  
MEETING # 14

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES

October 2, 1980

Present:

Commissioners

Eileen McGuckian  
Mary Ann Kephart  
Mark Papa  
F. Moran McConihe  
Frederick Gutheim  
Tod Butler

Staff

Craig Gerhart  
Mark Walston

Absent:

Bruce Lane  
Bill Thomas  
Bob Fredlund

Others:

Sarah Underwood - H&CD  
Charles Parker - Parker Farm  
Hazel Parker - Parker Farm  
Virginia Parker - Parker Farm  
Malloy Moxley - Friendship  
Ruby Moxley - Friendship  
Gordon Fredine - Wild Acres  
Edith Fredine - Wild Acres  
Wayne Smith - Wild Acres  
Harry Lerch - Wild Acres  
Joseph Blocker - Davis Farm  
Nancy Albrecht - Hopkins/Frey  
Tom Albrecht - Hopkins/Frey  
Mr. Abolt - Waters Gift  
Mrs. Abolt - Waters Gift  
Roy Gauzza - Wild Acres

The meeting was called to order at 8:10 p.m. in the Red Room of the County Office Building. Eileen McGuckian introduced Sarah Underwood, the newly appointed director of the Department of Housing and Community Development, who offered the cooperation and assistance of her agency to the Commission.

The members of the Commission then introduced themselves to the visitors present. Craig Gerhart briefly outlined the intent of the meeting, the process by which the Commission makes recommendations to the Planning Board, and the concept of the Master Plan for Historic Preservation. It was noted that letters had been sent to property owners informing them of the meeting.

The properties on the agenda were discussed in the following order:

### Friendship 10/1

During the slide presentation, Mark Walston questioned the accuracy of the 18th century date of construction given on the MHT Farm, further adding that the House was significant in any event as a 19th century farm house. Ms. Kephart echoed Mark's concern about the date, citing the style of the windows, etc., as being reflective of a later date. Mr. and Mrs. Moxley indicated that they preferred that the site not be placed on the Plan noting their concern about the demands and restrictions placed on the property owner.

Following discussion, Mr. McConihe moved the HPC recommend against placement. Mr. Butler seconded the motion which carried with McConihe, Butler and McGuckian voting yes, Kephart and Gutheim voting no, and Papa abstaining. Due to apparent confusion over the previous motion, McGuckian stepped down from chair and moved reconsideration. Butler offered the second, and the motion to reconsider carried 5-1 with McConihe opposed. McConihe then moved to HPC not recommend placement and Butler seconded the motion. The motion was defeated as McGuckian, Kephart and Gutheim voted no, McConihe and Butler voted yes and Papa abstained. Kephart then moved the HPC recommend placement under criterion 2a. (see attachment) with a second by Mr. Gutheim. The motion was adopted with McGuckian, Kephart and Gutheim supporting, McConihe and Butler opposing and Papa abstaining. 3-2-1

### Wild Acres 30/15

Following a brief presentation by Mark Walston, representatives of the Renewable Natural Resources Foundation (RNR) discussed the development plans for the site while paying particular emphasis on the immediacy of the pending development and RNR's institutional sensitivity to the environment surrounding the estate. The Commission was urged to either not recommend placement or define the environmental setting in such a way as to not delay the development. Mr. Gauzza, a landscape historian, recommended placement citing the significance of the landscape as well as the estate as an example of an early 20th century Montgomery County estate.

Considerable questions and comments were discussed following which Mr. McConihe moved the HPC not recommend placement. Mr. Gutheim provided the second and the motion carried 4-1-1 with McGuckian opposing and Kephart abstaining.

### Waters Gift 15/65

Mark Walston presented slides of the site and recommended against placement noting the magnitude of the alterations to the home. Mr. and Mrs. Abolt inquired about the impact of placement on the owners. Upon learning that the interior was not affected by the ordinance, they did not oppose placement. They further mentioned that the house, in its original condition, was intact beneath the redwood siding and that they might someday consider restoring the exterior by removing the siding.