

1 THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

- 3 - - - - - X
- 4 HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT - : HPC Case No. 35/155-08A
- 5 7025 MacArthur Boulevard : REVISION 35/155-07A
- 6 : Master Plan Site No. 35/155
- 7 - - - - - X
- 8 PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION - : Takoma Park Historic
- 9 7300 Cedar Avenue : District
- 10 : District
- 11 - - - - - X
- 12 PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION - : Takoma Park Historic
- 13 7017 Poplar Avenue : District
- 14 : District
- 15 - - - - - X

11 A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on  
12 February 27, 2008, commencing at 7:25 p.m., in the MRO  
13 Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland  
14 20910, before:

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

17 Jeff Fuller

18 COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- 19 Timothy Duffy
- 20 David Rotenstein
- 21 Warren Fleming
- 22 Nuray Anahtar
- 23 Leslie Miles
- 24 Caroline Alderson
- 25 Thomas Jester
- Lee Burstyn

ALSO PRESENT:

Joshua Silver  
Clare Kelly, Staff  
Scott Whipple  
Anne Fothergill, Staff

APPEARANCES

<u>STATEMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Dean Brenneman	8
Greg Wiedemann Christine Simpson	20
Thomas Luebke	29
Barbara Sears, Esq. Aaron Gerard, Esq.	45
Nelson Leehouse	47
Kate Coronda Chris Goodwin	52
Mary Reardon	59
Marcy Sickle	67
Jane Bergwin Rand	71
Mary Jacobs	73
David Paris	76
Felicia Eberling	81
Jim Humphrey	84
Wayne Goldstein	87



1           MR. FULLER: Thank you. To start the review of  
2 the work permits, we're going to go through those items that  
3 we believe can be expedited. I'm going to look to see if  
4 there is anybody to speak in opposition to any of the  
5 following cases. Case A at 7121 Sycamore Avenue, Takoma  
6 Park; case C at 16101 Oak Hill Road, Silver Spring; case D  
7 | at 8 Valleyview Avenue, Takoma Park; or case E at 7318  
8 Willow Avenue, Takoma Park.

9           MR. ROTENSTEIN: Mr. Chair, hearing none, I move  
10 that we approve the following Historic Area Work Permits  
11 based on the staff reports. Case number 37/03-08F at 7121  
12 Sycamore Avenue in Takoma Park; case number 15/52-08A at  
13 16101 Oak Hill Road, Silver Spring, with the note that we  
14 generally don't like to approve work permits retroactively;  
15 | case number 37/03-08G at 8 Valleyview Avenue in Takoma  
16 Park; and case number 37/03-08H at 7318 Willow Avenue in  
17 Takoma Park.

18           MR. FULLER: Is there a second?

19           MS. MILES: Second.

20           MR. FULLER: Any discussion? All in favor? Those  
21 pass unanimously. If one of those was your Historic Area  
22 Work Permit, please see staff after our hearing and they'll  
23 direct you on how to proceed. We appreciate your efforts  
24 putting together those applications.

25           So the first item on our agenda this evening we  
26 will hear is case B at 7025 MacArthur Boulevard in Bethesda.

1 Is there a staff report?

2 MS. FOTHERGILL: The applicant isn't here yet, but  
3 should I start with my staff report and expect that he will  
4 arrive any minute? Okay.

5 This is a revision, proposed revision to an  
6 approved Historic Area Work Permit to a master plan site,  
7 the Sycamore Store, which the Commission recommended for  
8 designation on the master plan in 2005, and then it went  
9 through a lengthy special exception review process. And  
10 then in 2007, the HPC approved a Historic Area Work Permit  
11 for a plan to reuse the historic store as professional  
12 offices and with some alterations to it, and the landscape.  
13 And the applicant is now proposing some revisions.

14 I think we're going to put up some slides. The  
15 Sycamore Store was designated for its role in the  
16 development of the Glen Echo Heights area and the Potomac  
17 River resort history. It's located at a historically  
18 important commercial intersection where the end of the  
19 street car line at Sycamore Junction. And it was found to  
20 be an established and familiar visual feature of that area.

21 The applicant is proposing some changes to the  
22 approved HAWP including to change from copper gutters and  
23 down spouts to aluminum, instead of copper roofing, modified  
24 bitumen roofing material on the flat roof sections, and then  
25 the, on the left side, the applicant is proposing to reuse  
26 an original window that the Commission had approved to be

1 removed from the right side in a new window opening on the  
2 first floor, retaining the existing second floor door where  
3 the replacement window had been approved. So that's a  
4 change just to retain the existing conditions. And then  
5 replace the existing first floor door with a wood window.

6 From the rear elevation, the applicant is  
7 proposing to install four skylights on the rear roof slope,  
8 instead of six skylights, which the Commission had approved.

9 The most major change that the applicant is  
10 proposing is that as you can see in this front slide on the  
11 right of this building is a screen porch that was not an  
12 original feature, but was added in the late twenties or the  
13 early 1930's. And in the original application, the  
14 applicant was proposing enclosing that, essentially creating  
15 a sunroom with a lot of glazing.

16 And the proposal now, as you can see in circles 12  
17 through 15, is actually on the front would be three vertical  
18 panels with side lights, and on the right side, which you  
19 can see in circle 14, it would be glazed at the top and then  
20 panels at the bottom, as opposed to almost entirely window  
21 panes.

22 And that's the main concern staff has with this  
23 proposal, which is that in order to recall that porch  
24 feature of this building, you know, I think the Commission's  
25 intent was to have it recall that porch with all the glazing  
26 and creating a sunroom.

1           And so the staff had recommended a condition that  
2 that front elevation have more glazing, and that staff would  
3 work with the applicant on a final design that removed those  
4 three center panels and had some other design solution.

5           The other changes staff finds are, you know, don't  
6 have an adverse impact on this resource and since the  
7 resource was designated more for its role in the community  
8 than for its architectural detailing, staff found they would  
9 not adversely impact it, and were in keeping with the  
10 property.

11           This is the front elevation. This is that left  
12 side. And this is the view from the road. And I thought I  
13 had an aerial, but I guess not. No, I guess not. And the  
14 applicant is not here yet, so -- I believe he's coming. I  
15 don't know if you want to hold discussion until he is here.

16           MR. FULLER: Do we have any other items that we  
17 can talk about? Do you have a way of getting in touch with  
18 the applicant?

19           MS. FOTHERGILL: It's a work phone number in the  
20 application, but you could try it.

21           MS. ALDERSON: I have one question for staff. But  
22 it may require further discussion with the applicant. And  
23 that is whether you discussed the possibility of using  
24 obscure glass in that upper area to allow the daylight but  
25 with the privacy that he's seeking?

26           MS. FOTHERGILL: We didn't, and I think, I think a

1 lot of his concern was noise.

2 MS. ALDERSON: It could be achieved with fabric  
3 curtains, perhaps. So that maybe we could talk about some  
4 alternatives.

5 MS. FOTHERGILL: When he's here.

6 MS. ALDERSON: Yes.

7 MR. FULLER: Question. Are either of the two  
8 preliminaries available that we could talk to? It would be  
9 fairly early.

10 MS. FOTHERGILL: He's here. The applicant is  
11 here. You can come on up, Mr. Brenneman. We actually just  
12 finished the staff report, so you have perfect timing.

13 MR. BRENNEMAN: My apologies for --

14 MS. FOTHERGILL: Push the button and state your  
15 name for the record.

16 MR. FULLER: I guess, actually, we would probably  
17 just more formally ask, does the Commission have any  
18 questions for the staff? Would the applicant like to make a  
19 presentation or --

20 MR. BRENNEMAN: I think staff's report really

21 ~~really~~ covered it. For the record, my name is Dean

22 Brenneman. I'm one of the owners of the property.

23 And about four years ago I began this sojourn to  
24 try and bring this building back, and devised this adaptive  
25 reuse concept for the building; went through designation to  
26 get the building designated history, a lengthy special

1 exception process to get the permission to operate my  
2 architectural offices there. And we're not finally at the  
3 permit process, and we're just fine tuning it and trying to  
4 make it the best that we can.

5           And some of the things that we've looked at here  
6 today are, some of them are code related tunings of it. And  
7 probably most significant is in the screen porch area where  
8 we are enclosing that to make an office, looking to make a  
9 change regarding the fenestration there that provides a  
10 little bit more of a solid wall towards MacArthur Boulevard.

11       The more time we've spent over there, the more time we've  
12 realized just how much traffic there is, and that it's nice  
13 to have a little bit more wall than all glass on that one  
14 facade.

15           And other than that, I can just answer any  
16 questions you may have.

17           MS. ALDERSON: I have just one, and I know that  
18 Anne had talked about that you, as far as I know, probably  
19 the only issue for us is the front porch. Is there a  
20 solution that would create some, provide the transparency,  
21 but also provide sound separation? And what I'd like to  
22 toss out is, have you considered or would you consider the  
23 possibility of say a translucent or etched glass to get  
24 visual privacy and/or the possibility of adding additional  
25 landscaping of an evergreen nature that would provide some  
26 filtering of the noise?

1           MR. BRENNEMAN: The landscaping is difficult  
2 simply because we don't own the property in front of the  
3 building, as you may or my not recall from earlier hearings.  
4 That is all owned by the Corps of Engineers. Our building  
5 is on the front property line. And so there is not too much  
6 we can do further out in the way of landscaping.

7           The idea of translucent glass is certainly a  
8 possibility. I think the preference was to work more with a  
9 more significant articulation of the skin there, given that  
10 this is the part of the building that is trying to, that is  
11 not the original skin. We're putting a new skin on the  
12 roof. I thought there could be, perhaps, a little more  
13 liberty in doing some more contemporary ideas. And so the  
14 idea of having some solid and some void was appealing.

15           If the Commission feels strongly in opposition of  
16 that, we could certainly look at translucent glass. I  
17 wouldn't be opposed to that. It's just not my preference.

18           MS. ALDERSON: So that area, the landscaping, what  
19 you're looking at in this immediately hedge area that you've  
20 got there --

21           MS. FOTHERGILL: Yes.

22           MS. ALDERSON: -- it's a little bit but it's not  
23 much.

24           MR. BRENNEMAN: Yes. I've got that.

25           MS. ALDERSON: But if you were to -- I like the  
26 panelized idea. I think that's a nice articulation for this

1 kind of building. And, you know, thinking that maybe part  
2 of that could remain glass going, you know, across. To me  
3 that reads a little more kind of coherently than having the  
4 side lights, because I've never seen, in a very traditional  
5 arrangement, the vertical panels, the skinny side lights on  
6 the side.

7 MR. BRENNEMAN: Right.

8 MS. ALDERSON: So I tend to think in a building  
9 that is very traditional looking in front, that this is just  
10 going to read simpler. So certainly my preference would be,  
11 if there is a solution that allows for some form of glazing,  
12 obscure or not, and with that barrier for sound either being  
13 behind that obscure glazing or, you know, or some of it --

14 MR. BRENNEMAN: Right.

15 MS. ALDERSON: -- with evergreen shrubs or a  
16 combination, I just think it would be a little more  
17 successful.

18 MR. BRENNEMAN: I have no objection to that, if  
19 that's the sense of the Commission.

20 MR. FULLER: Are there other questions for the  
21 applicant? Should we proceed forward into deliberation?

22 MR. BURSTYN: I would just like to get, I made  
23 this comment before, but commend the applicant and owner for  
24 his efforts to bring back and restore and maintain which I  
25 consider a significant Montgomery County landmark that has  
26 been with us for over 90 years.

1           I was fortunate to meet the gentleman was the  
2 previous owner who actually began working there as a small  
3 boy, grew up in the area, and ended up owning the property;  
4 and that it had been maintained and run for also a small  
5 commercial enterprise or store for so many years.

6           And I just think that you are to be commended that  
7 you've chosen this for your office site, and will maintain  
8 it in a good condition for future generations to enjoy as a  
9 landmark in the lower Montgomery County.

10           MR. BRENNEMAN: Well thank you very much. I very  
11 much approached this from the beginning as a chance to do  
12 with my office what I preach to my clients every day about,  
13 working with the existing fabric of older buildings, rather  
14 than tearing down and building new. And I saw this as a  
15 chance to sort of make a statement about my beliefs as a  
16 historic preservationist.

17           And I have appreciated the support I've had from  
18 all the County agencies throughout this process. Everybody  
19 complains about the bureaucracy in Montgomery County. But  
20 at every hearing that I've had, I've had nothing but support  
21 and graciousness from all the County agencies involved.  
22 I've appreciated that very much.

23           MR. FULLER: Thank you. Let's move into  
24 deliberations. Are there any comments, considerations?

25           MS. MILES: Mr. Brenneman, hi. I wanted to start  
26 by saying, first of all, just to put on the record, that I

1 testified in favor of the use of this property as an  
2 architectural office before the Zoning Commission. So I  
3 want to make that disclosure.

4           And of course, this store is at the bottom of my  
5 street and I see it every day. And Mr. Brenneman is going  
6 to be my, or is already my neighbor, but will be my neighbor  
7 twice over.

8           I have no objections to anything you are proposing  
9 other than the issue with the porch. And I'd like to  
10 essentially make this point. The store was designated for  
11 | it's use and not for its architectural significance,  
12 plainly. And you can see why when you look at it.

13           But I think that it's also important because of  
14 | its location not just at a commercial intersection, but it's  
15 location adjoining the river. And this neighborhood was  
16 originally a neighborhood of bungalows, you know, was a  
17 seasonable community by the river. And many of them were  
18 houses that had sleeping porches that were at the rear of  
19 properties, screen porches. And I would think that this was  
20 really a pretty essential element in this structure. And I  
21 would like to see it continue to read as more of a permeable  
22 feature.

23           It is right across from the river. And the  
24 Sycamore Store sold bait, I understand, long ago. So, you  
25 know, that aspect of it is significant. So I would want to  
26 see it remain much more of a permeable surface than panels.

1 MR. FULLER: Any other questions for the  
2 applicant? Any other deliberations we want to have?

3 MR. DUFFY: I'd just like to agree with  
4 Commissioner Miles. I think for a slightly different reason  
5 it's important for the porch to continue to read as open,  
6 primarily in my view because if it's opaque surfaces, it  
7 changes the sense of the massing of the building, and it  
8 makes it seem larger.

9 MR. FULLER: Could I have a motion?

10 MS. ALDERSON: I'd like to make a motion that we  
11 approve the HAWP as submitted with one requested revision  
12 that would allow for a greater sense of transparency or  
13 translucency in the upper portion of the side porch to  
14 resemble the existing screened porch. And that detail could  
15 be worked out with staff.

16 MR. FULLER: Is there a second?

17 MR. DUFFY: Second.

18 MR. FULLER: Any discussion? I'm a little lost.  
19 Are we, is your motion to approve the HAWP as submitted, or  
20 based on the staff report or the staff recommendation --

21 MS. ALDERSON: I'm sorry, I need to say staff -- I  
22 need to restate that, because yes, it's based on, I'd like,  
23 the motion should be to approve the HAWP based on the staff  
24 recommendation including the recommendation to modify the  
25 porch design to appear more transparent, and with that  
26 detail to be worked out with staff.

1           And again, from all of us, commending you for your  
2 sensitive use of the property.

3           MS. MILES: Can I have a friendly amendment?

4           MS. ALDERSON: Possibly.

5           MS. MILES: I actually would like it to read not  
6 just from the front elevation, which is what is stipulated  
7 in the staff report. I think that even from the side  
8 elevation, which is highly visible coming north on MacArthur  
9 Boulevard, that it should be translucent, transparent to  
10 some degree from both elevations.

11           MS. ALDERSON: Let me modify that to read that  
12 it's to recommend support of the staff recommendation, of  
13 the HAWP as recommended by staff with a modification to the  
14 porch front and side elevations to maintain the general  
15 sense of transparency, and acknowledging that that could  
16 allow for obscure glass.

17           MR. FULLER: Is that motion secondable?

18           MR. DUFFY: Second.

19           MR. FULLER: Any additional discussion? All in  
20 favor? It passes unanimously. Thank you very much.

21           MR. BRENNEMAN: Thank you.

22           MR. FULLER: Appreciate it. Next on our agenda  
23 this evening, we move into preliminary consultations. The  
24 first consultation is at 7300 Cedar Avenue, Takoma Park. Is  
25 there a staff report?

26           MS. FOTHERGILL: There is. This is an outstanding

1 resource in the Takoma Park historic district. It was built  
2 in 1873 and originally as a Queen Anne Victorian four-square  
3 with wrap around porch. But in 1939 extensive remodeling  
4 was done, and it was colonial revivalized. And at that  
5 time, the wrap around porch was altered.

6 And at some point, a three and a half story rear  
7 addition and carport were added. Windows were replaced,  
8 siding was changed, so a lot of alterations happened to the  
9 house. It's not clear what happened in 1939 and what  
10 happened at a different time.

11 In 1991 a two-story sunroom was added on the west  
12 side where there had been an existing porch, an earlier  
13 porch. So those are some clarifications from the staff  
14 report that the architect and the applicant can also further  
15 clarify.

16 But I will show you slides of the house, and then  
17 I think the applicants have a model and can talk in detail  
18 about what they are proposing to do.

19 This is an aerial, and you can see that it is a  
20 corner property, sort of a peninsula, and this is looking at  
21 the left side of the house, and the back. And there you can  
22 see that rear addition. And they are proposing to remove  
23 that piece and construct essentially in the same location a  
24 similar size massing addition in that location. So those  
25 are the arrows.

26 This is circa 1939. And you can see the porch

1 railing which they are proposing to put back on the front of  
2 the house. And this is the existing conditions as you  
3 approach coming down Cedar, the front of the house.

4 And going around, there is, you can see the  
5 carport down below, and then the rear addition. And they  
6 are proposing to remove the rear addition and construct a  
7 new addition in the same general location.

8 As you can see in your staff report, the proposed  
9 addition will have a glazed hyphen or link to the massing.  
10 And you can see that in circle 13. So if you look at circle  
11 13, that is this left side elevation. And so they are  
12 proposing a two-story flat roofed link, and then a taller  
13 massing that would still be lower than the historic house.

14 And the materials for the addition are stucco  
15 foundation, wood windows with simulated divided lights, wood  
16 siding, a slate roof, a metal roof on that link section, and  
17 metal roof on the dormers.

18 They are proposing to remove the carport, and the  
19 block retaining wall along Cedar Avenue. They are  
20 proposing, as I mentioned, to reconstruct the 1939  
21 decorative railing on the front porch. They are proposing  
22 to replace the existing slate roof with a new slate roof,  
23 and they are proposing to remove the cement siding that was  
24 put on three sides of the house and restore the wood siding  
25 underneath.

26 And on the front of the house, they are proposing

1 | to replace the ~~drummer~~dormer windows for code issues for  
2 | egress, and they are replacing them with wood windows with  
3 | true divided lights to match the original windows. They are  
4 | proposing to install storm windows where needed.

5 |           Going around, this is coming up Cedar from the  
6 | other angle, you can see the back of the house. And then  
7 | going around on this side, they are proposing to install a  
8 | -- oh, there will be a wood deck on this side and then in  
9 | the back yard there will be a garden shed with wood siding,  
10 | slate roof, and wood trim, and air conditioning units with  
11 | wood fencing around them, copper gutters and down spouts.

12 |           In the plans, you can see that they are removing  
13 | this section that was built in 1991, but was constructed  
14 | where an existing porch had been. And they will be removing  
15 | that and allowing the original rear left corner of the house  
16 | to read. And then off the new rear addition, there will be  
17 | a side extension that will come out beyond the side plane of  
18 | the house. But it is entirely off the new addition, and not  
19 | off the historic massing. And then the deck is off of that.

20 |           And this is the view from Birch. Is that the  
21 | street? Birch. And so you can see that they will be  
22 | removing that section. The historic massing will read and  
23 | remain prominent, and then the rear addition will be  
24 | essentially in the same location at that existing massing.

25 |           The proposal actually reduces the overall  
26 | footprint of the house, and allows the historic house to

1 remain prominent. And so staff generally supports this  
2 application. It involves a lot of restoration and  
3 rehabilitation to the house, including removing the  
4 artificial siding, restoring the wood siding underneath,  
5 retaining the original windows, removing that rear addition,  
6 and constructing an addition that is lower and sympathetic,  
7 and in keeping with the house.

8           The only point staff mentioned as possible  
9 concerns are the possibility of repairing the existing slate  
10 room rather than holistic replacement, and the idea of this  
11 rear left side bump out that would come out beyond the side  
12 plane of the house, although it would be behind that  
13 existing massing, and behind the historic house. And it is  
14 really the least visible section of this house.

15           And so those were the only minor concerns staff  
16 had. Overall, it allows the historic house to remain  
17 prominent. The materials are appropriate. The design is  
18 sympathetic. And staff finds it in keeping with the Takoma  
19 Park guidelines, and the Secretary of Interior standards.

20           MR. FULLER: Are there questions for staff? If  
21 the applicants would like to introduce themselves and make a  
22 presentation, you have seven minutes, or up to seven  
23 minutes, if you would like. Thank you.

24           MR. WIEDEMANN: My name is Greg Wiedemann. I'm  
25 with Wiedemann Architects in Bethesda, Maryland. My client  
26 is Christine Simpson. Christine's family has resided in

1 this house since 1961, and has chosen to restore this  
2 significant house in Takoma Park.

3           And as Anne described, the house has had two  
4 histories, one when it was originally built as a Queen Anne  
5 Victorian in 1873, and it underwent a substantial renovation  
6 in 1939 which transformed the front of this house to its  
7 present colonial revival appearance.

8           This model depicts the addition and small shed  
9 that we are proposing to add to the house. We are doing  
10 repairs to the entire front of the house, and we are adding  
11 the railing on the top of the porch which had been lost, in  
12 accordance with the photographs that you've seen from the  
13 1939 period.

14           It is this dormer here in the front of the house.  
15 It has some windows that we believe were installed in 1939.  
16 They're not the original windows of the house below. And  
17 they are the ones that will be replaced, basically, in kind,  
18 with the exception of meeting egress requirements. But the  
19 appearance from the outside will be similar.

20           We will be using a true divided light window here  
21 as opposed to the simulated divided light windows which are  
22 being used in the addition.

23           We've had preliminary roofers look at the  
24 condition of the slate, and we are certainly in support of  
25 using as much of the existing slate as possible. We have  
26 been told that the flashing is deteriorating, and it is

1 imperative to remove the slate to properly waterproof this  
2 house. So we are certainly open to reusing the original  
3 slate to the extent that is possible.

4 We plan to replace it with similar slate with  
5 similar detailing. There is some coursing of decorative  
6 slate on the roof, and that will certainly be repeated on  
7 the reinstallation of the slate.

8 As this model depicts, the addition is set back  
9 from Cedar. Cedar Avenue, as you all know, comes, it  
10 approaches this house actually, and then it bends to the  
11 side. And Birch is along here.

12 We have set the addition back along the east side,  
13 removed the carport that's in this vicinity, filled in that  
14 portion so that the natural grade along here is restored.  
15 And we're able to have, develop an entrance in this linking  
16 portion that's depicted here in the model.

17 There is a small bay on this side, and a bay on  
18 this side, on the west side, and a link to an existing  
19 terrace on this side as well.

20 The earlier photograph that you saw was a bay that  
21 bridged between the present addition and overlapped the  
22 existing four square.

23 One of the things that we are doing is restoring  
24 the complete roof profile of the original house by  
25 introducing the lower linking roof. And also setting that  
26 link back from the line of the historic house. So again,

1 respecting the massing of the original four square and  
2 creating a station between new and old. I'm open to  
3 questions.

4 MR. FULLER: Thank you very much. I appreciate  
5 that. Are there questions for the applicant?

6 MS. ALDERSON: I don't have a question, just the  
7 briefest comment, because I pass this house all the time.  
8 It's a real neighborhood landmark. And interestingly, as  
9 altered as it is, that colonial treatment made for a very  
10 strong formal front in the way the roads ended up being  
11 curved out. And I, it's an impeccably sensitive design to  
12 both the site and to the character of the house.

13 And I really commend your thinking 360 degrees  
14 about the way the roof reads. And that is one of the things  
15 that had been lost was the strong reading of the roof. And  
16 right now you see the front and then you kind of don't  
17 notice anything else. And this will make it more integrated  
18 all the way around the house, and make it a stronger house  
19 on the site. And at the same time, I don't see anything  
20 that takes anything away from the front.

21 It's terrific that you are restoring that railing.  
22 That's going to add a lot. And I think the treating of the  
23 second masses, is just a splendid and very sensitive idea,  
24 and that they are subordinate, and that the detailing is  
25 going to just tie the house together very nicely, and the  
26 effort you've made to kind of peel off changes that maybe

1 could be improved. So it's just a lot of work and a lot of  
2 investment, and the neighborhood is going to enjoy it.

3 MR. WIEDEMANN: Thank you so much.

4 MR. FLEMING: Yes, your parking, can you explain  
5 again what you are going to do about removing the parking,  
6 and once you remove it, where were you planning on parking?

7 MR. WIEDEMANN: Uh-huh. What may not be quite as  
8 evident in this model is that the driveway entrance is here.  
9 This is a brick paved driveway that they are actually  
10 building the shed along the edge of.

11 So the clients actually use this driveway for  
12 parking. There is a carport here, but it's not used for  
13 parking. It's used as storage. So that the parking will  
14 remain off site and on this part of the driveway.

15 MR. FULLER: Are there other questions for the  
16 applicant? Let's see, why don't we quickly run down the row  
17 and just, I think the only questions I've heard staff bring  
18 up are the issue of the bump out on the left side of the  
19 house, and the slate roof. And I think the applicant has  
20 spoken to the slate roof. Lee, why don't we start with you?  
21 Do you have any questions or comments?

22 MR. BURSTYN: I have no questions. I think it's a  
23 marvelous project, and I wish you well.

24 MR. WIEDEMANN: Thank you.

25 MS. MILES: I have no questions. I think it's a  
26 marvelous project, and I wish you well.

1 MS. ANAHTAR: I agree.

2 MR. DUFFY: I understand what staff is saying in  
3 their staff discussion section of their report about the  
4 bump out on the one side. However, I think that the nature  
5 of the site, with the streets forming a V in front of it,  
6 usually that logic about not havinge a bump applies to a  
7 property, a house that is perpendicular to a road, or  
8 parallel to a road, rather.

9 This is a unique condition, and I don't have an  
10 issue with it. I think that it's a wonderful house, it's a  
11 wonderful property. I think what you've done and-is done so  
12 well that it's commendable. And I think that one issue  
13 would usually be an issue, but because of the nature of the  
14 site, I'm okay with it in this case.

15 MR. ROTENSTEIN: I'll add my commendations to your  
16 well-conceived and outstanding property. I don't have any  
17 issues with the bump out. I think Commissioner Duffy stated  
18 it fairly well. This is ready to come back as a HAWP. And  
19 I think this is an outstanding example of how to approach an  
20 extensive project with an outstanding resource. You've done  
21 an outstanding job.

22 MR. FLEMING: No comment.

23 MS. ALDERSON: I have no problem with the bump out  
24 either.

25 MR. FULLER: That would, from my perspective,  
26 after the other Commissioners, I think this, you know, it's

1 actually a fairly large addition, but I think you've handled  
2 it incredibly well. I really like the execution on it. And  
3 I don't have a problem with the bump out.

4 Speaking from what I've heard from the Commission,  
5 I think you can resubmit your drawings as HAWP, and move  
6 forward from there. Thank you.

7 MR. WIEDEMANN: Thank you very much.

8 MR. FULLER: Next on our agenda this evening is  
9 7017 Poplar Avenue, also Takoma Park. Is there a staff  
10 report?

11 MS. FOTHERGILL: There is. This is a contributing  
12 resource in the Takoma Park historic district, and you all  
13 will recall that the applicants came to the Commission for  
14 their first preliminary consultation on January 23rd, so  
15 just a month ago. And they are proposing a bigger addition  
16 and some alterations to the house.

17 And at the first preliminary consultation, the  
18 Commission generally supported the rear addition massing,  
19 but they, at that time, the plan showed the new roof line  
20 being higher than the roof on the historic massing, and the  
21 Commission did not support that.

22 The applicant is proposing some changes to the  
23 existing side greenhouse, the 1960's greenhouse on the right  
24 side of the house, and the Commission didn't support the  
25 change in that massing. It was changing shape and getting  
26 larger, and it had a second story bay window coming off the

1 right side of the historic house. And the Commission didn't  
2 support that. And there was some discussion about  
3 materials, and the Commission supported removing the vinyl  
4 siding on the house.

5           These are aerial photos. The applicant's house is  
6 this one. And then this one, this one, I show this aerial  
7 so that you will get a sense of how far back these few  
8 houses are and the rest of the block, as you can see, on the  
9 right side of your screen. That's the general pattern along  
10 Poplar, and that these few houses are set much further back.

11           And this, you get a good sense of that roof form  
12 that the applicants are proposing to change on that, that  
13 1920's massing. And then this is the front.

14           And as you will see in your current plans, the  
15 applicant has responded to most of the Commission's  
16 concerns. The proposed roof line of the addition is now  
17 lower. And the applicants are now proposing to remove the  
18 vinyl siding, and the vinyl windows are return to wood. So  
19 both of those are great improvements from the first  
20 submission.

21           The one thing that staff would ask the Commission  
22 to consider and discuss with the applicant is whether in  
23 replacing the replacement windows, the applicant would be  
24 required to replace them with true divided light windows or  
25 if they would be allowed to use simulated divided light  
26 windows, since they are not replacing original windows.

1 That's in the historic massing. In the addition, the  
2 Commission generally supports simulated divided light wood  
3 windows.

4 The only outstanding issue that the Commission  
5 discussed with the applicants that is still in this  
6 submission is the bay window on the first floor. And you  
7 can see in circle 10, what they are proposing now, and in  
8 circle 11 what they were first proposing. And it has gotten  
9 simpler, and it's not octagonal in shape anymore, and it is  
10 smaller.

11 But there is still this bay window projection off  
12 the first floor of the historic house. And that's something  
13 that the Commission will need to give clear direction on  
14 tonight.

15 Otherwise, the applicant has made most of the  
16 changes that the Commission discussed at the last meeting,  
17 and this is a contributing resource and the Takoma Park  
18 guidelines, you know, state that they be reported for their  
19 report.

20 While the character of the district, rather than  
21 for particular architectural features, and that, you know,  
22 the review should mainly be what's visible from the street.  
23 So this is a rare addition, and staff finds that the rear  
24 addition meets the Takoma Park guidelines.

25 And I will just run through the slides so you can  
26 familiarize yourself with the house. But I know the

1 applicant has a model and has put a lot of thought into  
2 this. So this is that existing 1960's greenhouse. And  
3 there is the 1920's addition that the roof form will be  
4 changing. And the site of the rear addition. And the house  
5 from the street.

6 MR. FULLER: Are there questions for staff?

7 MS. MILES: Looking at this oblique angle, Anne,  
8 you can see, I believe, where that first floor bay window  
9 would appear. So your comment about the visibility from  
10 the road, this would indeed be visible from the road,  
11 correct?

12 MS. FOTHERGILL: Yes, this would be visible, which  
13 is why it's still an item of concern.

14 MS. MILES: Very good. Thank you.

15 MR. FULLER: Good evening. If you'd like to  
16 introduce yourself. As applicants, you have seven minutes,  
17 and we appreciate you coming back.

18 MR. LUEBKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members  
19 of the Commission. It's good to be back here again. And I  
20 thank you very much for your comments from last time, which  
21 were pretty useful in my own redesigning of this. And I've  
22 tried to address the comments that were made.

23 I think that Anne has summarized pretty well what  
24 the issues were. I can walk you through some of the  
25 specific things. I'll hit on the basic ones.

26 I think the biggest issue in terms of the whole

1 design was that there was some concern about the height of  
2 the addition being a little bit taller than the original.  
3 As you may recall, you did support the rear orientation of  
4 this roof to be lower here on the side, so that it would  
5 read as more subordinate to the original 1908 structure.

6 I finally, I worked out, I thing which, a couple  
7 of things working together that was to try to simplify all  
8 these things, rethinking exactly how this rear addition roof  
9 hit the original building. I combined this whole plane into  
10 a single line, as opposed to an in and out jog, and created  
11 a single slope from this roof down.

12 This is still slightly offset, but what it means  
13 is that this whole thing can come down a little bit, which I  
14 think was the concern, as well as now it just seems like a  
15 cleaner, simpler solution to the form of the roof while  
16 still letting the reading of that historic gable at the rear  
17 of the 1908 part of the structure to remain.

18 And so I think there was some concern about a lot  
19 of shapes at the addition and I tried to really clean that  
20 up, understanding that, you know, I still am using chamfered  
21 corner here, because of configuration of the lot and the  
22 turning radius required to get into the driveway.

23 This whole roof in the rear has been combined into  
24 a single volume with this little sort of, it's basically a  
25 window seat in the breakfast room, and I think that's, in my  
26 opinion, better. I hope you agree.

1           The one issue that the staff has also raised is,  
2 you know, it goes back to this greenhouse bump out issue at  
3 the side. And you know, I, you know, have tried to respond,  
4 looking for bringing more light into that room and getting a  
5 bit of a focus and have minimized what was proposed last  
6 time to just basically bringing the same character of window  
7 that was there before, doubling it. It's actually only  
8 coming forward about 21-22 inches. And I can pass, it may  
9 be useful if I pass this --

10           MS. FOTHERGILL: Maybe just the overall showing  
11 the relationship. Would that be useful?

12           MR. LUEBKE: If it's useful, I can send this  
13 around, but you may -- so, Mr. Chairman, those were my  
14 comments and I can certainly answer any questions you may  
15 have.

16           MR. FULLER: Are there questions for the  
17 applicant?

18           MS. MILES: Hi. Would you consider, since your  
19 concern was getting in more light, did you consider doubling  
20 the window without making it into a bay? And if you did,  
21 why did you reject that solution?

22           MR. LUEBKE: I would like to -- it's a design  
23 feature. I'd like to incorporate the greenhouse and make it  
24 more of an element itself. I would like to have the space  
25 inside the room for plants, and create sort of a  
26 conservatory kind of, you know, place. It's driven somewhat

1 by programming in the second, in the main level of the  
2 house. So that was the concern or the desire.

3 MS. MILES: Thank you.

4 MR. FULLER: Other questions for the applicant?  
5 You're being quiet tonight.

6 MR. DUFFY: Could we see the photograph from the  
7 street again?

8 MS. FOTHERGILL: Yes. Do you want this one or  
9 another one?

10 MR. DUFFY: That one.

11 MR. FULLER: If there a question? Why don't we  
12 proceed forward with comments, then, and try to -- from what  
13 I've heard, the items that staff has brought up, do we want  
14 to talk about the nature of the windows on the main massing  
15 of the house, the configuration of the greenhouse, the bay  
16 window.

17 And I think we've talked previously and I think  
18 | most of the concern~~s~~ is as it relates to the size and sort  
19 of overall massing of the other parts of the addition, I  
20 think are probably, I've not heard anything come back up,  
21 but let's at least address it as we go down the line.  
22 Caroline, do you want to start?

23 MS. ALDERSON: Yes. I think the roof modification  
24 works, and no issues with the massing. On the greenhouse,  
25 this is an odd way of relating to the issues of what's  
26 existing, what's original versus kind of what works with the

1 house.

2           And my sort of gut common sense is that actually  
3 the modification is a little more integral when the existing  
4 greenhouse is, because it does so much look like it's been  
5 pasted on. And so to me, it's made a little more modest in  
6 your revision, a little less of a statement.

7           Yes, it is a change. We don't normally encourage  
8 bump outs, but I think I'm actually more comfortable with  
9 the way you've modified it than the way it reads now. And  
10 to slightly integrate it as kind of a small conservatory, I  
11 am okay with that.

12           MR. FULLER: Caroline, you didn't comment on the  
13 divided lights on the main massing.

14           MS. ALDERSON: Either one is acceptable to me.

15           MR. FLEMING: When you came before, my only  
16 concern was the roof line, and it appears to me that you  
17 have made those adjustments, so I'm okay with everything.

18           MR. ROTENSTEIN: I'm okay with simulated divided  
19 light or a true divided light in the original massing. It  
20 doesn't really matter to me either way.

21           The rear addition looks good. Your modifications  
22 to the greenhouse conservatory look good, too. I still  
23 remain concerned, though, with the addition of that bay on  
24 the side, and the photo we're looking at, illustrating the  
25 property from the street, I think demonstrates very well  
26 that it is going to be visible and therefore contradictory

1 to the guidelines.

2           Even though this is a contributing resource,  
3 you're going to be affecting the view from the street, and  
4 therefore the streetscape, so I would urge you to maybe  
5 consider doubling up the window there and abandoning the  
6 bay.

7           MR. DUFFY: I'm okay with everything with the  
8 exception of the greenhouse window. It is much improved  
9 over the previous version, and I'm almost 50/50 about it.  
10 And I agree with Commissioner Alderson that it integrates  
11 that existing greenhouse better. However, it will be quite  
12 visible from the street and it is a significant change from  
13 the street. So it's not as strong as usual, ~~but~~ and I'm  
14 okay with everything else, ~~-~~ but I don't think that that  
15 greenhouse should be at that level.

16           MR. FULLER: I think most people are talking the  
17 greenhouse at the lower level. Are you talking about the  
18 bay window?

19           MR. DUFFY: I'm talking about the bay window, yes.

20           MS. ANAHTAR: Yes, last time my only concern was  
21 the greenhouse, too, and it still is. I would like to see  
22 it, a two-story bay window, more than what it is right now,  
23 rather than what it is right now. I don't like the larger  
24 first floor greenhouse with the bay window on top of it. I  
25 would rather see a smaller footprint on the lower side  
26 level, and then have it continuous two-story maybe. But

1 same size on the both floors.

2 MS. MILES: I have no objections or issues with  
3 anything else. I think you've done a good job of addressing  
4 all of our concerns, except for the bay window and  
5 greenhouse issue. It certainly is better rectangular,  
6 rather than octagonal. But I think it's going to be a very  
7 significant feature viewed from the street, and I would  
8 subscribe to Commissioner Rotenstein's comments and urge you  
9 to double up the window to introduce more light into the  
10 space.

11 MR. BURSTYN: What I was just thinking is that I  
12 hope we're not being swayed too much by the growth of the  
13 bushes that from the streetscape covers up the greenhouse.  
14 You can't really see it. But the bushes could be taken out  
15 or they could die and then you would see the greenhouse.

16 So to me it seems like something on that side  
17 would actually be a little bit of a balancing effect, as  
18 long as it doesn't stick out too much and is over-balanced.  
19 And I think we should give a lot of weight to the guidelines  
20 and that it is a contributing resource.

21 And I think we need to always be reminded that  
22 certain properties are given much more strict scrutiny than  
23 others, and in this case, that something be allowed to go  
24 there. I can't say what, but you can work that part out.  
25 But I don't have any problem with something being there.

26 MR. FULLER: Personally speaking, on the divided

1 lights, I would prefer to see true divided lights in the  
2 main massing. I think that's consistent with our other  
3 decisions. I don't have any problem with the size of the  
4 addition at this point, as I've said in the past.

5 |           The greenhouse in its simpler ~~recti~~e-linear form,  
6 I think is preferable than the original more complex form.  
7 And personally, I'd prefer to see the bay window pushed back  
8 to being essentially a double window. But as Mr. Burstyn  
9 was indicating, on a contributing resource, we are supposed  
10 to be viewing what we can see from the street. But it's not  
11 that we can't prohibit changes from there. So I think I  
12 could be swayed to still seeing some kind of a minor push  
13 out.

14 |           So that being ~~sidesaid~~aid, as I count the votes,  
15 going with the simulated divided light, it seems to be  
16 acceptable to the majority that spoke on the item. The size  
17 of the addition, I think you heard unanimously everybody was  
18 okay with. The greenhouse, I think I heard the majority  
19 | saying that they were okay with the simpler ~~recti~~e-linear  
20 configuration that you're now at, and on the bay window, it  
21 looked like that's still the toss up that's close to 50/50  
22 at the present time.

23           MS. ALDERSON: Might I just offer, because it  
24 seems like it is either two ways that might be the  
25 acceptable solution, but is still an alternation, but there  
26 seems to be some consensus that a solution that is integral

1 with the house would be more successful, which might lean  
2 either toward a greenhouse that does not have a stacked  
3 effect, but is simply, you know, a structure in and of  
4 itself that is one shape, or toward a bay window that is  
5 integral that does not project out so much.

6 I think part of the problem is you're trying to be  
7 two things, when it might be easier if it were only one  
8 thing, either a bay or a greenhouse that's more integral or  
9 more like a conservatory.

10 MR. LUEBKE: So, excuse me, is it all right for me  
11 to respond? I'm stuck here because I'm not understanding.  
12 Should -- on the one hand, I seem to be hearing, maybe it's  
13 best to extrude the plan of the existing greenhouse all the  
14 way up, or push it all the way back and do two windows. I'm  
15 talking about a fairly minor projection. It's only, I mean,  
16 it's less than two feet. I'm talking about this much space.  
17 So I'm trying to work -- I'm not sure which way this goes.  
18 Is there a --

19 MR. FULLER: I think I only heard Commission  
20 Anahtar suggest that it be a two-story larger greenhouse. I  
21 don't think I heard too much other support for something  
22 getting larger.

23 There seemed to be a lot of back and forth as it  
24 related to whether there was some opportunity that if you  
25 integrated the two together, somewhat as you've now done,  
26 between up and down, that actually may be more successful

1 than two separate elements. But at the same time, if they  
2 were simpler, above, that might work better. As I said, I  
3 don't think you're getting complete consensus on that item.

4 MS. ANAHTAR: Yes, I think two stories greenhouse  
5 will look better because you have the fake gable there, I  
6 mean, it's original roof, I think over the eave that we are  
7 seeing, but it's not, it doesn't have -- here, you know, we  
8 see this line in your model.

9 MR. LUEBKE: Yes.

10 MS. ANAHTAR: And in reality, it doesn't exist.  
11 It's on the same plane. So either a two-story bay,  
12 greenhouse, whatever you call it, a bay window, would go  
13 with that and complete this look. And it won't look as odd  
14 as it is right now.

15 MS. ALDERSON: Yes, what I heard was, was to go  
16 for either depth or height, not both. And to go for one  
17 uniform depth. So Nuray's suggestion was, if you wanted to  
18 pursue a two-story bay, you should bring the whole thing  
19 closer to the house, not have it project so far, and the bay  
20 would not project so far. If you wanted to pursue a  
21 conservatory, then you would eliminate the second story  
22 element. Right?

23 MR. LUEBKE: It does make sense.

24 MS. ALDERSON: It would look like a more, a  
25 simpler, more integrated structure, I think.

26 MR. LUEBKE: So you, the guidance then would be to

1 either omit it, come back with another revised massing that  
2 either does either of those things that you've described, or  
3 possibly, I would, you know, have doubled the window, but  
4 not the relatively simple thing which I've proposed. Is  
5 that what I'm --

6 MR. FULLER: I think I heard that if you were  
7 coming back with the greenhouse as it's currently shown, and  
8 either a single window above it that currently exists, or a  
9 double window that's stating the plane of the house, that  
10 would be approveable. But that wasn't consistent with what  
11 your program is, which said you wanted to have some plants  
12 on the second floor.

13 So it's trying to, as you try to push that out on  
14 the second floor is where you are running into conflict with  
15 several of the Commissioner's opinions.

16 MR. LUEBKE: I know.

17 MR. FULLER: I think that if you come back as a  
18 HAWP with a greenhouse similar to what's being shown, and  
19 windows flush in the plane of the house, I think you're  
20 okay. If you are interested in pushing the second story out  
21 and either reconfiguring it, then you're a little bit more  
22 of a marginal scenario.

23 MR. LUEBKE: Yes. Well, it's not my intention, I  
24 think, to do such a large addition at that living room  
25 level. So it was also not, at this point, I thought I would  
26 probably leave the footprint of the existing greenhouse as

1 it was. So at this point, I will probably do nothing or  
2 come back with a proposal in the work permit just to double  
3 the window.

4 MR. FULLER: My guess is, if you come back that  
5 way, you are approved.

6 MR. LUEBKE: Okay.

7 MS. ANAHTAR: But you don't have to enlarge the  
8 room on the second floor either. And you can have a two-  
9 story structure with the roof being taller --

10 MR. LUEBKE: Right.

11 MS. ANAHTAR: -- sitting higher.

12 MR. FULLER: So I think, you know, as I said, I  
13 think we're about as close as we're going to be able to give  
14 you in terms of direct direction. But as I said, if you  
15 choose less, I think you have a higher level of certainty.  
16 | The more you push it out, the more it gets into a little bit  
17 of a mixed message.

18 MR. LUEBKE: Okay. Thank you.

19 MR. FULLER: Thank you. Okay. Next on our agenda  
20 this evening is a master plan evaluation. We want to make  
21 sure that all speakers that are interested in participating  
22 in this tonight have filled out speakers forms and turned  
23 them in to staff.

24 We are going to be timing the presentations, and  
25 so we will ask you to please watch the time as you go  
26 through things. With that, I would like to ask for a staff

1 report.

2 MS. KELLY: Thank you for waiting. For the  
3 record, I am Clare Kelly, historic preservation planner.  
4 Staff is recommending that the Falklands Apartment Complex  
5 be designated on the master plan for historic preservation.  
6 The Falkland Apartments are located on three adjacent  
7 parcels located at the intersection of East-West Highway and  
8 16th Street in Silver Spring. The complex is listed of the  
9 locational atlas and index of historic sites.

10 One structure within the complex, the Cupola  
11 building has been individually designated on the master plan  
12 for historic preservation. It's shown on the bottom portion  
13 of the screen.

14 In August the HPC evaluated the Falkland  
15 Apartments to determine with in all likelihood the resource  
16 is eligible for designation on the master plan. That review  
17 was conducted under chapter 24-A-10 which is a moratorium on  
18 demolition. The owner had submitted a project plan  
19 application that proposed the demolition of all existing  
20 buildings on the north parcel.

21 The HPC voted unanimously to recommend the  
22 resource be found eligible for designation, and the Planning  
23 Board concurred by a 4-1 vote on December 6, 2007. At the  
24 direction of the Planning Board, the Falkland Apartments are  
25 now the subject of an amendment to the master plan for  
26 historic preservation.

1           Following the HPC evaluation the review will  
2 follow the usual master plan amendment process with review  
3 by the Planning Board, the County Executive, and the County  
4 Council with the County Council making the final decision  
5 about whether the Falkland Apartments is designated on the  
6 master plan.

7           The Falkland Apartments Complex was designed by  
8 architect Louis Justement. It was built in two phases, the  
9 first 178 units were built on the south parcel in 1936 and  
10 '37 and 301 units were built on the west and north parcels  
11 in '37 to '38. The entire complex of three parcels is of a  
12 coherent and cohesive design constructed between '36 and  
13 '38.

14           The Falklands are an early example of a building  
15 type, the garden apartment. Garden apartments are a planned  
16 suburban community consisting of moderately priced  
17 residences in a natural setting. In contrast to urban  
18 apartments, they are built in groups integrated in a natural  
19 setting, often around a courtyard, and typically two to  
20 three stories tall.

21           The aim of garden apartments was to provide a  
22 healthy alternative to city living conditions for people of  
23 modest means. The Falkland Apartments were the first  
24 example of a garden apartment complex in Montgomery County  
25 and one of the earliest of their type in the country.

26           The complex represents the explosion of the

1 population in lower Montgomery County following the New Deal  
2 programs. The flood of people coming into the region to  
3 work for the federal government programs needed places to  
4 live. The Falkland Apartments was the first large-scale  
5 rental housing project in Maryland whose mortgage was backed  
6 by the newly established Federal Housing Administration.

7 |           The complex ises representative of the  
8 construction and design standard set by the FHA for  
9 comfortable, functional, and attractive housing. The  
10 resource is highly representative of the formal and  
11 traditional colonial revival style architecture of its era.

12           The success of the site plan design was noted in  
13 contemporary journals including architectural record and  
14 architectural forum. Notable design elements of garden  
15 apartments included landscaped courtyards, staggered  
16 setbacks, tree shaded winding pathways, ample green space,  
17 and the preservation of natural features including the  
18 stream valley.

19           The Falkland Apartments have had some alterations.  
20 A portion of the original block of apartments consisting of  
21 six two-story buildings west of Draper Lane was demolished  
22 and replaced in 1992 by the high rise apartment buildings,  
23 Lenox Park Apartments.

24           There have been some material changes, notably  
25 window replacements. Despite this, the Falkland Apartments  
26 retains a high level of integrity. The Maryland Historical

1 Trust has determine the Falkland Apartments are eligible for  
2 listing on the national register of historic places.

3 Staff recommends the entire Falklands Apartment,  
4 all three parcels, be designated on the master plan for  
5 historic preservation, that it meets criteria 1A, 1D and 2A.

6 The recommended environmental setting includes parcels  
7 P393, P532 and P555.

8 And the attachments to the staff report include  
9 the text of the amendment for the master plan, historic  
10 preservation, which has a map showing the environmental  
11 setting; the national register nomination form; and you also  
12 have before you correspondence that's been received. Are  
13 there any questions?

14 MR. FULLER: Questions for staff? Okay. At this  
15 point, we would like to invite the owners to speak. We have  
16 agreed to a 15-minute interval for the group. We'd  
17 appreciate if you'd introduce yourselves. Thank you.

18 MS. SEARS: Yes, Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of  
19 all, I'd like to thank the chair and the members of the  
20 Commission for the additional time. We have here tonight,  
21 my name is Barbara Sears with Linowes and Blocher,  
22 representing the owner.

23 And the owner is here with, Mr. Nelson Leehouse,  
24 who is to my immediate right, who was here before in August  
25 before you. And then to my left is Aaron Gerard of my  
26 office. And then we have here also tonight Chris Goodwin

1 and Kate Coronda of Goodwin and Associates, historical  
2 consultants.

3 We wanted to thank you first, as I said, thank you  
4 for the additional time, but also give you just a few  
5 minutes of background before Mr. Leehouse addresses you, and  
6 then we turn to the consultants.

7 But first of all, as Clare mentioned, we were here  
8 before you August 15. And the reason we were here is that  
9 we had filed a project plan in accordance with our zoning on  
10 the north parcel.

11 If Clare, maybe you could go back to the aerial,  
12 or is that too difficult? But anyway, the parcels in and of  
13 themselves are three parcels. And the north parcel is zoned  
14 CBD/R1, which is a high density residential with mixed use  
15 type allowance for a CBD area. This is a central business  
16 district.

17 And the project that was submitted was in full  
18 accord with the 2000 sector plan for Silver Spring. This  
19 parcel, as you see here on the display to the north, that is  
20 adjacent to the Metro tracks and the railroad tracks is, as  
21 I indicated, 800 feet from the platform at the Metro. And  
22 it has always been considered to be, through the master  
23 planning process, the redevelopment parcel for the  
24 Falklands.

25 The project, as I mentioned, was in full accord  
26 with this, to use a transit oriented development for the

1 parcel. And we talked about that a little bit when we were  
2 here before.

3           Tonight, we don't want to focus on that project  
4 plan so much as we want to focus on your criteria. And the  
5 overall property that is sought here by the recommendation  
6 to be designated is 23 acres. It is an enormous piece of  
7 property.

8           What you will hear tonight, and I hope that you  
9 will see the wisdom of it, is there is a distinct difference  
10 in the development of these parcels. There are two distinct  
11 projects. And what has occurred here is the sort of lumping  
12 of the Falklands into one, shall we say, conclusion as to  
13 the historicity of the site. And that is what we have asked  
14 Goodwin to address, to study it, to objectively look at it,  
15 to do the research and really come here tonight to explain  
16 what they have found, and try to set the record straight  
17 about what is occurring here.

18           The history of the review by the County Council  
19 has been consistently not to designate these sites. They  
20 have designated the Cupola in 1985, found the rest of the  
21 property not eligible. They then looked at it very  
22 carefully again in 1993 with the master plan, again found  
23 the rest of the property not eligible. Looked at it again,  
24 comprehensively in 2000, with the master plan, and again  
25 found it not to be eligible, except for the Cupola.

26           We would like to proceed with what they did find,

1 which was, it was important to redevelop, for public policy  
2 reasons, the north parcel. And it's even more so today than  
3 it was in 2000.

4 And so we would like now to turn to Mr. Leehouse  
5 and he would address you for a few minutes, and then we  
6 would turn to Goodwin and Associates.

7 MR. LEEHOUSE: Good evening. We've worked long  
8 and hard at developing our plan for the north parcel. We  
9 have endured a few labels along the way, including strip  
10 mining Silver Spring for profit. But the truth is, we are a  
11 good company of decent people who are passionate about what  
12 we do, which is building and maintaining communities where  
13 people live. And we are very proud to be the owners of  
14 Falkland Chase.

15 We see many similarities between the housing  
16 problems of the thirties that began this program that was  
17 used to finance the original Falkland Chase project, and the  
18 housing affordability problems of today.

19 We are excited about the opportunity to develop a  
20 project that would be both successful for our company while  
21 at the same time going above and beyond County policies to  
22 provide a substantial amount of new, affordable housing  
23 stock.

24 Much has been made of the fact that we purchased,  
25 when we purchased the property, Falkland had already been  
26 identified on a survey of Silver Spring properties as

1 having potential historic merit. So we were certainly aware  
2 that his work was underway.

3 We were also told that the historic evaluation  
4 process was not one to place in a vacuum, but rather one  
5 that considered the public interest in the broadest term.

6 We also believe that it should be significant, as  
7 Barbara mentioned, that the south parcel is zoned for low  
8 density residential development, while the north parcel,  
9 that we would like to redevelop, is zoned for high density,  
10 although both of these parcels are in the central business  
11 district.

12 We have spent two years and over a million dollars  
13 working with all of the County agencies involved in the  
14 development and review process to make sure that project was  
15 not merely technically compliant with the requirements of  
16 Silver Spring, or the Silver Spring central business  
17 district sector plan. But it represented the spirit of the  
18 plan as well.

19 I was especially sure when we received a copy of  
20 the memo that the community based planning group sent to the  
21 historic preservation staff recommending support for  
22 redevelopment of the north parcel, since it seemed to  
23 confirm what we had been told by the staff that a  
24 development proposal pursuant to the Silver Spring sector  
25 plan would be regarded favorably.

26 I would like to read a portion of this memo dated

1 June 5th, 2007. I quote, recommendations. The community  
2 based planning division recommends that the portion of the  
3 Falkland Chase Complex located north of East-West Highway,  
4 i.e., the 7.55 acre north parcel, not be designated as a  
5 historic site under master plan for historic preservation.

6 The master plan for historic preservation  
7 stipulates that the Planning Board must balance competing  
8 public interests, including master plan goals, with the  
9 historic merits of the nominated properties. We believe  
10 that other public policies should be considered more  
11 important with regard to the north parcel than the aspects  
12 of the Falklands, which might be considered historic, can be  
13 commemorated by preserving only the 8.34 acre south parcel,  
14 and the 6.29 acre west parcel, unquote.

15 The letter then reviews the history of the  
16 Falklands, discusses the possible impact of the purple line,  
17 and ends with the following conclusions, and again I would  
18 quote. The proper decision to promote intense residential  
19 uses on the northern portion of the Falklands, i.e., the  
20 section next to the Metro, is consistent with the principals  
21 of smart growth and transit-oriented development.

22 The County's current effort to promote housing  
23 opportunities throughout Montgomery County also supports the  
24 notion that the northern section of the Falklands should be  
25 available for residential development.

26 In the northern section of the Falklands -- excuse

1 me. In light of these policies in the land use and zoning  
2 decisions made in the CBD sector plan, community based  
3 planning believes that it would unfortunate if the entire  
4 Falkland property were to be identified as a historic  
5 resource that must be preserved.

6 We are also concerned that designation of the  
7 north parcel, including both the buildings and their  
8 environmental settings, could potentially interfere with the  
9 implementation of the purple line alignment being considered  
10 on the south side of the railroad tracks.

11 In light of these recommendations -- excuse me, in  
12 light of these considerations, we recommend that the north  
13 parcel not be included in any historic designation, i.e.,  
14 the historic merits of Falkland Chase can be commemorated  
15 without necessarily protecting the entire property. End of  
16 quote.

17 Tonight, you will hear from Kate Coronda, an  
18 expert historical housing consultant, who has new  
19 information to present as a result of primary research that  
20 has been done recently. As a result, Kate believes that the  
21 first development which consists of the south parcel, does  
22 meet the County criteria for historic preservation.

23 However, the second development that includes the  
24 north and west parcels, do not rise to that standards, and  
25 is therefore not historical.

26 It is clear to us from Kate's research that the

1 south parcel was the well-known and widely publicized  
2 project and that redevelopment of the north parcel would in  
3 no way impact the integrity of the south and west parcels,  
4 and yet would provide for new development in accordance with  
5 the County's own stated planning objectives. Thank you.

6 MS. SEARS: Kate.

7 MS. CORONDA: Good evening. My name is Kate  
8 Coronda, and I am senior vice president with architectural  
9 and historical services with Goodwin and Associates. As  
10 Nelson has mentioned, we've been retained by Home Properties  
11 to analyze the Falklands project, and I'd like to briefly  
12 summarize our findings. We do have a Powerpoint if it's  
13 coming up?

14 (Discussion off the record.)

15 MS. CORONDA: Okay. At the offset of this  
16 project, we reviewed the mountain of information that's been  
17 generated on the Falklands. There are at least two  
18 generations of national register nominations. There were  
19 numerous reports, the meeting minutes, and there have been  
20 | opinions weighed ~~in~~-in public meetings as well as submitted  
21 by, in letters.

22 And despite the great respect I have for everyone  
23 who has worked on this project, I couldn't help but be  
24 bothered by the disconnect I found between the significance  
25 justification for the 45 buildings, and what I was seeing on  
26 the ground. I wasn't seeing a single unified comprehensive

1 plan, or a consistent level of architecture or design. So I  
2 went back to the archival record, undertook field  
3 investigations, and re-analyzed.

4           The residential housing market in the early 1930's  
5 set the stage for the construction of the Falklands. At  
6 that time, over 30 percent of rental projects were in  
7 foreclosure. The nation faced a housing shortage that was  
8 particularly acute for lower income renters.

9           The New Deal solution was the amended National  
10 Housing Act would address the failures of the private  
11 market. By the standards of the period, this legislation  
12 was radical economic and social intervention.

13           The FHA was the agency that was responsible for  
14 selecting the economic revival projects, with life spans  
15 that would exceed the anticipated 20 to 30 year mortgages.  
16 The objective here was to make sure that the projects were  
17 of sufficient quality, were not speculative, and that they  
18 would, essentially, offer good returns so that they could be  
19 occupied for the life of their mortgages.

20           Now, during the same period, the Blairs are  
21 unsuccessfully attempting to either sell or develop portions  
22 of the Blair estate in Silver Spring. The national housing  
23 act provided them the means to do this through two separate  
24 projects.

25           The first project was developed on the south  
26 parcel, and the second included the north and west. These

1 separate projects had different financing, different site  
2 design, and different architectural character.

3           The first project was the first large scale  
4 federally financed and federally insured rental housing  
5 project in Maryland. This is the one that established the  
6 economic and design benchmarks for the FHA project.

7           The second, which was constructed only a year  
8 later, was among 139 FHA projects that were underway  
9 nationally that included eight that were under construction  
10 in Maryland that would eventually add over 1400 units to the  
11 State's rental inventory.

12           The first project was capitalized at an overall  
13 cost of over \$6000 per unit, while the second cut the cost  
14 by \$800. This decreased cost produced a very different  
15 project. While the first project was a fully realized  
16 garden city plan, the second focused on density and regular  
17 apartment block.

18           The south parcel established the popular image of  
19 the Falklands property that continues to this day, with its  
20 residential scale and much landscaping. This was the  
21 project that was widely publicized in professional journals.

22           It was frequently cited as the development model by FHA in  
23 their own publication, Insurance Mortgage Portfolio.

24           The importance of the first project in the New  
25 Deal is suggested by its dedication by Eleanor Roosevelt and  
26 William Blair, the sponsor, commented on its economic

1 success in the same year. Quote, it looks so good from both  
2 the land owning and the State investment standpoints that we  
3 began planning a more ambitious project.

4           Okay. The great success of the first project was  
5 due in part to its garden city plan. This is the one with  
6 the picturesque park, the residential streetscapes, the  
7 public and private space, the pedestrian orientation, and  
8 the limited vehicular access. The buildings are residential  
9 in scale, they're staggered in mass, and they integrate plan  
10 with ornamentation.

11           While there have been changes made over time,  
12 including the loss of the Draper Triangle, this project  
13 retains its overall integrity. This first project clearly  
14 meets both criteria 1 and 2.

15           The second and more ambitious project was designed  
16 and built by the same architect and developer. It had a  
17 separate design, separate financing. It's cited as a  
18 separate project in the FHA records. It had greater density  
19 and a larger percentage of hard-scape than the first  
20 project.

21           Apartment blocks were cited throughout the  
22 parcels. Surface parking ~~and~~ interior roads replaced the  
23 central landscape. And open space is very formal, public,  
24 and generally concentrated around the buildings. The  
25 buildings are larger, higher in scale, and regular in  
26 geometry. Style is limited to applied ornamentation.

1           Now, these apartments still meet the minimum FHA  
2 standards for sunlight and ventilation, but the lower costs  
3 were realized, increased density, straightforward  
4 construction, fewer amenities, and easier maintenance.

5           The degree of change over time distinguishes the  
6 two parcels. The west retains its integrity, while the  
7 north has shrunk in size. East-West Highway has been  
8 expanded. Garages have been demolished, and surface parking  
9 expanded.

10           Then we also have the looming Purple Line, which  
11 will require building demolition, and further reduce the  
12 site --

13           MR. FULLER: If we could get you to start wrapping  
14 up, please.

15           MS. CORONDA: Sure. And views. So it is our  
16 conclusion the north and west parcels vary in integrity.  
17 They lack the direct importance associations necessary for  
18 criterion 1 or criterion 2.

19           The second project -- excuse me. This wasn't the  
20 first, it wasn't the model for the program, and it doesn't  
21 embody the important planning things that are seen in the  
22 first.

23           This is two separate and distinct projects. The  
24 first possesses a high degree of importance on the State,  
25 local and national level. And it clearly warrants long term  
26 preservation.

1           To find that the two projects possess equal  
2           significance diminishes the overall significance of the  
3           undisputed historic site that comprises the south parcel.  
4           Thank you.

5           MR. FULLER: Thank you.

6           MS. SEARS: Yes. I think in conclusion, we would  
7           like to -- I'm sorry. We would like to just emphasize that  
8           we think we have found an acceptable and accurate conclusion  
9           or solution to this proposed designation. And that would  
10          be, we would not object to the designation for the south and  
11          the west.

12          We would strongly object to the north. We feel it  
13          does not, when really evaluated against the criteria, for  
14          the reasons that Ms. Coronda has said, it cannot be found to  
15          meet those criteria, and that the findings in the staff  
16          report, although they may be pertinent to the south, cannot  
17          be extended by any kind of analytical factual analysis to  
18          the north; nor do they comply with all of the public policy  
19          that has preceded us in terms of the history of this  
20          property.

21          MR. FULLER: Thank you. Are there questions for  
22          the owners?

23          MR. ROTENSTEIN: I have some questions for the  
24          consultant. Can you walk us through the primary research  
25          that you conducted for your presentation?

26          MS. CORONDA: We looked at all the FHA records

1 that survive in the National Archives, and if you've looked  
2 at those records, you know that there's been, the records  
3 retention schedules were not as kind as we would like them  
4 to be. But they are, the insured mortgage portfolios  
5 survived, as well as the primary source of publications for  
6 the period.

7 MR. ROTENSTEIN: Were those the only record books  
8 you relied on?

9 MS. CORONDA: In addition to the mountain of other  
10 information that had been generated through the various  
11 national register nominations. We went back and reviewed  
12 those, the documentation that had been assembled in the  
13 past.

14 MR. ROTENSTEIN: Thank you.

15 MR. FULLER: Are there other questions for the  
16 ownership? Thank you.

17 MS. SEARS: Thank you. Participants, I invite you  
18 to come forward, stay on the same side of the table. All  
19 right. At this point we'd like to ask Mary Reardon to come  
20 forward. She will be speaking for herself representing  
21 Silver Spring Historical Society. Linda, are you here?  
22 George French. George, you're here, right? Loretta, and  
23 Maurice. We're not down to Maurice. I'm sorry. If you  
24 would please introduce yourself, and welcome.

25 MS. REARDON: I think I have three people ceding  
26 time to me. I don't believe I'll need the whole time.

1 That would be equal to 14 minutes, but I won't take that  
2 much time.

3 I'm the preservation -- I'm Mary Reardon,  
4 preservation chair of Silver Spring Historical Society. In  
5 hearings before this body and the Planning Board, I believe  
6 that we and our supporters have demonstrated beyond doubt  
7 the historical and architectural significance of all of  
8 Falkland Complex as a whole.

9 It's not surprising that the owner would have you  
10 limit the designation of Falkland to the parcels they have  
11 no plans to redevelop. The owner has argued unsuccessfully  
12 that the north parcel is less significant than the other  
13 two. The attorney even claimed before the Planning Board  
14 that the role along East Falkland Lane was the centerpiece  
15 of the north parcel. I'm sure that claim would have amused  
16 the architect of Falkland.

17 To lose part of Falkland would not be a  
18 compromise. If someone can take something valuable from  
19 you, but decides to take less, that's not a compromise. And  
20 sculpting a designation to accommodate a planned development  
21 is not the way the designation process is done.

22 Before showing slides, I'll touch on two issues  
23 that are not really relevant to your decision tonight, but  
24 that may be on your minds.

25 First, given an overwhelming need for affordable  
26 housing in this County, the next gain in affordable units

1 the proposed development would provide is a pittance,  
2 especially weighed against mangling a value historic  
3 resource and disrupting a viable community.

4           Second, while it's true that the sector plan  
5 allows for redevelopment of the north parcel, this is not a  
6 mandate. Sector plans are not mandates to develop. The  
7 areas around transit hubs need not contain uninterrupted  
8 high rise development. And also, the community based  
9 planning staff, they don't have the last word. The Planning  
10 Board is going to have the last word on this, as far as the  
11 Planning Board is concerned.

12           You can advance to the next -- okay. Tonight,  
13 we're continuing the process begun five years ago where a  
14 historic inventory of downtown Silver Spring buildings  
15 opened the way for a review of all properties 50 years and  
16 older for potential designation. Now, saying that twenty  
17 some years ago when this was rejected, there was a lot less  
18 known. There was a lot less research done on Falkland, and  
19 a lot more done since then. But I'm not going to go into  
20 that. We've talked about that before.

21           The site plan slide. Next slide. You can see how  
22 large the endangered north sector is, and how it fits into  
23 the overall design. The Maryland Historic Trust is well  
24 aware of the loss of 34 of the 484 units on the Draber  
25 Triangle, yet they have indicated the property is eligible  
26 for the national register, after we filed a nomination, and

1 they sent a letter of support to the Planning Board urging  
2 local designation.

3 I want to talk about our supporters. At the  
4 hearing before the Planning Board on December 6th there were  
5 numerous speakers and numerous letters sent to the Board.  
6 And our supporters, a lot of them are experts, and I think  
7 they argued fairly persuasively that all three sectors of  
8 Falkland are eligible for designation.

9 Our supporters for master plan designation  
10 include, they include County, State and national  
11 preservation entities. Besides Silver Spring Historical  
12 Society, we have Montgomery Preservation Inc., Historic  
13 Takoma, Preservation Maryland, Maryland Historical Trust,  
14 the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Art Deco  
15 Society of Washington, the D.C. Preservation League, and the  
16 LaTrobe chapter of the Society of Architectural Historians.

17 Preservationists in the District of Columbia  
18 realize Falkland's significance to the whole region. Civic  
19 groups testified for Falkland for master plan listing.  
20 Montgomery County Civic Federation, Woodside Park Civic  
21 Association, Seven Oaks Evanswood Civic Association, and the  
22 Civic League of North Portals Estates, a community just over  
23 the line in D.C., and environmental groups. Maryland Native  
24 Plant Society, Sierra Club of Montgomery County and the  
25 Audubon Naturalist Society.

26 And among our supports are 10 activists in the

1 area whom the Planning Board also heard from, and who you  
2 will hear from tonight.

3           Leading experts in architecture and architectural  
4 history are calling for master plan listing of all of  
5 Falkland. Richard Longstreth, who I'm sure you're all  
6 familiar with, one of the country's most prominent  
7 architectural historians, Ralph Bennett and Isabel Gournay,  
8 who have given, who are specialists in housing architecture  
9 and have done a thorough study of housing, I believe it was  
10 in 1998, in this area.

11           Then there is former chair of the Housing  
12 Opportunities Commissions, James M. Goode, author of two  
13 major works on D.C. area architecture, Best Addresses, and  
14 Capital Losses. Professor John Boone of Loyola College, who  
15 is a consultant to Maryland Historical Trust; and planners  
16 Dawn McGrath and John Fondersmith.

17           There are three basic reasons for Falklands'  
18 significance. First is the connection with the New Deal.  
19 Falkland was the second apartment complex in the country to  
20 be underwritten by the Federal Housing Administration.  
21 These new projects influenced suburban projects afterwards.  
22 Eleanor Roosevelt cut the ribbon when Falkland opened in  
23 1937 to celebrate the success of this program for moderate  
24 income people, like those pouring to Washington to work on  
25 New Deal programs.

26           The owner of Falkland likes to point out that she

1 cut the ribbon on the south parcel and not the north parcel,  
2 but the north and west parcels were underway at the time,  
3 and James Bray, the developer who the owner has talked  
4 about, intended to have one project cover all three parcels,  
5 referring to them collectively as, quote, Falkland  
6 Properties, unquote. It was one project. The fact that  
7 they had separate financing, I don't think, makes these  
8 separate projects in terms of designation and architectural  
9 review.

10 Falkland and Colonial Village and Arlington were  
11 among the D.C. area models for middle income apartments  
12 nationally over the next generation. This is from the  
13 Washington Post in 1937. Falkland is at the top. Falkland  
14 was indeed a prototype.

15 Second reason for Falkland's significance was that  
16 it was part of a proud line of early multi-family projects  
17 that adopted the English garden city principals as reported  
18 by Clarence Stein and Henry Wright.

19 Generous green space and low rise construction  
20 were keeping pines, ensuring that relatively dense housing  
21 was nevertheless pleasant. I find it amusing doing research  
22 that this was considered dense housing at the time.

23 Sunnyside Gardens in Queens was the first such  
24 project. All of these developments, I'll show you, are on  
25 the national register, even though all made allowance for  
26 automobiles over the years, as did Falkland. Sunnyside

1 starts it at two blocks from a major L stop, about 20  
2 minutes outside Manhattan.

3           And Radburn is another, Radburn, New Jersey. All  
4 of these early projects were built in stages, just as  
5 Falkland was, but no one considers any parcel less important  
6 | than the others, nor ~~what~~would anyone suggest the parts are  
7 separate properties.

8           In Chatham Village the topography dominated the  
9 plan move and add the two others. It's more like Falkland  
10 in that regard. Chatham Village was named one of the 10  
11 great neighborhoods for 2007 by the American Planning  
12 Association.

13           Close to home we have Colonial Village, also on  
14 the national register, and it's sandwiched between two metro  
15 stops. This was the first large scale rental housing  
16 project in the U.S. to be backed by FHA mortgage insurance,  
17 just before Falkland.

18           Falkland's site plan was dictated by topography,  
19 which is why ever sector is unique. The architect, Louis  
20 Justement said, for example, he deliberately retained the Y-  
21 shaped stream valley in the north and south sectors. And by  
22 the way, Falkland, as Clare mentioned, was widely celebrated  
23 in contemporary architectural journals during and after  
24 construction. This one is from the architectural record.

25           The third reason the Falklands significance is now  
26 part of its history, that is literally generations of Silver

1 Spring and County activists joined Falkland tenants to  
2 defend the site whenever it was threatened. The lead  
3 senator, Ida Mae Garrett, was among them. Here is a photo  
4 from the Evening Star in 1972.

5           The reasons for defending Falkland were to  
6 preserve affordable housing, and because of its  
7 architectural and historic merit, and people from the close  
8 in D.C. neighborhoods joined in, and you have a letter about  
9 that, petitioning the County Council to spare Falkland.

10           The green space in Falkland is a major asset. You  
11 can bring in the boards to orient people. This aerial view  
12 was from 1955, but the same abundant green space and tree  
13 cover exist today throughout Falkland. Falkland and Joseph  
14 Blair Park together comprise the last significant stance of  
15 native trees in downtown Silver Spring.

16           Wherever you live in Falkland, you can look out  
17 and see trees, all three sectors. And the building space  
18 and major streets are set back with grassy frontage, like  
19 along East West Highway and Colesville Road and 16th Street.  
20 At the left is the stream bed in the north parcel.

21           As for Falkland buildings, in these next three  
22 slides I want to point out that Falkland, those buildings  
23 contain a variety of detailing, have an integrated design,  
24 all three parcels. I think our architectural historian's  
25 orders made that point.

26           None is less significant than the other. This is

1 a mix of photos from all three parcels. These dual ones are  
2 on the north parcel, exemplify some of the architectural  
3 details. Next slide.

4 There are buildings on the south, and these are  
5 buildings on both the south and north parcels. And at the  
6 right on the slide is the north parcel's East Falkland Lane,  
7 on the side closest to the Metro station.

8 All right. I want to talk about Louis Justement a  
9 little bit. The architect of Falkland designed several  
10 landlord buildings in D.C., Harvard Hall and 2120 Kalorama  
11 Road, on James M. Gutz' Best Addresses book.

12 The federal, the federal courthouse is national  
13 register eligible. Justement's Longworth building is called  
14 one of the best examples of neoclassical revival in  
15 Washington. Justement's Howard Euing photographic studio on  
16 F Street is on the national register.

17 Justement was part of a Princeton symposium in  
18 1946 that included ~~Louis~~ Ludwig Mies van der Rohe ~~Vanderow~~,  
19 Frank Lloyd Wright, Walter ~~Robeous~~ Gropius, Robert Moses, and  
20 Philip Johnson, among others, real luminaries in the world  
21 of architecture and planning, and he ~~is~~ a part of that.

22 And finally, we're not desperate for housing to  
23 arrive in the CBD in Silver Spring. This isn't relevant to  
24 tonight's discussion, but it's worth mentioning. We counted  
25 nearly 3600 units recently approved, under construction, or  
26 recently completed since 2003. And there are nearly 1500

1 units proposed, not counting Falkland. That would bring the  
2 total since 2003 to over 5000 new units.

3 Both the HPC and the Planning Board have voted  
4 that all of Falkland is eligible for inclusion on the master  
5 plan. We urge you to take the next logical step tonight in  
6 recommending amending the master plan to designate the  
7 entire property. Thank you.

8 MR. FULLER: Any questions for the speaker? Thank  
9 you. Marcy. I believe you will be speaking for yourself  
10 and for Bonnie.

11 MS. SICKLE: Bonnie ceded her minutes.

12 MR. FULLER: Yes. Welcome. If you'd like to  
13 introduce yourself for the record, please.

14 MS. SICKLE: Marcy Sickle -- I don't think this is  
15 on.

16 MR. FULLER: Press the button.

17 MS. SICKLE: Marcy Sickle. It's interesting to  
18 note at the beginning that Royce Hanson thought that the  
19 Falklands were, all of the Falklands was the work of a  
20 master to be. And that's one of the qualities the Falklands  
21 has, but we have enough other criteria, that we only need  
22 one to designate it. But Royce Hanson did, at the Planning  
23 Board hearing, say that he thought it was the work of the  
24 master.

25 And Andrea Riebeck also called Justement an  
26 architectural master. And I should be passing out this --

1 excuse me. And also, she recommended that Falklands be  
2 placed on the national register. Justement himself said, an  
3 existing Y-shaped valley has been carefully preserved. And  
4 this has permitted the retention of practically every tree  
5 on the original site.

6           The use of courts opening on the surrounding  
7 streets permits greater variety and appearance, and a more  
8 economical use of the land, while providing the same density  
9 per acre as typical row housing. The preservation of  
10 existing trees provides privacy, as well as agreeable  
11 surrounding. The living porches generally face the rear  
12 garden, and there are quiet areas for small children in his  
13 new cities for old.

14           Justement won professional acclaim for his  
15 Falklands project. American Architects directory, 1962,  
16 second addition notes, Falklands won an international award,  
17 and honorable mention for the Fifth PanAmerican Congress of  
18 Architects.

19           Other works of Justement is the Howard University  
20 Law School, Medical School Administration building, the  
21 Sibley Memorial Hospital, the Meridian Hotel which won an  
22 award of merit from the Washington Board of Trade. And in  
23 1921 he won two out of three first prizes in the national  
24 own your own house competition. He was admitted to the AIA  
25 in 1921, and in 1946 he was one of only eight architects  
26 elected a fellow of the American Institute of Architects,

1 the highest honor the profession can bestow on its peers.

2 Justement's 1952 E. Barrett put him in the Federal  
3 U.S. Courthouse on Constitution Avenue, is national register  
4 eligible, and a contributing building to the Pennsylvania  
5 Avenue national historic site. And it's also included in an  
6 American Institute for Architects guidebook. And also,  
7 Harry Truman laid its cornerstone in June 1950.

8 Justement's Harris and Ewing Photographic Studio  
9 was on the national register. He designed the Longworth  
10 House Office building. He also designed bridges, which are  
11 in the American Building Survey and the Historic American  
12 Engineering Record Collection.

13 He designed the K Street Bridge spanning Rock  
14 Creek and Potomac Parkway, the Massachusetts Avenue Bridge  
15 spanning Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. Photographs of  
16 Justement's work are in architect Arthur Heaton's Library of  
17 Congress collection. He was part of the Washington Rent  
18 Advisory Group in the 1930's.

19 Also, 31 of Justement's works are photographed and  
20 featured within the Library of Congress' extensive  
21 collection of renowned photographer Theodore Horseak. And  
22 so Justement used Horseak's aerial photographs of the  
23 Falklands and Fort Dupont Houses in his book, New Cities for  
24 Old.

25 Also, George Washington University Geldman Library  
26 contains Justement's manuscripts as a major holding. Also

1 James Gude's photographs in Library of Congress collection  
2 for his book, *Best Addresses*, speak of his, *Justement's*  
3 *Harvard Hall Apartments*, featured an indoor swimming pool.  
4 And he was admitted to the institute in 1921, has made  
5 notable contributions to the profession of architecture,  
6 particularly in group housing, a pioneer in his field.

7           It's very important to note that before the  
8 Planning Board in 2003, that for the locational atlas status  
9 it was either the *Falklands Apartments* or the *St. Charles*  
10 *Garden Apartments* and the Planning Board unanimously chose  
11 the *Falklands*. And we just recently lost the *St. Charles*.  
12 So just giving you a quick rundown of the significance of  
13 *Justement's* work.

14           I guess I could give the rest of my minutes to  
15 someone else. Are there any questions?

16           MR. FULLER: Are there questions for speaker?  
17 Thank you, Marcy. Next are individuals speaking for  
18 themselves or for groups, but speaking individually, so I  
19 would like to call three up at a time. If we could have  
20 Jane Bergwin Rand, Mary Sinclair Jacobs, and David Paris,  
21 please.

22           I have Jane, you're speaking as an individual, so  
23 you get three minutes. Mary, you're speaking for the  
24 Charter House residents so you have five.

25           MS. JACOBS: Thank you.

26           MR. FULLER: And David, you're speaking for

1 Historic Takoma, so you get five as well. Thank you.

2 Please introduce yourselves?

3 MS. RAND: My name is Jane Bergwin Rand, and I'm a  
4 current resident of Falkland Chase Apartment, and I have  
5 previously submitted copies of over 50 signatures of other  
6 Falkland residents who, like me, are urging that the north  
7 parcel of Falkland be saved from demolition by designating  
8 the entire Falkland complex as historic.

9 Having grown up in Montgomery County, I first  
10 discovered Falkland back in 1972 and lived in the southwest  
11 segment. I rediscovered Falkland a few years ago on a visit  
12 from Michigan where I had been living. I was thrilled to  
13 see that the landmark Falkland buildings were still standing  
14 and continuing to serve as a visual gateway to Maryland from  
15 D.C. I moved back to Falkland November 2006, this time in  
16 the north section. I truly felt I could come home again.

17 But sometime after I moved in I learned the part of  
18 Falkland where I was living was in danger of being  
19 demolished. Once I realized that this was not a done deal  
20 as I had been led to believe, I helped to gather tenant  
21 signatures in support of saving all of Falkland.

22 Without exception, 100 percent of the residents I  
23 asked to sign the letter did so without hesitation. The  
24 residents I spoke to love living at Falkland as it is, and  
25 the residents of the north parcel do not want to be forced  
26 to move.

1           They chose Falkland for many reasons, including  
2 diversity of residents, green open spaces, and a sense of  
3 community. Falkland is a safe place where residents plant  
4 flowers in their gardens and put carved pumpkins on stone  
5 walls at Halloween. Even the property's website touts about  
6 Falklands as having the unique extra, a mature landscaping  
7 not found in most urban apartment communities.

8           It's ironic that Home Properties is willing to use  
9 the rarity of the setting as the selling point, while  
10 preparing to obliterate the very same. It simply does not  
11 seem logical to consider dismembering the Falkland complex,  
12 declaring one-third less historic and less important than  
13 the remaining two-thirds.

14           When signing up to rent at Falkland, there's  
15 nothing distinguishing the sections. All were designed by  
16 the same architect, and the north parcel not only is joined  
17 by the south by a stream bed which runs under East West  
18 Highway, but also by an underground tunnel still used by  
19 maintenance staff to get from one section to the other.

20           Why now would one section not be considered  
21 historic while the other two are? Why should the tenants in  
22 Falkland be the bandaid for Montgomery County's affordable  
23 housing problem?

24           I urge the Historic Preservation Commission on  
25 behalf of myself and the 50-plus residents who signed the  
26 letter thus far, to please save all of the Falkland Chase

1 Apartments and designate the entire complex a historic  
2 landmark so that the buildings will remain as important a  
3 part of Silver Spring that they have always been since  
4 Eleanor Roosevelt cut the opening ribbon in 1937. Thank  
5 you.

6 MR. FULLER: Thank you. Questions for the  
7 speaker? Mary. Thank you.

8 MS. JACOBS: My name is Mary Sinclair Jacobs, and  
9 I am the president of the Charter House Residents  
10 Association. The truth never changes. It seems obvious  
11 we've learned nothing from history.

12 Landmark properties are cornerstones of a healthy  
13 informed society. Preservation is a trademark of sound  
14 business practices. Nine acres comprising Falkland Property  
15 of family homes, gardens, trees, and a natural stream bed at  
16 the corner of 16th Street in Silver Spring, Maryland, at the  
17 opposite end of the White House of the United States of  
18 America. Every inch of Falkland Chase should be treated the  
19 same as the White House's 82 acres at 1600 Pennsylvania  
20 Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C., because they share a  
21 rich history.

22 The cornerstone for the White House was laid  
23 October the 13th, 1792, and the Falkland Chase 1936-38. The  
24 White House stands gracefully as an example of preservation  
25 and retrofitting. We should have learned something from  
26 history through conservation of precious housing stock that

1 is soundly constructed.

2           This placement is a most dramatic experience. In  
3 my opinion, it ranks very close to being in a war zone of  
4 losing a loved one. At age 72 years old, I was among the  
5 over 200 residents 55 plus who were displaced from the  
6 Charter House apartment building on November 30th, 2006.  
7 The trauma still exists and it will never matter where I  
8 live.

9           Residents of the Charter House were fortunate to  
10 have the taxpayers of Maryland to pick up most of the tab.  
11 We were also fortunate to be able to return to a building  
12 known as our home, in spite of the over 290 code violations  
13 which are fixable.

14           Any resident that is displaced is homeless, is  
15 without a place to sit down, eat, bathe, rest or sleep with  
16 peace of mind.

17           Now, does the Parks and Planning have a plan in  
18 place to relocate the residents from the Falkland Chase?  
19 Does Park and Planning have a financial plan available to  
20 house the displaced residents from the Falkland Chase? Will  
21 Parks and Planning be responsible for and will pay for the  
22 displaced residents while the destruction and construction  
23 go forward?

24           Does Park and Planning have knowledge of a phase  
25 in plan program while construction is in progress? Does  
26 Park and Planning have a plan in place for the residents who

1 will return to qualify for an apartment at the same rate as  
2 when they were forced to leave? Can and will our utility  
3 system, that is water, sewer, electricity be sufficient to  
4 handle more high rise buildings in this congested area?

5 Our health is compromised from the air and noise  
6 pollution. Surrounding communities join the noise  
7 pollution, towering bricks, suffocating heat, blocked out  
8 sunlight, traffic jams, and inhalation of filthy, unhealthy  
9 air from vehicular traffic jams.

10 There is evidence that renovation is half the cost  
11 rather than tearing down and starting from scratch. The  
12 horror of destroying this landmark property will not solve  
13 the availability nor affordability issue of renting housing  
14 and replacing with a Humpty-Dumpty towering structure.

15 An evacuation plan in this congested area is  
16 futile. None so blind as one who will not see except  
17 through greed grounded blends. These same issues will be  
18 rehashed 10 to 20 years before a different group of faces  
19 unless some gut wrenching decision is made now to stop the  
20 need to be a disposable society.

21 Let this well-established, safe and sound housing  
22 stock of bricks and white siding landmark known as the  
23 Falkland Chase, which stands at the opposite end of the  
24 White House of America on 16th Street continue to stand as  
25 the cornerstone for a wealthy neighborhood in Montgomery  
26 County, Silver Spring, Maryland. Thank you.

1           MR. FULLER: Thank you. Are there questions for  
2 the speaker? Thank you. David.

3           MR. PARIS: My name is David Paris. I am  
4 presenting testimony initially on behalf of Historic Takoma.  
5 We feel this is a very important property which has  
6 important architectural merit to the community. It's an  
7 integrated property which needs to be viewed as such.

8           It was planned by all appearances in a totality  
9 and presents not only an architectural coherence throughout,  
10 but also a very notable integration with the natural  
11 landscaping throughout its environs. And the quite notably,  
12 the proposal for new development would be a marked change in  
13 the landscape, not only with the physical building, but also  
14 the very radical leveling of the landscape to street level,  
15 where it now has respect for the rolling contours of the  
16 land.

17           Additionally, and now I'm speaking as an  
18 individual, I was really taken aback by some of the  
19 conclusions of a historian, Dr. Daniel Cosie-Carroll that  
20 have, that were introduced by Home Properties, or  
21 reintroduced by Home Properties in the record of the  
22 Planning Board proceeding.

23           Purporting to be an architectural historian,  
24 Dr. Cosie-Carroll claimed that Falkland was not a prototype  
25 for garden apartments, that it was not inspired by the  
26 garden city movement, that it was not designated by a,

1 designed by a master architect, and that it was not  
2 constructed pursuant to a unified design vision.

3 Dr. Cosie-Carroll's qualifications to make such  
4 pronouncements warrant scrutiny, particularly because his  
5 views are so radically at variance with the prevailing  
6 opinion of architectural historians, historic preservation  
7 organizations, and the staff of the Historic Preservation  
8 Commission.

9 It appears that Dr. Cosie-Carroll was better  
10 suited to conduct an analysis of anthropological matters  
11 relating to the Falkland Islands than the architectural  
12 history of the Falkland Apartments.

13 Although portrayed on his letterhead as an  
14 architectural history consultant, Dr. Cosie-Carroll appears  
15 to be a distinguished anthropologist, rather than an  
16 architectural historian. He failed to attach his curriculum  
17 vitae to his testimony; however, it has been reported that  
18 in 2003 he was awarded a Ph.D. in anthropology from Catholic  
19 University.

20 Moreover, the accuracy of Dr. Cosie-Carroll's  
21 sweeping conclusions appears to be suspect. His letter  
22 asserts that the Falkland Apartments were not a prototype  
23 for other garden apartments because its design copied  
24 heavily from earlier apartment developments such as Colonial  
25 Village in Arlington, Virginia. Yet the construction of the  
26 Virginia Apartment began only a year before the Falkland

1 project. And his analysis is at variance with those of a  
2 number of qualified architectural historians, including  
3 James Wood in his well known book, Best Addresses. Home  
4 Property's own website states the Falkland was a prototype  
5 for other apartment complexes that followed.

6 It's additionally notable that in William Blair's  
7 article, Solving the Estate Investment Problem, which was  
8 written immediately after construction of the first phase  
9 and during construction of the second phase of Falkland,  
10 that he makes note of the Colonial Village project as  
11 inspiring the financing of, and made possible the entire  
12 Falkland project.

13 The claim that Falkland is divided into three  
14 distinct parts is refuted by one of Dr. Cosie-Carroll's own  
15 sources, and I'm speaking of the Blair article. He  
16 described the combined west and north parcels as the second  
17 section which will contain 301 family units.

18 For Blair, the result of the Falkland effort is  
19 that we have transformed 24 acres of land which two years  
20 ago were a liability to the Blair Estate, into a community  
21 providing housing, completed or under construction, for 479  
22 families. There is no sense in that of their being  
23 components. In fact, it appears from the Blair article,  
24 which discusses the financing in great detail, that the  
25 reason that the project was divided into two parts appears  
26 to have been for financial reasons.

1           The Union Center Life Insurance Company purchased  
2 the mortgage for the first phase of the Falkland Apartments  
3 from the Federal Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The  
4 mortgage was insured by the FHA which generated the  
5 insurance company's interest in the investment opportunity  
6 in the first place.

7           The success of the first phase persuaded the  
8 insurance company to finance the second construction, and  
9 the ongoing mortgage for the second phase. They did it  
10 directly as a result of their experience with the first  
11 phase.

12           MR. FULLER: I'd like you to start to wrap up,  
13 please.

14           MR. PARIS: I will. There are reports that  
15 because of the way in which the first project worked out,  
16 the insurance company was willing to extend by about  
17 \$225,000 its usual \$1 million dollar annual limit on the  
18 size of mortgage loans.

19           And I'm just concluding now. Therefore, because  
20 the insurance company was only willing to exceed its lending  
21 limit by 25 percent, because of the success of the first  
22 page, it's unthinkable that it would have been willing to  
23 exceed its lending limit by simultaneously funding the  
24 \$840,000 first phase, and the \$1,225,000 second phase  
25 simultaneously. Thank you.

26           MR. FULLER: Thank you. Are there questions for

1 the speaker? Thank you. If I could ask the last group of  
2 speakers to come forward, please. Jim Humphrey, Felicia  
3 Eberling -- sorry about that -- and Mr. Wayne Goldstein.  
4 I believe each of you are speaking for an organization, so  
5 you will each be given five minutes to speak this evening.  
6 Felicia, we'll start with you.

7 MS. EBERLING: Okay. My name is Felicia Eberling.  
8 And I am vice president of the Cole Spring Plaza Tenant  
9 Association. And I'm here not as a historic expert, but  
10 rather as a neighbor who has been living in this  
11 neighborhood since the early eighties. And I'm here to  
12 speak in favor of designating all of the Falklands as  
13 historic, not just part of it, but all of it.

14 To us neighbors, I think there's an aspect of  
15 being historical that is valid, even though it is not  
16 scholarly, and that is that it's part of our heritage.  
17 There is an aspect of being historic that is also part of  
18 being the heritage of a neighborhood.

19 And I remember when I lived in the Falklands in  
20 the mid-eighties, I shared a two-bedroom, and we all had to  
21 move. Two things were going on. They were going to tear  
22 down the building on the corner where a lot of us lived to  
23 put up a high-rise apartment building. And that turned out  
24 to be Lenox Park. So a whole bunch of folks had to move.  
25 That was very upsetting because we lost a lot of neighbors.  
26 You know, we lost our neighbors.

1           Also, in my building, we had to move because they  
2 were renovating. It was implied to us that they were going  
3 to go condo. Well, then ended up not going condo, but they  
4 still did renovate, so we all had to move.

5           So the thing that makes it our heritage, it's the  
6 Falklands is an oasis in this frenzy, surrounded by this  
7 frenzy to keep on building and developing and higher and  
8 higher high rises and, you know, just pack the people into  
9 these high rises and make all the money you can.

10           The Falklands has always been kind of an oasis  
11 where you can walk through that neighborhood. That was  
12 something that reminded you, that gave you the illusion, if  
13 you lived in one of the high rises, like I look out my  
14 window, I see a County parking lot. In the Falklands, I  
15 looked out a window, and I had trees. I had crickets. I  
16 had, lovely. It was nice. You could walk. The kids could  
17 play there. And neighbors could walk through there, too.

18           I mean, it was just part of the neighborhood. And  
19 you could even detour through there, because it would help  
20 make your walk home from the bus stop a little less  
21 horrible. Trying to be a pedestrian on Colesville Road,  
22 come on. So anyway, that's part of what I mean by heritage.

23           But also, we don't want to see the continued  
24 erosion of that which makes our neighborhood nice and pretty  
25 and charming. Those trees and everything are a treasure.  
26 I'm thinking of a building, United Therapeutics. They tore

1 down the one thing that was a big consolation walking down  
2 Cameron Street, the magnolia tree, got torn down. It got  
3 replaced by a stark white building. They haven't replaced  
4 that magnolia tree. They probably never will.

5           The St. Charles Apartments, we lost that. That  
6 was a beautiful place. That was nice. It made you think  
7 you lived in a nice neighborhood. So please keep the  
8 Falklands together. Keep it as a thing that is geared  
9 towards people. We've lost the Silver Spring Armory. That  
10 was nice. That was part of our heritage.

11           We've lost the Little Dell on Ellsworth Avenue  
12 where they used to have the little concerts. That's gone.  
13 We've lost, as I just said, the St. Charles. And also, you  
14 know, the aspect of affordable housing, yes, okay, so you  
15 build a high rise, you put in a few MPDU's and you put in  
16 some MPDU's to replace the affordable apartments that got  
17 lost when that other, when Falklands gets torn down, that  
18 north part.

19           But the biggest thing that's really eating away  
20 affordable housing is the lack of restraint on rent  
21 increases. Tenants month after month are having to move.  
22 Year after year their rents go up, you know, so much beyond  
23 what their pay can handle. They've been here for decades.  
24 So affordable housing, there's much more to it than just put  
25 up a few MPDU's. We've lost thousands of apartments. The  
26 affordability has gone away, not a few hundred.

1           So I don't really think that building a high rise,  
2 a luxury high rise there and tearing down the north part of  
3 the Falklands is going to really make a big impact on  
4 affordable housing either. It's much bigger problem.

5           And also the loss of the neighbors. I mean, all  
6 these high rises, you know, I look in my building, I look in  
7 other buildings, I know people in a lot of the other  
8 buildings in this neighborhood, and, you know, we've got  
9 people with kids. You live in a high rise. You live on the  
10 14th floor. Where are your kids going to play? You know,  
11 the Falklands, please keep it. It's a treasure. All of it.

12           And then, you know, okay, so we take down the  
13 north parcel and we keep the south and east as a  
14 commemoration. Well, we don't commemorate here. We live  
15 here. Please, keep it that we can live here.

16           That's pretty much all I wanted to say. From the  
17 point of view of the neighbors and renters, people who live  
18 here, have been living here for a long time. Please don't  
19 destroy anymore of our neighborhood. Thanks.

20           MR. FULLER: Thank you. Are there questions for  
21 the speaker? Jim. Thank you.

22           MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of  
23 the Commission. My name is Jim Humphrey. I'm chair of the  
24 planning and land use committee for the Montgomery County  
25 Civic Federation. And in case there are any of you that  
26 don't know, the Federation is a congress of neighborhood

1 citizens associations from all across Montgomery County. It  
2 began in 1925.

3           At the March 2005 meeting of the Civic Federation,  
4 the delegates approved a resolution supporting placement of  
5 the Falkland Apartments on the locational atlas, an index of  
6 historic sites, because we believed then as we still do  
7 today that the Falklands are a jewel of architectural  
8 history to be cherished and preserved.

9           And so we also support inclusion of the Falklands  
10 on the master plan for historic preservation. I did give  
11 you a copy of that resolution when I testified before you  
12 last year on the Falklands.

13           The Falklands was one of the first in the nation  
14 of a style of multi-family housing developments that gave us  
15 the term garden apartment, and it could be argued that it's  
16 the best remaining example. It's certainly the best example  
17 in Montgomery County of how these projects were successfully  
18 integrated into both the natural and the built environment.

19           The three sections of the Falklands together  
20 exhibit a bravado in their fusion with this topographically  
21 challenging site, and they beautifully demonstrate the  
22 diversity of approach to the siting of garden apartments,  
23 the eastern portion situated in the divergence of 16th  
24 Street and Colesville Road, with its central courtyard green  
25 area; the western portion nestled into the woods on a rise  
26 that top a branch of Rock Creek; and the northern portion

1 woven around a deep stream gorge and a stand of 100-year old  
2 or so oak trees between the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad  
3 tracks, and historically important East-West Highway.

4 The Falklands would certainly rank as the first  
5 stop on a heritage tourism visit to the area, and the  
6 marketing of an architectural heritage tour could be a real  
7 asset to Silver Spring's economic development.

8 But there is more to be preserved here than a  
9 relic of historically important style of architecture.  
10 There are environmental assets worth preserving as well, in  
11 the form of a green space in which residents can walk their  
12 dogs, toss a ball with their children, or spread a blanket  
13 and have a picnic. And there is the important forested area  
14 on the northern section which becomes more valuable every  
15 day as our urban tree canopy falls victim to redevelopment.

16 The Falklands is also a community of people, and  
17 that's important to the civic federation because decades ago  
18 the residents there formed the first citizens association of  
19 renters in the County.

20 There is only one Falklands in Montgomery County.  
21 Please recommend master plan designation for all three  
22 sections of this historically and architecturally important  
23 treasure. Thank you.

24 MR. FULLER: Thank you. Questions for the  
25 speaker? Wayne. You have five minutes. Thank you.

26 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I'm Wayne Goldstein, president of

1 Montgomery Preservation Inc. I believe this is my sixth  
2 hearing about the Falklands and the third time I am  
3 appearing before the HPC.

4           There is really nothing new that I can add or that  
5 I can improve on from others about why this complex warrants  
6 designation. I'll simply say, Montgomery Preservation  
7 agrees with the staff recommendation and finds that the  
8 complex meets criteria 1A and 1B and 2A.

9           I will point out, simply because no one else has  
10 said it, and it may well be obvious to the Commissioners  
11 that there were a number of contradictions with what the  
12 owner and their consultant was saying in the sense they  
13 seemed to want to have it both ways.

14           On the one hand, the east section is historic,  
15 despite losing the Draber Triangle. On the other side, the  
16 north section is not historic in part because it would lose  
17 parts of a few buildings because of the purple line right-  
18 of-way.

19           The consultant says that the north and the west  
20 parcels are not, don't meet the criteria because they are  
21 different than the east, but still willing to have the west  
22 section designated. So whatever they're trying to achieve,  
23 the contradictions really, I think, harm the argument if  
24 there is any merit to it, which I don't find there is. So I  
25 hope you will recommend that this be designated on the  
26 master plan for historic preservation. Thank you.

1           MR. FULLER: Thank you. Are there questions for  
2 Wayne? I think at this point we'd like to move into  
3 deliberations, so thank you. Are there comments or  
4 questions?

5           MR. ROTENSTEIN: I'd like to return to a question  
6 for staff. I note from the master plan amendment that  
7 you've written in that this is to be designated as one  
8 individual site in the master plan for historic  
9 preservation, yet the national register of historic places  
10 form that we have indicates that the property has been  
11 identified as a district. Can you explain that discrepancy?

12          MS. KELLY: Where are you looking in the form?

13          MR. ROTENSTEIN: National register from page, the  
14 second page under classification, category of property.

15          MS. KELLY: I see. Well, for the master plan for  
16 historic preservation we have the practice of looking at a  
17 property that's owned by the same property owner, it's  
18 multiple buildings on each parcel, but there's one parcel  
19 with multiple buildings on it. So we would look at it as an  
20 individual resource rather than a historic district.

21          MR. ROTENSTEIN: Aside from that practice, is  
22 there anything preventing the HPC and Montgomery County from  
23 designating this as a historic district?

24          MS. KELLY: There is nothing preventing us, no.

25          MR. ROTENSTEIN: The reason I ask that is, I think  
26 we're dealing with a very complex historic property here.

1 And not only are we dealing with a property that was built  
2 in phases, but we're also dealing with public rights-of-way  
3 that dissect the property, and we're dealing with a complex  
4 physical setting.

5 And I think in terms of the type of property and  
6 future preservation goals and procedures, I'm just wondering  
7 whether or not it would be more appropriate to designate  
8 this as a district rather than an individual property?

9 MS. KELLY: Well, you do bring up a good point.  
10 We have, I'm not aware of another resource such as this one  
11 that has been this complex of buildings that's had more than  
12 one owner on more than one parcel.

13 MR. ROTENSTEIN: The other reason I raise that is,  
14 it seems that with a historic district, we'd be able to  
15 classify individual resources within that district as to  
16 whether or not they are outstanding, contributing, or  
17 noncontributing, to use one scheme that we use. I'm just  
18 wondering why this property is treated as a monolithic  
19 whole.

20 I don't disagree that -- it is historic in my  
21 professional opinion. It's just, I am just questioning  
22 whether or not we're painting it with too broad of a brush  
23 here.

24 MS. KELLY: I think it has to do with the history  
25 of the property, and with ownership of the property. And I  
26 think it's still possible to categorize buildings as

1 outstanding contributing or noncontributing, and we do that,  
2 for example, with farmsteads, with complexes of buildings on  
3 one parcel, and there are many new buildings. Typically,  
4 when we designate them, we identify which are the historic  
5 buildings. And we can even further, you know, identify them  
6 as of the historic buildings, which are the outstanding  
7 buildings that require, possibly, greater scrutiny in their  
8 review.

9 MR. ROTENSTEIN: If we were to do that with this  
10 single property, would you hazard a guess as to whether or  
11 not it's possible to categorize the components in a scheme  
12 like that?

13 MS. KELLY: Well, in my opinion, there is not the  
14 level of difference between the buildings that you find,  
15 typically, for example, with -- like the example I gave of a  
16 farmstead where you have buildings built over a long period  
17 of time, and some of them were built within the historic  
18 period and some were not. I think with the Falkland  
19 Apartments, it is such a cohesive group that, you know, you  
20 may find that there are some minor structures which are  
21 built outside the historic period. But, you know, certainly  
22 the vast majority of the site was all built within that  
23 historic period.

24 MR. ROTENSTEIN: Thank you.

25 MR. FULLER: Barbara, do you guys want to have a  
26 brief summary statement? We typically allow the owners a

1 minute or two.

2 MS. SEARS: I'd appreciate that. Yes. I think  
3 I'd like, I think Ms. Coronda had a few points that she  
4 would like to make in rebuttal.

5 MR. FULLER: If we could just keep it brief.  
6 Thank you.

7 MS. CORONDA: Okay, very briefly. Going through  
8 the criteria that's been cited, if we look at this property  
9 as a single site, it's over 22 acres, 23 acres, and has 44  
10 buildings on it. We're saying that the criteria should  
11 apply to those resources equally across the board. And I  
12 don't think that's the case.

13 We clearly have, in the south parcel, a portion  
14 that is of unusual significance, and transcends even local  
15 significance of this current designation, and should be  
16 considered important on a State and national level too. And  
17 it's really long term preservation.

18 In addition to the buildings, you have landscape  
19 features. And the landscape features on the south parcel  
20 are of extraordinary importance as well. When you look at,  
21 they are the regular design, and the monolithic brick  
22 apartment blocks that were built in the second section, you  
23 can clearly see that the developer was trying to maximize  
24 density and achieve a cost economy in the way of  
25 construction in how these building were set up; the  
26 staggered massing and the orientation of the structures.

1           Much has been said about the amount of the  
2 hardscape, but if you look at that site, yes, they made  
3 accommodations for automobiles, but they drove them right  
4 through the site.

5           The comparisons between the period photographs of  
6 what was designed and what's actually out there are striking  
7 in the amount of hardscape and paving that's been added over  
8 the years. We've lost sections with the Draber Triangle.  
9 We've got the expansion of East West Highway. The north and  
10 east just do not rise to the level of significance that the  
11 south does.

12           MS. SEARS: I think that's the real point, and I  
13 think your point raised that. I mean, you've got 44  
14 different buildings, 23 acres here. And to say that this  
15 should go as a single unit when the real research shows it  
16 wasn't. It wasn't a comprehensive plan. It was done, first  
17 as the south piece, and that was the piece that Eleanor  
18 Roosevelt cut the ribbon at. That was the piece that used  
19 the Garden City planning tools. That was the piece that met  
20 those standards as something worthy of being retained and  
21 preserved.

22           But just to spread that out for all 23 acres, and  
23 say the rest should just go with it because they went ahead  
24 and did a second project that didn't meet any of those  
25 standards is not right. It's not what this Historic  
26 Preservation Commission is charged to do.

1           They are charged to really find the fine examples.  
2    And they put a terrific burden on a property owner when  
3    they designate something. And this property owner will  
4    accept that burden when those criteria are met such as they  
5    are on the south parcel.

6           But just to spread that out and paint it all with  
7    the same brush is not fair, and the questions that are  
8    raised about development, growth, no growth, they are not  
9    questions that go to the historic nature of the preceding.

10           And we would ask this Commission to apply those  
11    criteria with the great respect that I know you have for  
12    that criteria, and do what is right in terms of preserving  
13    what is right.

14           And I think Ms. Coronda has very carefully  
15    articulated the differences, and done a very good job in  
16    terms of real true research on the facts. And what we've  
17    heard tonight is conclusions not facts from others. And I  
18    don't doubt their sincerity, but this group has, the  
19    Historic Preservation Commission, has a great  
20    responsibility, and it puts a great burden on somebody who  
21    owns property.

22           And to put that burden on the south side where it  
23    meets those criteria is acceptable to this property owner.  
24    And that should be where it should stop. Thank you.

25           MR. FULLER: Thank you. Are there any other  
26    questions for the ownership group? Let's continue forward

1 with deliberations.

2 MS. MILES: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I have a  
3 question I would like to ask Clare. Excellent job, by the  
4 way, on your report. I learned a great deal from reading  
5 your presentation. Thank you.

6 Can you help me understand the things that  
7 changed, essentially, between the prior attempts to  
8 designate these properties and the current application?

9 MS. KELLY: Well, the Falkland Apartments were on  
10 the locational atlas originally, and they were evaluated in  
11 the early eighties. The Cupola building was designated in  
12 '85 and the rest of the Falklands were taken off the  
13 locational atlas at that time.

14 At that time, there was not the understanding of  
15 garden apartments and the garden apartment movement that  
16 there is now. Since 1985, there have been several studies  
17 of garden apartments that have been done, and also garden  
18 apartment complexes that have been designated on the  
19 national register.

20 So with this understanding of garden apartments,  
21 and also a study of Silver Spring subsequently, the Falkland  
22 Apartments were put back on the locational atlas. So that  
23 happened in 2003. So it was a combination of research that  
24 was done on the whole garden apartment phenomenon, and also  
25 research done specifically on Silver Spring, looking at,  
26 okay, there were several garden apartment complexes in

1 Silver Spring, and recognizing that Falklands was the  
2 earliest, the most comprehensive, and was put back on the  
3 locational atlas.

4 MS. MILES: Thank you.

5 MR. BURSTYN: I have questions for staff as well.  
6 First of all, I don't have a clear understanding of the  
7 impact of placing a property on the master plan. If this  
8 was a singular structure, I could deal with it, I think in  
9 my mind, a little easier.

10 But so therefore, in this case, when we have the  
11 designation of multi-structures, and in fact there was a  
12 good point made whether this should be a designated resource  
13 or a historic district. But I guess I would ask staff, what  
14 are the implications in the future of say if an entity above  
15 us, say the County Council, wish to approve some type of  
16 plan that would require the taking of one of the buildings  
17 of the, of the Falklands. Would the rest of it still be on  
18 the master plan? Or would it be just amended to show that  
19 one of the buildings is now gone? How would that be  
20 treated?

21 Do you have any idea? You may be speculating,  
22 because it may not have ever been, never happened before.  
23 But I don't know.

24 MS. KELLY: Well, if the Falkland Apartments were  
25 designated on the master plan, then a project that would  
26 affect one of the buildings or some of the buildings would

1 be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission. There  
2 are some groups that are above the Historic Preservation  
3 Commission, such as the federal government. And we are  
4 limited in our ~~reivew~~review of projects that are on the  
5 federal level.

6 But if it's a County project, if it's a project  
7 that's generated by the property owner or by the County, the  
8 Historic Preservation Commission reviews these projects. So  
9 we review Historic Area Work Permits for building permits  
10 that are required on projects. And we also review, as staff  
11 we review development plans to see how they affect  
12 designated historic sites. And as you know on the HPC you  
13 review these projects as well.

14 MR. BURSTYN: So if, in fact, a building was taken  
15 in the future, the remaining parcels would still be on the  
16 master plan as an historic site, right?

17 MS. KELLY: Right.

18 MR. BURSTYN: Okay. Just one other small point.  
19 I was looking at the June 5, '07 memo of the community based  
20 planning division chief, and that person's recommendation.  
21 And I was just wondering, when the Planning Board reviewed  
22 our decision and voted four to one on December the 6th to  
23 concur with our designation of the Falkland Apartments, were  
24 they privy to this June 5th memo? Was it in their packet,  
25 or did actually the chief of the community based planning  
26 division personally testify before the Park and Planning

1 Board? Do you know that?

2 MS. KELLY: No, there wasn't any testimony from  
3 community based planning, but the Board was aware of this  
4 memo, yes.

5 MR. BURSTYN: Thank you.

6 MR. FULLER: Clare, to follow on one of these  
7 comments of the alternative evaluations, your example of  
8 some of the up country properties, typically, when we are  
9 looking at farms and things like that is, you said there is  
10 sort of an alternative evaluation and we say certain things  
11 are outstanding or they are the primary resource and other  
12 things are not.

13 On this application as it is coming forward, there  
14 really is no distinction. There is no distinction as to  
15 either quality differences or view of quarters or things  
16 like that. Do I take it then from your report that your  
17 approach is that each of the buildings are equal, or is that  
18 something that you think simply based on the complexity of  
19 this that that would have to be identified as a second  
20 phase?

21 MS. KELLY: That is something we could do as a  
22 second phase, to actually go building by building. There  
23 might be, for example, some garages that were not built in  
24 the original time period, but we might want to look at as  
25 being from a different time period.

26 There might be some individual structures, as you

1 are saying, but as a whole the complex largely dates from  
2 the '36 to '38 period. But as typically as found with, you  
3 know, complexes of this size, I would imagine that there are  
4 buildings from outside that historic period. And that's  
5 certainly something we can look at in another phase or as  
6 part of this if the HPC, you know, chooses to direct that.

7 MR. FULLER: Other questions or comments for staff  
8 for deliberations?

9 MS. SEARS: What the Planning Board did was ask  
10 for the initiation of a master plan amendment. So they  
11 didn't designate the property. They've still got to take it  
12 up, and take it up in the next phase of this.

13 And so I don't think they anticipated, number one,  
14 determining at that juncture that there be a designation.  
15 They endorsed the filing, if you will, or initiation of a  
16 master plan amendment.

17 The other thing is that there was no discussion  
18 about a second phase of going through the property. I mean,  
19 this was about whether or not everything should be  
20 designated as a historic resource. And I think that's the  
21 posture it's really in.

22 MR. FULLER: Thank you.

23 MR. ROTENSTEIN: Mr. Chair, just to address that  
24 last comment, since I represented the Commission at that  
25 Planning Board meeting, the Planning Board did endorse the  
26 finding that the property did meet the criteria for

1 designation in the national plan for historic preservation,  
2 not simply addressing us to deal with an amendment. It  
3 actually did find that the property could meet the criteria.

4 MS. SEARS: It can't do that by law.

5 MR. ROTENSTEIN: But the members did state that  
6 they believed that it did meet the criteria for designation.

7 MS. ALDERSON: It's similar to an eligibility  
8 determination. It's a determination of eligibility on the  
9 register. It doesn't nominate it. It's preliminary.

10 I'd just like to add, you know, for the record,  
11 what my gut sense of the concept of complex versus district.

12 There is a clear distinction on our master plan between  
13 districts and complexes. Complexes generally have, you're  
14 right, a history of ownership, sometimes with uniformity,  
15 sometimes with not.

16 A farm parcel may have parts that were acquired  
17 over the years, parts that were dispensed with over the  
18 years. Particularly, though, where there is a complex that  
19 was under single ownership and was developed in a rather  
20 coherent way, it would make no sense to treat it as a  
21 district.

22 So while I would support it if it were the only  
23 option, it doesn't seem like the most logical one, and to be  
24 the principle reason in a district for creating two tiers  
25 would be where there are vastly differing resources of  
26 vastly different integrity.

1           And there may certainly be some resources that are  
2 less important, and to me, that's what we look at in a  
3 permit review when we are looking at trade offs for change.  
4 And that's an okay time to make those kinds of  
5 determinations.

6           MR. FLEMING: Could I get some clarification? The  
7 site now, apparently, is on the atlas, and one particular  
8 building is on the master plan.

9           MS. KELLY: That's correct.

10          MR. FLEMING: Okay. Got it.

11          MR. FULLER: Any other discussion? You've been  
12 quiet tonight.

13          MR. BURSTYN: I've appreciated all the testimony  
14 tonight, and it's given all of us, including those in the  
15 audience, I think, a lot of thought about how development  
16 proceeds in our large metropolitan area that we live in.

17           And I think I move, and we are all moved by the  
18 issue of affordable housing, of the ability to grow at a  
19 reasonable pace as our society becomes more complex. And  
20 there is a lot of issues like that, that we could discuss.

21           However, I'm reminded that our Commission is not  
22 concerned about affordable housing, or transportation  
23 projects in the future, or maximizing commercial real estate  
24 development. Our charge is historic preservation.

25           And in that regard, I think we are guided by the  
26 information from the U.S. Department of Interior, national

1 register, the history of the Falkland Apartments, the  
2 previous vote of the Planning Board. And because of that,  
3 from a pure historic perspective, I would vote to go forward  
4 to the Planning Board and vote in favor of the master plan  
5 designation.

6 MS. MILES: I would concur, looking at this solely  
7 as a question of whether or not the criteria are met, I  
8 believe that they are met. I believe that this is, indeed,  
9 one project, and I'm not persuaded that it is, you know,  
10 was multiple projects, but merely a typical staged  
11 development of one project. And I believe it does meet, in  
12 full, the criteria necessary to recommend designation.

13 MR. FULLER: Anybody else want to speak to  
14 comments before we -- before we ask for a motion? Does  
15 anybody else want to?

16 MR. DUFFY: Well, I have a number of comments that  
17 I'd like to make, and I'll be as brief as I can. I think  
18 this is a particularly important case, and it merits some  
19 depth.

20 I think Clare Kelly of the historic preservation  
21 section has well stated the historical significance of the  
22 Falkland Apartments. However, to me the main significance  
23 is that they are a particularly fine example of the garden  
24 apartment movement in terms of planning and design in a  
25 number of respects.

26 One, the siting and integration of the natural

1 landscape features into the courtyards and open space are  
2 very well done. The buildings are very well designed in  
3 their orientation to those courtyards. They very carefully  
4 and closely relate to them.

5 |           The architectural detailing, I think, is somewhat  
6 whimsical. I wouldn't say it's a master architect in my  
7 view, but I think it is very well done for this overall  
8 composition.

9           Perhaps most importantly, the north and south  
10 parcels have an important open space axis connecting them.  
11 It's formed by buildings on either side. It's consistent  
12 north and south. And in general, I think an excellent  
13 example of garden city or garden apartment design, it's an  
14 excellent environment, regardless. And the three parcels  
15 clearly constitute an integrated coherent whole, and they  
16 clearly meet the criteria for designation on the master  
17 plan. So I think we should vote to designate.

18           MS. ALDERSON: I would like to add just one  
19 thought to that. I think so too. There is not a, there's  
20 not such a sharp difference between one section and another  
21 to say that one completely abandoned the concept they are  
22 clearly integrated, and that the incremental difference of  
23 \$800, I mean, any building, you might have a time rising in  
24 one wing, a minor economizing. That wouldn't mean that that  
25 wing doesn't quality to be part of the rest of the building.

26           The one thought I would like to add is the idea of

1 diminished integrity because of additional paving. Forest  
2 Glen had been a very green property, still a green property,  
3 had some paving added over the years. We did not consider  
4 that reason to de-list it or not consider it not qualified.  
5 And in fact, the developer is removing the paving that was  
6 added later on, or a great deal of it, to restore it to its  
7 originally intended green state. And that's certainly a  
8 possibility here too.

9 MR. FULLER: Just to add my two cents, I guess.  
10 Personally, I'm a strong advocate of preservation and smart  
11 growth, and therefore I'm very glad that Ms. Sears pointed  
12 out the competing interest argument that is up to our staff  
13 to deal with. What we're really looking at is the historic  
14 aspect of the property. And from my perspective, I think  
15 it's clear that the property does warrant designation.

16 I don't disagree that there are differences within  
17 the properties, but I can't see from what I have seen or  
18 from what's presented tonight, a strong distinction between  
19 north and south, or strong enough distinction between north  
20 and south to say that one should and one shouldn't be.

21 I do think there are differences within some of  
22 the buildings, and I think as this moves forward that one  
23 thing staff should be doing is coming up with some kind of  
24 an evaluation matrix of the 44 buildings that are out there,  
25 because I do not believe them all to be equal.

26 But with that, from my perspective, I think what I

1 would like to be doing is asking for a motion regarding a  
2 recommendation. This is not a motion for --

3 MR. ROTENSTEIN: Mr. Chair, I move that we  
4 recommend to the Planning Commission that the amendment to  
5 the master plan for historic preservation for the Falkland  
6 Apartments move forward with our recommendation that it does  
7 meet the criteria for designation in the master plan.

8 MR. FULLER: Is there a second?

9 MR. FLEMING: I second.

10 MR. FULLER: Any further discussion? All in  
11 favor? It passes unanimously. Thank you. I appreciate you  
12 coming out tonight.

13 Okay. We're down to the minutes portion of our  
14 agenda. We're looking at the minutes for January 23rd.  
15 Were those ones that you did, or did you do the 13th?

16 MR. ROTENSTEIN: I did February 13th.

17 MR. FULLER: Who did the 23rd?

18 MR. WHIPPLE: I don't have them with me. I don't  
19 know who did them. I know that they were done.

20 MS. MILES: I did do one recently, but I feel like  
21 it was weeks ago. I don't remember what date it was.

22 MR. WHIPPLE: They have been returned corrected to  
23 our office.

24 MR. FULLER: Can we make a motion to approve them  
25 based on the corrections that were provided to staff? And  
26 Dave, you're okay with the corrections you made on the --

1           MR. ROTENSTEIN: Right, I read the minutes from  
2 February 13th, 2008, submitted corrections to staff, copied  
3 the chair, and if the chair is willing to entertain a  
4 motion, I move that we --

5           MR. FULLER: Yes.

6           MR. ROTENSTEIN: -- approve the minutes for  
7 January 23rd, and for February 13th, 2008.

8           MR. FULLER: Second, somebody?

9           MS. MILES: Second.

10          MR. FULLER: They were approved. Other business.  
11 Commission items? Any Commission items? I want to thank  
12 Scott again for the worksession. I think that worked out  
13 very nicely. The facility was great. The food wasn't quite  
14 as good as the first time, but hey. But seriously, it was  
15 well done. I appreciate that. Staff items? As you are the  
16 only staff member, meeting adjourned.

17                   (Whereupon, at 10:08 p.m., the meeting was  
18 concluded.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

√ Digitally signed by Teresa S. Hinds

ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATE

DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the foregoing pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Teresa S. Hinds". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "T" and "S".

Teresa S. Hinds

3/04/08