

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD

HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

CASE NUMBER 91-05

Washington, D.C.

Thursday, November 1, 2007

PARTICIPANTS:

Board Members:

TERSCH BOASBERG, Chairman
ANDREW AURBACH
DENISE JOHNSON
ANNE LEWIS
ROBERT SONDERMAN
JOHN VLACH

Witnesses:

TOM BOWER
RICHARD BUSCH
STYLIANOS CHRISTOFIDES
BENJAMIN FORGEY
DAVID ALAN GRIER
GEORGE R. KEYS
DARROW KIRKPATRICK
RICHARD LONGSTRETH
TERRANCE LYNCH
BOB MEEHAN
REBECCA MILLER
WHAYNE QUIN

* * * * *

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (10:20 a.m.)

3 MR. BOASBERG: Good afternoon,
4 ladies and gentlemen. Actually, it's not
5 afternoon, it's still morning. It feels like
6 afternoon, but it's just morning. This is
7 the continuation of the October meeting of
8 the D.C. Historic Preservation Review Board.

9 Mr. Quin, let me ask if -- and I
10 also want to see if there's -- is there a
11 representative of the Committee of 100 here?
12 Okay, Mr. Longstreth.

13 Is there a representative of DCPL
14 here? Okay, Ms. Miller.

15 I just want to talk a little bit
16 about procedure today. I know that there was
17 a late staff report, and that it didn't come
18 out until yesterday.

19 And I think it reflects in many
20 ways the delicacy and difficultness of the
21 situation and of the case, which presents
22 quite a few problems in the historic

1 preservation field and in our own as well.
2 And I think that's why it took so long to
3 resolve.

4 I do feel that we want to give
5 everyone a chance to adequately reply to
6 that. And I think also that the Board wants
7 to do a site visit so that the Board can
8 visit the complex and see for themselves,
9 which I think is always important in a case
10 of this magnitude.

11 So I'm going to keep the record
12 open. And we're pretty flexible here in
13 terms of when that should be. I know there
14 are constraints in terms of time, but I want
15 to make sure that everything is done
16 properly.

17 So Mr. Quin, I'll just give you a
18 chance to say anything that you would like to
19 see in a procedural way and then we'll
20 address it.

21 MR. QUIN: Yes. As you know, we've
22 had about 24 hours to respond, and the two

1 owners have not had the opportunity to truly
2 analyze that and respond to it. I don't
3 think we would really just want to have the
4 record open for a written filing. I think
5 it's very important, and I think the rules
6 contemplated that you have five days -- or at
7 least five days for the report -- so that you
8 can then appear before the Board. So we
9 would like to have that opportunity.

10 You do have a hearing set for the
11 15th. If we can proceed today and get most
12 of everything out of the way in terms of the
13 responses to the application, maybe that
14 could be a very short presentation. I don't
15 want to constrain our clients, but I think
16 that the goal would be to try to move this
17 thing along because there's a time crunch.

18 The other procedural matter, which
19 is separate and distinct, and I don't know
20 how you deal with it at this point, is that
21 the Applicants for the designation have not
22 filed and have not complied with the rules as

1 to the witness list. We surmised that there
2 will be at least one witness, but there's
3 noncompliance with that, and I just don't
4 know how you deal with that.

5 MR. BOASBERG: Okay.

6 MR. QUIN: It's to our prejudice in
7 some way because we don't know what they
8 would say.

9 MR. BOASBERG: Sure.

10 MR. QUIN: Or there's no filing for
11 that.

12 MR. BOASBERG: Sure, okay. Let me
13 just ask. Committee of 100 and DCPL, any
14 response?

15 You have to identify yourself for
16 the record, and just speak right into the
17 mic.

18 MR. LONGSTRETH: Richard Longstreth
19 for Committee of 100. I did not ask any
20 witnesses to appear on our behalf.

21 MR. BOASBERG: Ms. Miller, anything
22 that you wish to add?

1 MS. MILLER: We were approached by
2 several different people, but -- and we just
3 gave them the date and time of this hearing.
4 We did not ask anyone in particular to
5 appear.

6 MR. BOASBERG: Okay. Let's --

7 MR. QUIN: I'm sorry, just to be
8 complete, and this is just maybe a nitpick,
9 but a witness list includes the person that's
10 going to testify on behalf of the Applicant.
11 That's what normally you file, and that was
12 not filed in this case.

13 MR. BOASBERG: Okay, we're --

14 MS. MILLER: Mr. Boasberg,
15 I -- with the many times that the DCPL has
16 presented before the HPRB, we have never
17 supplied a witness list, and we're not aware
18 of that.

19 MR. BOASBERG: Well, we are, as I
20 say, not a court of record. And as an
21 administrative agency, we will sort of take
22 all of that into consideration, but people

1 have ample time to respond.

2 Mr. Quin, I think your request is
3 reasonable. So let me see how things go
4 today.

5 And we know we're going to keep the
6 record open, and I am hopeful that we might
7 even encourage, if possible, some kind of
8 settlement if that's possible. It may not
9 be, but if it's possible. So I will do all I
10 can to do that. So at least there will be
11 some additional chance that you will have to
12 orally present, as well as any documents, and
13 we'll set a date at the end of the hearing
14 for that.

15 Okay?

16 MR. QUIN: Thank you.

17 MR. BOASBERG: In terms of
18 proceeding today, first of all, let me
19 welcome everyone here. I know many of you
20 are not regulars, like Mr. Quin or
21 Ms. Miller, Prof. Longstreth. And this is an
22 informal body. We are an administrative

1 agency. We would like you to relax as much
2 as possible. We know the issues are
3 emotional. We know they're also financial.
4 They may be spiritual.

5 We will try our best to take all of
6 those matters into account. But we're mainly
7 an architectural review board, and that's
8 going to be our main focus is on
9 architectural history and the criteria which
10 is enunciated in our statute and in our
11 regulations for landmarking. As I say, we
12 won't make a decision on that today.

13 We want to give everybody a chance
14 to talk. We understand the issues are
15 complex. We understand that the issues go
16 beyond those on the written page. We
17 understand that these issues are felt keenly
18 on both sides. We understand there's
19 probably not a right or a wrong answer in
20 this. So we will do the best we can to carry
21 out our mandate, which is to make a decision
22 as to whether or not we feel the complex

1 should be a D.C. landmark.

2 And with that, we've allotted a
3 certain amount of time, but I don't
4 want -- again, you to feel rushed. We will
5 leave it open as much as we can.

6 And having said that, I would like
7 to start with the Applicant and have the
8 Applicant present the case. I would then
9 like to turn to the owner and have the owner
10 present his case/her case, and any
11 other -- the Church, certainly, to present
12 their case, and then any members of the
13 audience who have come here to testify either
14 in favor or in opposition.

15 And then I will ask our esteemed
16 staff reviewer, Mr. Dennee, to summarize his
17 staff report orally for the Board, fairly
18 briefly. Because since we probably will come
19 back, I will also call upon you, Mr. Dennee,
20 at that time, after we've had a chance to
21 hear everyone.

22 Let me also acknowledge that the

1 case -- the landmark application's been
2 pending for some time. We're certainly aware
3 of that. There's been a lot of thought that
4 has gone into this whole complex on both
5 sides, and I really appreciate all of the
6 work that has been done.

7 I especially want to salute David
8 Maloney, who's leaving the room in an
9 outburst of modesty, for the work that he's
10 done in trying to work with the parties.
11 There is no one more objective or fair than
12 David Maloney. And he has just been made our
13 state historic preservation officer, which is
14 a well-deserved tribute of his ability and
15 independence and integrity. And I'm glad
16 that he is sort of leading this case with Tim
17 Dennee, who has been extraordinary.

18 So thank you.

19 Prof. Longstreth, if you'll
20 introduce yourself. Anyone who's going to
21 testify, they need to fill out a witness
22 card. The witness cards are at the front of

1 the table, and hand it to our court reporter
2 so we can just identify your voice. The
3 testimony is being recorded and there's also
4 a videotape being made. And I've never
5 figured out what happens to those videotapes,
6 but I guess they're around, but I've never
7 seen one. Anyway, supposedly, there's a
8 videotape being made, so be on your best
9 behavior.

10 Prof. Longstreth?

11 MR. LONGSTRETH: Mr. Chairman,
12 members of the Board, it's been some time
13 since I've last appeared before you. It is
14 always a pleasure. I'm representing the
15 Committee of 100 on the Federal City, which
16 with the D.C. Preservation League submitted
17 this nomination a number of years ago. That
18 was done out of what was at that point a very
19 real fear that the building would be lost
20 unless such an application was submitted.

21 We indicated at that point, and
22 have indicated ever since our willingness to

1 sit down with all parties and discuss the
2 issues and to try and seek a resolution to
3 the fullest degree of all of our abilities.
4 We reiterated that when meeting with the
5 developers and representatives of the Church
6 in the last couple of days, and so we
7 proceed.

8 Before I begin my testimony, I
9 should add that in the early 1990s, for I
10 think rather obvious reasons, the consultant
11 who we hired to prepare this nomination in
12 terms of the church history itself had access
13 to secondary sources, not the primary sources
14 that are available in the church archives.

15 And in response to the Third
16 Church's response to the application for
17 historic landmark designation of structures
18 at 16th and I Streets, NW, a communique dated
19 the 6th of October of this year, which I
20 think everybody involved has a copy of, the
21 first claim, "The Third Church building is an
22 important example of a national church

1 movement," and there is an extensive rebuttal
2 to that.

3 And then several pages later, a
4 second claim that "the two buildings at 16th
5 and I Streets were constructed as part of a
6 centennial celebration and are of symbolic
7 importance," and again, an extensive rebuttal
8 based on primary sources for that.

9 I think we are not here to in any
10 way, shape, or form to argue with the Church
11 about its own history. And I think our
12 inclination is to support the suggestion in
13 the staff report that those components of the
14 nomination not go forward.

15 That much said, I would like to
16 focus on the aspects of this complex that
17 rallied us to come to its aid some over 15
18 years ago, and still do so today.

19 Let me ask, is there a way to dim
20 the lights in this room so folks can see?

21 MR. BOASBERG: We have a Ph.D. who
22 performs that task very well. Thank you.

1 MR. LONGSTRETH: Designed in
2 1967-'68 and constructed over the next three
3 years, the Third Church of Christ, Scientist,
4 and the Christian Science Monitor Building of
5 16th and I Streets, NW, constitute a complex
6 of extraordinary architectural distinction
7 for Washington, D.C. -- a design that is
8 unusually rich in the development of form,
9 detail, materials, and space.

10 It was the creation of I.M. Pei &
11 Partners, one of the nation's most prominent
12 architectural firms of the second half of the
13 20th century. Although less well-known
14 nationally, and even locally, than the Pei
15 firm's more or less contemporary East Wing of
16 the National Gallery of Art, the church
17 complex evinces that same kind of
18 sophistication and refinement -- a cool
19 monumentality that nonetheless engages the
20 human scale, with bold, sculptural
21 abstraction that also speaks to the environs
22 comprised of older, classical and

1 classicizing buildings, a textural richness
2 that is imbued with precision.

3 While the Pei firm's work of the
4 1960s and early 1970s exhibits a clear house
5 style, considerable variety in expression can
6 be found as well. This range is due in part
7 to the personalities of the senior design
8 partners -- then Pei, Henry Cobb, and Araldo
9 Cossutta -- each of whom had charge of his
10 own projects.

11 But differences, too, came in
12 response to a variety of programmatic
13 circumstances ranging from the nature of a
14 site to the demands of symbolic and
15 utilitarian functions, as evidenced in the
16 National Center for Atmospheric Research in
17 Boulder, on the left, of '61-'67, and the
18 Rogers Memorial Library in Columbia, Indiana,
19 of '63-'69, both of which had Pei as the
20 partner-in-charge.

21 The constraints and opportunities
22 of a narrow, corner site in a prime, downtown

1 location, as well as the two fundamentally
2 different demands of quarters of the Third
3 Church and office of the Monitor were key to
4 the design of a Washington complex.

5 Visually, the church building
6 appropriates the corner of a property and the
7 public land beyond, its octagonal form
8 enhancing its sense of centrality and command
9 of the environs as a freestanding object. It
10 is in this urbanistic role no less than the
11 fundamental form and scale that Cossutta
12 adopted from the Romanesque Baptistery in
13 Florence, itself a quintessentially urban
14 statement in a tight public space, which
15 served as a conceptual springboard for the
16 strong, geometric mass he gave to the church.

17 One might add a correspondence
18 exists, too, in the linearity of wall
19 surface, although Cossutta, like other
20 modernists of his and the previous
21 generations, almost always drew from the past
22 obliquely, interpreting it with a vocabulary

1 that seemed entirely of the present. The
2 massiveness of the church building is
3 underscored by the dearth of openings in or
4 protrusions from its sheer walls. Far from
5 being unrelieved, however, these surfaces are
6 rich with the texture of a highly crafted
7 formwork as well as whale remnants and
8 expansion joint of reinforced concrete walls.
9 The ribbon windows of the Monitor building
10 further the sense of surface linearity, while
11 also affording an arresting contrast as
12 nearly unbroken, banded voids.

13 Church building and office building
14 form an integral whole. Established in part
15 by a uniformity of materials and
16 construction, but also the dialogue of their
17 dissimilarities in form and character, a
18 relationship underscored by the principal
19 elevations of each component facing the other
20 in counterpoint. The triangular, landscaped
21 green set between them also fosters this
22 sense of wholeness through contrast. Its

1 configuration bifurcates the two components
2 rather than typing them together. When seen
3 in plan, this play of elemental geometric
4 shapes -- octagon, triangle, and rectangle,
5 none of which is aligned to the
6 other -- recalls the then-radical studies in
7 abstract form painted by the Bauhaus faculty
8 during the 1920s, most specifically those of
9 Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, such as "Composition
10 Axx," which you see on the right.

11 A play of opposites in form and
12 space was sometimes used to create a sense of
13 dynamic tension in complexes by the firm, as
14 with Cobbs Academic Center at SUNY Fredonia
15 of '62-'70. At the church complex, however,
16 opposition charges the two major components
17 with a formalizing strength that enhances
18 their prominence amid a dense urban setting
19 comprised of numerous larger buildings.

20 The church complex is in reality a
21 single construction, with two above-ground
22 components joined below grade with service

1 spaces for utilities and storage. Their
2 separation and distinct visual identities in
3 the public sphere not only underscore their
4 fundamentally different purposes, those
5 dualities enhance the progression of space
6 inside the church building.

7 The glazed entry enunciates the
8 sharp contrast between indoors and out. From
9 the lobby that is at once capacious and
10 cavernous, stairs entered on either side, at
11 the buildings perimeter, up through the
12 narrow, tall, sky-lit shafts of worship
13 space. The contrasts in this sequence are
14 abrupt, imparting along the way an aura of
15 mystery, then majesty.

16 Configured in the more or less
17 square meetinghouse form, with a large
18 U-shaped gallery, the worship space is at
19 once grand and tranquil, solemn and
20 embracing, internalizing and spiritually
21 uplifting.

22 Flooded with light filtered from

1 above through the peripheral shafts, the
2 space is a true sanctuary, apart from the
3 world -- a place of solitude, of quiet
4 dignity conducive to reflection, but also a
5 place of gathering, of community, of
6 regeneration.

7 According to Cossutta, his client
8 had no predisposition toward specific spatial
9 arrangements. The solution was developed to
10 impact a sense of intimacy for a small
11 congregation. At the same time, since the
12 1920s, many of the denominations churches
13 employed the meetinghouse arrangement in
14 various forms, the simplicity and New England
15 origins of its 18th century prototypes held
16 as desirable associations.

17 The centralized mass of sheer,
18 reinforced concrete walls, the "rear" entry
19 via a plaza and away from the streets that
20 define two of its boundaries, the cavernous
21 lobby, the narrow, ascending paths of entry
22 opening into a dramatic, embracing, top-lit

1 worship space all recall one of the icons of
2 modern architecture and 20th century
3 religious buildings, Frank Lloyd Wright's
4 Unity Temple at Oak Park, Illinois, of
5 1905-'08.

6 Cossutta greatly admired this
7 building and its architect, believing that
8 the configuration was optimal for the kind of
9 worship space he desired in Washington.
10 Unity Temple was not an overt model, however.
11 Cossutta indicated that it was likely in the
12 back of his mind as the designs
13 conceptualization and development progressed.

14 The similarities, he maintained,
15 were by no means coincidental. At the same
16 time, his vocabulary is wholly different.
17 The scale and simplicity of his space evoke a
18 rational clarity and a monumentality that is
19 quite unlike the complex, embellished
20 intricacies of Wright.

21 The church building's character was
22 intended to be consonant with the

1 spirituality of the congregation it was to
2 house, but also was consistent with that of a
3 number of other institutional as well as
4 civic projects by the firm, as seen in Pei's
5 Municipal Administration Building in Dallas
6 of 1966-'67, on the right.

7 Like much of the firm's work, too,
8 the church complex is superbly related to its
9 physical context and fulfills the
10 congregation's desire at that time of having
11 a building that would be befitting of its
12 important site two blocks from the White
13 House, while in nearly all of its particular
14 aspects, the design affords a contrast to
15 many nearby buildings on 16th Street, most of
16 them constructed during the four previous
17 decades.

18 That contrast is manipulated to
19 enhance the richness of a streetscape, but
20 not to counter it. It is more than color and
21 mass that make the complex compatible with
22 its neighbors, it is a grasp of the range in

1 form and scale of the ensemble and a capacity
2 to work in concert with the spectrum absent
3 any overt kind of reiteration of fundamental
4 components in its design.

5 Pei also achieved this equilibrium
6 with consummate eloquence in relating the
7 East Wing to its grand classical neighbors in
8 the Federal Triangle and on the Mall, most
9 specifically to the main block of the National
10 Gallery, with sharply contrasting sequences
11 of expansive mural wall surfaces, accentuated
12 by sharp breaks in form and in intricate
13 detail.

14 Pei set the stage for such
15 contextualism with his Society Hill Towers in
16 Philadelphia of 1960-'64, designed as a
17 centerpiece of an urban renewal project that
18 was then unique in retaining a major portion
19 of the existing fabric. Pei not only used
20 the multi-paned windows that pervaded the
21 late 18th and early 19th century houses that
22 were the object of the projects' retrieval as

1 a leitmotif for his exteriors, he massed the
2 buildings as grand, classicizing piers that
3 were antithetical to the slab form then
4 prevalent for high-rise residential
5 buildings.

6 Born in the former Yugoslavia,
7 trained at the Ecole de Beaux Arts, and
8 apprenticed to Le Corbusier in Paris,
9 Cossutta joined Pei's firm in 1956, a year
10 after it was organized. He became a partner
11 in 1963, remaining with the office for
12 another decade. Cossutta's participation
13 began to exert a significant influence on the
14 firm's work at an early stage.

15 Both Pei and Cobb were products of
16 Harvard's Graduate School of Design,
17 completing their work in 1946 and 1949,
18 respectively. Both were partial to the
19 minimalism of a curtain wall expressing steel
20 frame construction, as advocated by their
21 teacher Walter Gropius and most eloquently
22 advanced by Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, as is

1 well evident in Pei's Mile High Center in
2 Denver as 1954-'56 and Cobb's Place Ville
3 Ste. Marie in Montreal in 1955-'62.

4 Cossutta was also a GSD product,
5 graduating in 1952, but his European
6 background, and especially his exposure to Le
7 Corbusier, whose Unite d'Habitation in
8 Marseilles of 1946-'52 you see here, made him
9 especially partial to the use of concrete to
10 create a weighty sense of mass in bold,
11 sculptural forms. The presence of these two
12 differing approaches to modernism led to a
13 synthesizing tendency for which the Pei firm
14 gained much of its reputation.

15 Well before he assumed partner
16 status, Cossutta had charge of major projects
17 in which the amalgam of the two spheres was
18 clearly expressed, most notably with the
19 Denver Hilton for William Zeckendorf of
20 1958-'60 on the left, and the Green Earth
21 Sciences Building at MIT of '59-'64 on the
22 right. that dual character remained evidence

1 in Cossutta's work at L'Enfant Plaza begun in
2 the early 1960s, maturing to a more original
3 style within a few years, notably with the
4 major additions to the Christian Science
5 Center in Boston, which you see on the right.
6 The impact on Pei and, to a lesser degree, on
7 Cobb and the others in the office is evident
8 in the schemes you have seen from
9 Philadelphia to Boulder, Columbus, and
10 Fredonia, among other examples.

11 The Pei office has had significant
12 ties to Washington since its earliest stages
13 as in-house designers for Zeckendorfs Webb
14 and Knapp -- here the Zeckendorf Plan for the
15 Southwest redevelopment area, the initial
16 plan of '53-'54 -- to the recently completed
17 Air Force Memorial in Arlington. The array
18 of projects range from Town Center Plaza of
19 '60-'62 in the Southwest, still reflecting a
20 penchant for Miesian transparency, to a much
21 later, historicizing Holocaust Memorial
22 Museum of '86-'93 and the Ronald Reagan

1 Building of '94-'98. Surveying this
2 extensive record, the church complex
3 certainly ranks as a significant work during
4 the period when the firm was attracting
5 widespread national and international
6 attention.

7 The church complex also fares well
8 when compared with contemporary Washington
9 buildings of a somewhat similar genre,
10 emphasizing corporeality with massive forms,
11 and often in exposed reinforced concrete.
12 The federal government was a major generator
13 of this sort of work, with the General
14 Services Administration's responding to Pres.
15 Kennedy's call for excellence in federal
16 building design by commissioning a number of
17 the nation's most prominent architects: here
18 Marcel Breuer's buildings for the departments
19 of Housing and Urban Development of '63-'69,
20 and Health and Human Services of a decade
21 later; or the Forrestal Building by Curtis &
22 Davis of '63-'66, and the Hoover Building of

1 C.F. Murphy & Associates of '69-'72; or the
2 Smithsonian's Hirshhorn Museum by Gordon
3 Bunshaft of SOM, '66-'74, and Air and Space
4 Museum by Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum of
5 1972-76.

6 The private sector contributed as
7 well, perhaps most conspicuously and in the
8 most prickly of fashions at Georgetown
9 University's Lavinger Library by John Car
10 Warnecke of '68-'70, and most eloquently in a
11 wonderfully low-key manner with Keyes,
12 Lethbridge & Condon's Sunderland Building of
13 1966-'69.

14 The church complex should also be
15 considered as part of the impressive array of
16 religious edifices along 16th Street, NW,
17 beginning at the avenue's southern end with
18 St. John's Episcopal Church, constructed in
19 the 1810s, with major additions from the
20 1880s, on the left. The most intense church
21 building activity along this corridor
22 occurred from the turn of the 20th century

1 through the 1920s with work of historicizing
2 character: here the Swedenborgian Church of
3 the Holy City of '94-'95, or the Universalist
4 National Memorial Church of '28; the First
5 Baptist Church, erected, quite remarkably,
6 after World War II still in a modern Gothic
7 manner; All Souls Church of '23-'24; and what
8 was originally the Mount Pleasant Methodist
9 Episcopal Church of '27-'28.

10 Northern sections of 16th Street
11 include newer houses of worship, such as the
12 Ohev Shalom, Talmud Torah Congregation of
13 '58-'60, on the left. Among modernist
14 religious properties of the post-World War II
15 era in Washington, the Third Church and
16 Monitor office building really have no
17 comparisons. Most examples are oriented to
18 in-town or outlying neighborhoods, such as
19 Christ Church on Massachusetts Avenue of
20 '64-'67, which you see on the right, and were
21 designed along entirely different parameters.

22 None approaches the exceptional

1 high-art attributes with which the Christian
2 Science Church complex is imbued. This is
3 not in any way to extent a qualitative
4 judgment, only to underscore basic
5 differences.

6 The complex does, however, merit
7 comparison with a number of modernist
8 churches in other parts of the country that
9 were celebrated in their time by both
10 architectural and liturgical presses, such as
11 Breuer's St. Francis de Sales in Muskegon,
12 Michigan, of '64-'67, or St. John's Abbey in
13 Collegeville, Minnesota, on the right, of
14 '58-'61.

15 Breuer's characteristically
16 inventive and muscular use of reinforced
17 concrete structure as a basis for expression
18 was counterpointed by others who explored the
19 potential for the thin-shelled concrete
20 construction to define both form and worship
21 space, as with HOK's Benedictine Priory
22 mystical on the interior was used with

1 unusual aplomb by Eero Saarinen in the North
2 Christian Church in Columbus, Indiana, of
3 '58-'64.

4 While a comprehensive and detailed
5 analysis of modern religious architecture in
6 the U.S. has yet to be written, or anything
7 approaching it has yet to be written, we know
8 enough to see that the Third Church complex
9 is distinguished in an original and indeed
10 highly singular design, certainly at the
11 local level, but arguably, too, at the
12 national level.

13 Unlike most of the prominent
14 examples of the period, it eschews structural
15 exhibitionism, inside and out, for a more
16 reserved, but not less vibrant, manipulation
17 of form that at once emphasizes mass and
18 surface. It offers lyrical response to its
19 program and to its setting. It offers homage
20 to tradition while being of a thoroughly
21 modern cast. Yet unlike so many buildings of
22 its era, this one has not been reduced to the

1 ranks of a period piece in retrospective
2 view. It's many attributes are intrinsic;
3 they transcend time and place. This is a
4 design that will likely foster awe,
5 wonderment, inspiration, and spirituality for
6 generations to come.

7 In certain respects, it parallels
8 another Christian Science Church, one that
9 likewise was unorthodox in its time and
10 received almost no publicity. That church,
11 in Berkeley, California, designed by Bernard
12 Maybeck nearly a century ago, remained an
13 inconnu for decades. Only in the mid-20th
14 century did its exceptional qualities come to
15 be recognized beyond a small circle of
16 admirers. Now it is appreciated
17 internationally as one of the great works of
18 20th century architecture.

19 Whether the Third Church complex
20 will someday attain comparable rank is beside
21 the point.

22 Its design is of a caliber that

1 will make it an enduring monument to the
2 human faith in God and the extraordinary
3 power with which that faith can be expressed.
4 It will not be an easy building to maintain,
5 but its many exceptional attributes warrant
6 our every effort to ensure that they can be
7 appreciated for future generations.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. BOASBERG: Thank you very much,
10 Prof. Longstreth. That was extremely
11 informative.

12 What I'd like to do is save our
13 questions and get the bulk of the
14 presentation done. And I think now would be
15 a good time for the owners. Is there
16 anything else that you wanted to add? Okay.

17 I think now would be a good time
18 for the owners to present their case and then
19 we'll have the audience, ANCs, and so forth
20 present.

21 So Mr. Quin, whatever you'd like to
22 orchestrate here.

1 SPEAKER: You need lights?

2 MR. BOASBERG: Yeah, we can do
3 lights? Are we going to do more slides? No.
4 Okay.

5 If anyone's going to testify, if
6 you fill out a card so that you can give it
7 to our court reporter.

8 Who would like to proceed?

9 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: Good morning,
10 everyone, and thank you very much. We don't
11 have a presentation. We've already filled
12 out all the cards, yes, and handed them in.

13 My name is Stylianos Christofides,
14 and I'm a principal of ICG Properties. And
15 I'm joined here at the table by my colleague
16 David Stern, who's also a principal with ICB
17 Properties. We are the owners of what is
18 known as Square 185, Lot 41, located at the
19 corner of 16th and I streets, NW.

20 That is also recognized as an
21 office building known as "the Monitor
22 building," 910 16th Street, and the Third

1 Church of Christ, Scientist.

2 Just to clarify the ownership, the
3 structure of the properties in question is
4 the following: ICG owns the Monitor building
5 and land of the entire site, and Third Church
6 actually owns the octagonal structure, the
7 octagonal form that resides in the corner.
8 ICG also owns the adjacent building at 1600 K
9 Street.

10 Let me take a few minutes just to
11 introduce the firm to you. ICG Properties is
12 an award-winning local real estate
13 development firm that was established in
14 1995. We develop and own almost exclusively
15 urban properties in Washington, D.C., many of
16 which have been recognized for architectural
17 excellence and their sensitivity to historic
18 preservation. Of particular relevance to
19 today's proceedings is that we were the
20 co-developer and majority owner of the Gallup
21 Building, an award-winning project recognized
22 for its successful preservation and adaptive

1 reuse of the 130-year-old Masonic Temple
2 located at the corner of 9th and F streets.

3 Similarly, our conceptual design
4 for Takoma Walk, a mixed-used project in the
5 Takoma Park Historic District, has won
6 numerous AIA awards. Also, our successful
7 renovation and conversion to residential
8 units of the Kingsbury School in Kalorama was
9 accomplished in partnership with the
10 Sheridan-Kalorama Historical Association, the
11 Sheridan-Kalorama ANC, and HPRB. We have a
12 sincere respect for sound preservation
13 policies and promote preservation of worthy
14 examples of our capitals architectural
15 heritage.

16 ICG Properties acquired the Monitor
17 building and land from First Church of
18 Christ, Scientist, in Boston in March of this
19 year in competition against some of the major
20 national firms attracted to the Washington
21 real estate market. Our success in
22 purchasing the property reflects, we believe,

1 the fact that we are a local firm, willing
2 from the outset to use our ownership of the
3 adjacent 1600 K Street to create the
4 opportunity for Third Church to remain in
5 their property comfortably. Indeed, common
6 ownership of these properties creates
7 opportunities for the 16th Street
8 neighborhood, Third Church, Washington, D.C.,
9 and ourselves, which have not existed in a
10 long time and are very unlikely to exist
11 again.

12 The property was proposed for
13 landmark designation in 1991, a mere 19 years
14 after its construction, and has since been
15 subject to a pending landmark application for
16 a total of 16 years, almost half its life.
17 This pending landmark designation has been a
18 burden to the owners making their property
19 more costly to maintain, difficult to use,
20 and potentially resulting in very significant
21 financial loss. It is important to note that
22 although the site is included in the

1 extension of the 16th Street Historic
2 District, it is recognized as
3 non-contributing.

4 In preparation for this hearing we
5 selected architectural historian Emily Eig of
6 Traceries to undertake an analysis of the
7 landmark application that has been pending
8 for the past 16 years. Traceries spent the
9 better part of two months researching and
10 evaluating the arguments made in the
11 application in favor of landmark designation.

12 This research included a review of
13 files maintained by Third Church dating back
14 to the project's initial conception and
15 face-to-face interviews with Third Church
16 members and Araldo Cossutta, the project's
17 architect. What Traceries discovered truly
18 surprised us.

19 We have submitted the Traceries
20 memo into record and encourage you to review
21 it in detail, and have also brought copies
22 which I think have just been given to you for

1 your convenience. However, given today's
2 time constraints, I just want to summarize on
3 the main points made by the memo.

4 The application rests its case on
5 four assertions, all of which are inaccurate.
6 It states that the Third Church project was
7 constructed as part of the National Church
8 Movement. This has been proven to be false
9 by both available documentation and the very
10 nature of Third Church as a local church. As
11 you see here, the church is present and they
12 will elaborate on that particular point.

13 The application attempts to
14 establish a connection between Christian
15 Science theology and the architecture of
16 Third Church. From historical records, Third
17 Church's testimony, and the testimony of the
18 architect himself, it is clear that not such
19 relationship exists.

20 The application also asserts that
21 I.M. Pei was personally involved in the
22 church project. Cossutta, the architect, has

1 refuted that that was the case. During his
2 interview he even questioned whether Mr. Pei
3 ever visited the site.

4 Finally, the application makes
5 statements regarding the original design,
6 intent, and style of the project which are
7 incorrect, describing the design as
8 "Brutalist." The architect himself,
9 Mr. Cossutta, refutes the Applicant's
10 assertions as to the style of church and
11 Monitor building and the architectural school
12 to which they belong.

13 I would like to quote just some
14 findings from the memo, if I may. "The
15 application inaccurately cites ownership of
16 the properties, mistakenly links the building
17 campaign with the National Church Movement,
18 misrepresents the relationship between
19 Christian Science theology and architecture,
20 incorrectly associates the buildings directly
21 with I.M. Pei, and misunderstands the style
22 and design. In addition, an examination of

1 the sources in the bibliography of the
2 application reveals that more than a quarter
3 of those listed have no relevance to the
4 history or significance of the properties.
5 Thus, there is sufficient confusion and error
6 as to a number of fundamental facts in the
7 application. Therefore, landmark designation
8 on the basis of this application would be
9 inconsistent with D.C. Historic Preservation
10 regulations."

11 In conclusion, based on the
12 numerous and serious errors in the
13 application itself, the fact that the
14 properties already lie within an historic
15 district which gives HPRB review
16 jurisdiction, and the burden designation
17 would place on the owners, we formally object
18 to the application for designation of Square
19 185, Lot 41, as an historic landmark.

20 We thank you for your time. And at
21 this point, I would like to actually
22 introduce Mr. David Grier of Third Church,

1 also owners who will actually elaborate on
2 the subject.

3 MR. BOASBERG: All right. Let me
4 just ask a question. I'm still a little
5 confused on the ownership. The Third Church
6 owns the building, the church building
7 itself? It is the owner of that building?

8 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: That is correct,
9 sir.

10 MR. BOASBERG: It doesn't own the
11 land underneath it or any other parts of the
12 complex?

13 MR. BOASBERG: That is correct.

14 MR. BOASBERG: But it does own that
15 building itself?

16 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: That is correct.

17 MR. BOASBERG: Okay.

18 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: And that's
19 basically an ownership relationship that has
20 been mirrored since the original inception of
21 the church.

22 MR. BOASBERG: Okay, thank you.

1 Its Mr. Christofises?

2 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: Christofides.

3 MR. BOASBERG: Christofides.

4 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: Yes.

5 MR. BOASBERG: I got the accent
6 wrong.

7 Mr. Grier?

8 MR. GRIER: Thank you very much.

9 MR. BOASBERG: I'm sorry, did you
10 want a question?

11 MS. JOHNSON: I had a question
12 about IGC's testimony.

13 MR. BOASBERG: Hold on.

14 Ms. Johnson?

15 MS. JOHNSON: I'm sorry, for IGC,
16 if we could just go back. You mentioned two
17 or three historic properties that you've been
18 involved in. I just -- I couldn't catch
19 those.

20 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: Yes, ma'am,
21 sure.

22 MS. JOHNSON: If you could just

1 reiterate what they were.

2 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: If I may, for
3 the record, it's ICG Properties.

4 MS. JOHNSON: I'm sorry, ICG.

5 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: We get the
6 acronyms mixed up ourselves, so that's okay.

7 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

8 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: The three main
9 properties I cited were the Gallup Building,
10 901 F Street. It's a 130-year-old Masonic
11 Temple. We as a team with Martinez and
12 Johnson actually created a volumetric
13 preservation and restoration, and also
14 expanded the building to a total 113,000
15 square-foot development. We've won awards.
16 I think the chairman is intimately familiar
17 with the project.

18 We also have worked on Takoma Walk,
19 which is a mixed-use project in the historic
20 district of Takoma. And that is a
21 residential unit with retail, also preserving
22 and maintaining the historic elements. And

1 that has won several urbanistic awards as
2 well as AIA awards, the latest one being of
3 Northern Virginia, chaired by Mr. Frank
4 Gehry.

5 In addition to that, the other
6 project I cited was in Kalorama. We
7 purchased the Kingsbury School, which is
8 located on the corner of Bancroft and Phelps.
9 And that was a total of three buildings which
10 were originally row houses, and what we
11 actually did is we returned them to the row
12 house character and have since been sold on
13 an individual basis. We completely restored
14 the exterior.

15 One of the buildings, as a matter
16 of fact, was painted over with lead-based
17 paint, so we did all of the environmental
18 abatement and all of that. And we worked
19 very closely with Steve Calcott of HPRB to
20 actually reach approval and reach an -- find
21 an agreement actually of an appropriate
22 solution.

1 MS. JOHNSON: Great. Thank you
2 very much.

3 MR. BOASBERG: Mr. Grier?

4 MR. GRIER: Thank you very much.
5 Good morning. My name is David Alan Grier
6 and I'm a member, a laymember, of Third
7 Church of Christ, Scientist, in Washington,
8 D.C. That's the church that owns the
9 structure at 16th and I Streets. I've been
10 asked to represent the church at the hearing
11 today, but I want to point out that there are
12 other members of Third Church in the
13 audience, including several of the officers
14 of our church.

15 We have Lois Khairollah, who is the
16 chairman of our board at the moment, and
17 that's our governing body, the Board of
18 Trustees; and then Darrow Kirkpatrick, who is
19 our first reader, who conducts our -- who's
20 the laymember who conducts our church
21 services; and Erasmus Ndukah, who is our
22 presiding officer, who conducts our

1 membership meetings. We very much appreciate
2 the opportunity to appear in front of you
3 today.

4 Third Church of Christ, Scientist,
5 was established in 1918 in a building on
6 Lafayette Square. We have been a downtown
7 Washington, D.C., church of 89 years. We've
8 held our services at various sites, but
9 always within three blocks of 16th Street.
10 We are a downtown church because most of our
11 members live or work in downtown Washington,
12 D.C., and we also minister to the local
13 community.

14 We oppose the landmark designation
15 of our church building. In October 1991, we
16 voted as a church membership to oppose
17 landmark designation. That decision remains
18 in effect and it has been reaffirmed quite
19 recently in our membership meetings.

20 Our response to the application are
21 detailed in a rebuttal document that we
22 submitted for the record on October 12th. In

1 that document, which was based on the records
2 of the church, which includes committee
3 reports, board minutes, records of membership
4 meetings, and our correspondence, as well as
5 the publicly available Christian Science
6 periodicals, we first showed that the
7 application submitted for us 17 years ago was
8 badly flawed, and also that the Third Church
9 does not meet the standards for historical
10 designation.

11 The records show that the church
12 building at 16th and I Street was first built
13 by a local organization, our church, unlike
14 the claims in the application. The entire
15 cost of it was raised by our members.

16 In addition, the document shows
17 that the application's historical claims
18 about our church are false. Its arguments
19 are based not on facts, but on speculations,
20 exaggerations, and inventions. And hence, do
21 not provide a basis for landmark designation.
22 I'd like to point out it's not just a case of

1 primary sources versus secondary sources.

2 In particular, the rebuttal
3 document shows that our church building was
4 not built by the First Church of Christ,
5 Scientist, "The Mother Church" as we call it,
6 in Boston, Massachusetts, as is claimed in
7 the application. Our church was not part of
8 the National Church Movement as is claimed in
9 the application. Our church was not built as
10 a monument to anyone or anything as is
11 claimed in the application. Our church
12 building was not built to celebrate some
13 event called the "Christian Science
14 Centennial" as is claimed in the application.
15 These points that we uncovered in our work
16 were confirmed by the report that you've
17 already heard about that Traceries did for
18 ICG.

19 The application tries to cover its
20 weaknesses by pretending to be scholarly. It
21 lists 85 secondary references for its claims.
22 But in our examination of them it was far

1 worse than the quarter. We find only six
2 that have to do anything with our church. In
3 particular, most of the claims that it is
4 making in terms of historic preservation have
5 no evidence at all to footnote them.

6 In presenting its claims for the
7 architectural significance of the church
8 building, the application makes mistakes that
9 are similar to its claims of historical
10 significance. It exaggerates its points and
11 demonstrates a lack of practical knowledge of
12 the building.

13 For example, the application refers
14 to "an easy circulation around the church,"
15 and asserts that the design "invites people
16 into the plaza." In fact, anyone familiar
17 with the plaza knows that it's generally
18 empty and windswept, that the narrow walkway
19 next to the church is not at all inviting.
20 In fact, it is quite dark and unappealing.

21 The application claims that the
22 plaza "draws attention to the church." This

1 is a quote. But the large triangular garden
2 so clearly points the eye to the front door
3 of the office building, not the church, that
4 one often doesn't know a church is there at
5 all.

6 The application refers to the
7 auditorium's "natural lighting." But so
8 little light reaches the interior that no one
9 can read so much as a hymnal without
10 artificial lighting. I'd like to point out
11 that's a standard claim, and that the
12 pictures one sees of our beautifully lit
13 interior, which has no windows piercing the
14 wall, are usually taken from the second floor
15 with the full interior lights on, as the ones
16 we saw today. Without them, there is very
17 little light in the auditorium.

18 The application claims that the
19 location of the front door, which faces the
20 plaza, is linked to the theology of our
21 church. But this location was opposed
22 forcefully by our members. We wanted the

1 door open to the city, on 16th Street, on I
2 Street, on the corner. Any one of those
3 would have been fine. We note that Cossutta
4 fought us on that and stated that such a
5 design was not consistent with his artistic
6 vision.

7 The application claims that the
8 church building together with the Monitor
9 building is a great work of architecture.
10 But architecture has to be judged both by
11 utility and artistry, "by both a concise and
12 economical solutions and the esthetic
13 satisfaction of the human soul," as made by
14 the founder of the Modernist movement, Walter
15 Gropius. Our records illustrate that Araldo
16 Cossutta made poor choices consistently
17 throughout the design period that undermined
18 both the practical and the esthetic aspects
19 of the building.

20 For example, Cossutta's decision to
21 use untreated concrete for a church building
22 has produced a structure that is already

1 starting to crack, crumble, and show its
2 rusting rebar. It is impossible to repair
3 without having what we've been told as
4 measles all over it, and it is certainly not
5 a church that will survive for the ages.

6 Cossutta's choice of lighting
7 systems for the auditorium which gives it its
8 wonderful natural lights is grossly
9 impractical because it requires a full set of
10 scaffolding to change even a single bulb.

11 Cossutta's insistence on a blank
12 concrete wall on I Street presents a bleak
13 and uninteresting view to people and has
14 confused many a visitor who has tried to
15 enter by the fire door.

16 Cossutta's requirement for a flat
17 roof, which he noted was one of the hallmarks
18 of a Modernist building, forced the heating
19 ventilation equipment into -- to be located
20 outside of our building and imposed upon us a
21 very expensive and a very inefficient system.

22 Less than 24 hours ago, we received

1 the staff report on the application and have
2 not had a chance to review it thoroughly, but
3 we very much appreciated that it acknowledged
4 the complete fallacies of the historical
5 claims of the application. We contend that
6 our church structure at 16th and I is a
7 building, not a sculpture, and that its
8 artistry is to be judged as a place where
9 people work and where they visit and where
10 they worship.

11 The application's claims as noted
12 for historical importance are false. Its
13 descriptions of architecture are exaggerated
14 and its claims of artistic value reduce this
15 building to a sculpture and overlook the poor
16 choices made by Araldo Cossutta, choices that
17 were often opposed by our members. The
18 building is not old enough to meet the normal
19 standard for historical landmark designation.

20 To give it a designation would be
21 to set a precedent that virtually any
22 building in this city could be given such a

1 designation no matter how flawed the
2 argument.

3 MR. BOASBERG: Thank you,
4 Mr. Grier.

5 MR. GRIER: Thank you.

6 MR. BOASBERG: Appreciate that. We
7 recognize the other members of the
8 congregation who are here. Thank you all for
9 coming. Is there anything further in terms
10 of the presentation of the main part of the
11 ownership here? Okay.

12 Then -- and as I said before, we
13 recognize that you didn't receive that report
14 until yesterday and we do want to give you a
15 chance to reply to that. So what I'd like to
16 do now is open the discussion to others who
17 are here, who have come to testify, and then
18 see where we are.

19 So is there anyone in the audience,
20 any members of the audience, Mr. Lynch,
21 anyone else who's come to testify? Yes.
22 Would you just come forward, save us a little

1 trouble and the time walking? Just come on.

2 Mr. Christofises.

3 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: Thank you,
4 Mr. Chairman. At least, if nothing else, it
5 puts a smile on all of our faces.

6 MR. BOASBERG: Well, try my name.

7 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: Respectfully
8 not. The only point I wanted to make is
9 something we just wanted to add for the
10 record. The presentation that was presented
11 to you by the Applicant, we just wanted to
12 make you aware that the photography used in
13 the presentations old. The trees you saw in
14 the plaza no longer exist. The architecture
15 is interrupted by a new addition of the
16 ULLICL (?) tower smack in the middle of the
17 plaza, which actually is right on the edge of
18 our borderline. So the grandeur that was
19 suggested of the overall complex has clearly
20 been interrupted and changed overall.

21 MR. BOASBERG: Well, we're going to
22 make a site visit with your permission.

1 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: Fair enough.

2 MR. BOASBERG: And look at both
3 buildings and the plaza and so forth, and so
4 we'll be able to determine that.

5 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: All right.

6 MR. BOASBERG: Thank you.

7 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: Thank you,
8 Mr. Chairman.

9 MR. BOASBERG: Thank you, sir.
10 Members of the audience, would you come
11 forward and take your seats? And why don't
12 we start with Mr. Lynch?

13 It's good to see you again,
14 Mr. Lynch.

15 MR. LYNCH: Good to see you,
16 Chairman.

17 MR. BOASBERG: You've been keeping
18 away from us, I don't know why, but you're
19 always welcome here, Mr. Lynch.

20 MR. LYNCH: I've been busy on a lot
21 of other projects.

22 MR. BOASBERG: I'm sure you have.

1 MR. LYNCH: But historic
2 preservation's very important.

3 MR. BOASBERG: Go ahead, Mr. Lynch.

4 MR. LYNCH: Thank you so much for
5 having me today. Just wanted to state, first
6 and foremost, that the Downtown Cluster of
7 Congregations, of which hat I'm wearing today
8 as the executive director, is a proud
9 proponent of historic preservation. We
10 believe both as individual members and as a
11 collective association we have a
12 distinguished record of both stewardship and
13 supporting historic preservation that
14 promotes the history and the fabric of the
15 community as a whole.

16 We mourn our losses, such as the
17 Monroe Apartments on Mass Avenue, and we
18 celebrate our victories, such as the Woodward
19 & Lothrop Building.

20 I was very pleased to be there as
21 (inaudible) opened and I saw the interior
22 steps were there as our agency was the one

1 that had promoted that designation.

2 So that said, we come to you to say
3 that our council, on 16th of this month at a
4 duly-called meeting, formally opposes
5 unanimously this application. It's very
6 unfortunate that this application was put
7 forward so many years ago, but we are very
8 thankful that you're finally going to make a
9 decision and clarify this. And it's
10 unfortunate that that's been left out there
11 for all these years and, frankly, should have
12 been dealt with previously.

13 I won't reiterate the points of the
14 logistics and the problems of the building,
15 that's already been done. Why doesn't it
16 qualify? I think it's fairly clear, even if
17 you look at your own staff report, which we
18 only got to see yesterday, why it doesn't
19 qualify.

20 The age of the building, less than
21 20 years old when the application was made.
22 Still, a building less than 40 years old.

1 Without giving away, it makes me eligible for
2 ancient status I would have to tell you
3 without giving everything away.

4 It has not had the significant
5 local and national impact that many of our
6 member congregations that are so recognized
7 do. It's not a Second Baptist Church which
8 served on the Underground Railroad. It's not
9 an Epiphany Episcopal Church that served as a
10 hospital during the Civil War. It's not a
11 Lincoln Congregational Temple that in many
12 ways was a home to a civil rights movement
13 just a generation ago.

14 Those events, probably owing to the
15 fact of its short life and history, it has
16 not been associated with either the local
17 fabric of the national fabric or the kind of
18 events that many of our member congregations
19 have. Many of our member congregations which
20 are not national cathedrals actually have
21 served in that capacity, whether it's
22 Metropolitan AME Church with many national

1 significant events or churches such as John
2 Wesley AME Zion and others, have done that,
3 consistently served as National
4 Cathedral-type churches. That's not done
5 this for this denomination.

6 So we would urge that you reject
7 this application. It's not embraced by the
8 community. It's not a building. It's not a
9 history. It's not a fabric part that we
10 believe rises to the stature that your so
11 designating should be setting the standard
12 for. So please reject this application.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. BOASBERG: Thank you,
15 Mr. Lynch.

16 Yes? Next person, please.

17 MR. FORGEY: Hello. My name is
18 Benjamin Forgey. I'm the former architecture
19 critic of the Washington Post, and in that
20 capacity, I wrote a piece about my feelings
21 about this architecture in 1992. And I'm
22 going to have a brief statement here. That

1 piece speaks for itself.

2 All of us who are attentive to the
3 architectural character of our city are
4 familiar with these questions: Why do I love
5 this building?

6 What are its outstanding qualities?
7 What especially does it contribute to its
8 particular setting and to the city as a
9 whole? We ask these questions all the time,
10 and in that way, your job and mine are quite
11 similar. So as you know, I'm here as a
12 critic to tell you that I very much admire a
13 particular building and why I do so, and to
14 suggest answers to those other questions.

15 For the record, the building, of
16 course, is the Third Church of Christ,
17 Scientist, and the Christian Science Monitor
18 Building. The very name suggests what I
19 believe to be one of its primary esthetic and
20 emotional characteristics. It is not a
21 single building. Rather, it is a pair of
22 buildings separated by a crisp, minimally

1 landscaped space. The word "separated,"
2 though technically correct, is precisely the
3 wrong word. Its opposite tells the truth.
4 This is a pair of buildings intentionally and
5 effectively united by the space in between.
6 The evidence that the three pieces were
7 designed as an ensemble is there for the eyes
8 to see.

9 First, we cannot help but
10 acknowledge the dramatic effective contrast
11 in shapes: The octagonal mass of the worship
12 house playing against the flat plane of the
13 office building.

14 Then there are the telling
15 similarities. Both buildings are clad in
16 board-formed concrete panels with similar
17 subtle detailing and with large, long, vast
18 windows framed top and bottom by horizontal
19 blades of metal. The architectural
20 vocabulary of both is the same down to the
21 reveals between the concrete panels, although
22 the more powerful gestures of piercing and

1 shaping are appropriately reserved for the
2 church building.

3 And then there is the triangular
4 glass panel between the two, a bit gussied-up
5 now with those little Victorian flowerbeds at
6 the angles, but still a powerful spatial
7 statement uniting the two architectural
8 pieces. In plan, we see an octagon and a
9 rectangle held in an appealing, dynamic
10 equilibrium by the green triangle projecting
11 outward into the broad public spaces framing
12 16th Street. The detailing is so simple
13 here, so careful, and so nice: gray granite,
14 manicured grass with a great granite border,
15 and beautiful narrow bricks in a herringbone
16 pattern. In three dimensions, as we walk by
17 our around the ensemble, it comes together
18 convincingly: the play of forms, the
19 contrasting textures, the unifying details.

20 There are lots of additional things
21 to be said in favor of this architecture, and
22 many have been said quite eloquently I think

1 by Prof. Longstreth. And I should say there
2 are some things you can say not so in favor
3 of it, and many of those have also been said.
4 That hard I Street elevation with the
5 necessary, but lamentable, fire door is not
6 the stuff that great streets are made of.
7 But even that negative aspect clearly derives
8 from an intention to create an inward-facing
9 ensemble, that facing inward nonetheless
10 opens itself quietly to the urbane character
11 of one of Washington's more noble streets,
12 the Street of Churches as it's often called.

13 When I ask myself what is the best
14 thing about this architecture, what is its
15 lasting contribution to the city, I answer as
16 follows: The evidence of the eyes and ears,
17 too, when that wonderful carillon calls out,
18 tells us this is a strong, distinguished
19 ensemble that offers a welcome, appealing,
20 refined, quiet, visual oasis to the busy
21 city. That, I believe, is a rare quality
22 imminently worthy to be saved.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. BOASBERG: Thanks, Mr. Forgey.
3 We're all the worse off for not having you
4 still at your old post.

5 MR. FORGEY: Nice of you to say
6 that.

7 MR. BOASBERG: And I hope you will
8 write occasionally or do something to keep us
9 well informed.

10 MR. FORGEY: I'll never stop
11 writing.

12 MR. BOASBERG: Thanks for making
13 the effort to come down here, and we pay a
14 good deal of attention to your writings.

15 Yes, sir?

16 MR. BOWER: I'm Tom Bower. I'm
17 president of the Foggy Bottom Historic
18 District Conservancy.

19 Foggy Bottom Historic District
20 Conservancy answered the call of our charter
21 to respond to historic preservation issues in
22 the District as well as within our own

1 district, strongly recommends that you grant
2 landmark status to the Third Church of
3 Christ, Scientist. This structure does miss
4 the date of consideration for landmark
5 designation by relatively few years. But
6 last year, in your wisdom, you graciously
7 granted landmark status to the Watergate,
8 which is of similar age.

9 This structure is not a Gothic
10 cathedral or a nice little chapel on a New
11 England green, but it is a prime
12 representative of its time and style of
13 architecture that reflects an urban
14 environment that was strong, gutsy, and
15 defensive. Medieval castles and Romanesque
16 churches are its ancestors. It is a good
17 example of the Brutalist format, and its
18 examples are an interesting variation when
19 compared with the round version of the style
20 presented by the Hirshhorn Museum on the Mall
21 not so far away. In particular, this
22 building is a rare example of a prime

1 location in the District which shows, when
2 contrasted with St. John's Church close by, a
3 bit of the history of the kinds of structures
4 Americans have chosen to build when they
5 wanted to worship -- one our basic freedoms.

6 From a sectarian view, the large
7 amount of open space involved in the churchs
8 relatively low scale and landscape add to the
9 worthiness as a site to preserve from the
10 fully built-out commercial blocks around it.
11 The owners have enjoyed tax benefits from
12 their status for a number of years, so
13 preserving their structure for the good of
14 the city should be a reasonable sharing of
15 their benefits with our fellow citizens.

16 For its rare presentation of a
17 unique style, open space, and contribution to
18 the religious architectural history of the
19 city and country, the Third Church of Christ,
20 Scientist, deserves to be granted landmark
21 status. Its contribution to our urban
22 environment should not be sacrificed for

1 missing an arbitrary date that will likely be
2 changed as time marches into the future,
3 which will judge us for what we save to share
4 with it.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. BOASBERG: Thanks, Mr. Bower.
7 Thank you for coming down here and taking the
8 trouble to come down. You do a great job
9 there where you are.

10 MR. BOWER: Thank you.

11 MR. BOASBERG: Mr. Busch?

12 MR. BUSCH: Good morning,
13 Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. My
14 name is Richard Busch, and I'm here today
15 representing the Dupont Circle Conservancy.

16 The Dupont Circle Conservancy
17 monitors architectural activities in the 16th
18 Street Historic District. We fully
19 understand the Third Church of Christ,
20 Scientist, designed in the late 1960s by
21 Araldo Cossutta of the firm of I.M. Pei &
22 Partners, does not fall within the period of

1 significance for that recently expanded
2 historic district.

3 The Conservancy believes, however,
4 that Third Church, by its singular physical
5 presence, exemplifies an important addition
6 to the community of other nearby historic
7 buildings that make up this part of downtown
8 Washington, D.C. It is a worthy religious
9 institution that has enjoyed the benefit of
10 that status, but it is also a significant
11 architectural landmark by a renowned firm,
12 representative of a time and style that has
13 had considerable impact on the built urban
14 environment during the last third of the 20th
15 century in shape, materials, and height. Its
16 shape, materials, and height connote a sense
17 of power rooted in religious structures from
18 ages past.

19 Further, its setting between very
20 tightly closed spaces of I and K streets, and
21 the spacious elegance of Lafayette Square and
22 the grounds surrounding the nearby White

1 House, provide an area with human-scale open
2 space that should be preserved. Once this
3 space is lost, it will never reclaimed. The
4 Conservancy believes that the Third Church
5 complex merits landmark status, and
6 recommends the Board to designate it as such.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. BOASBERG: Thanks, Mr. Busch.
9 And thanks for all the good work that you do
10 as well. Yes, sir?

11 MR. MEEHAN: Good morning. My name
12 is Bob Meehan. I'm an ANC commissioner from
13 Dupont Circle.

14 The Third Church of Christ,
15 Scientist, is within the Dupont Circle ANC.
16 And Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that we had
17 the report because I didn't know how, based
18 on my records, I was going to address this
19 adequately until I saw the report. So I
20 stayed up until 2:00 last night to try to put
21 it together. The ANC defers to the DCC for
22 architectural kinds of issues, and what I'll

1 be addressing will be the administrative
2 process, which is basically what we were
3 asked to comment on.

4 I am testifying today in my
5 personal capacity as an individual
6 commissioner. The ANC did not have adequate
7 time to place this historic landmark
8 application on our October agenda for a
9 meaningful community discussion. In fact,
10 the last time this matter came before the ANC
11 was in the fall of 1991. At that time, the
12 ANC also was unable to officially review the
13 application because it was withdrawn before
14 the ANC could discuss it at an official
15 meeting.

16 Nevertheless, each of the current
17 eight sitting members of the Dupont circle
18 Commission has individually signed a letter
19 to this Board, which outlines our personal
20 views of why this application should be
21 denied. I am here to expand on those views.

22 One, what is an historic landmark?

1 According to the staff report supporting this
2 application, there is no sense of time
3 associated with the term "historic." The
4 report specifically states that the 50-year
5 rule that has been the norm since historic
6 preservation started in the District is not
7 legally binding. The argument of the report
8 would support an historic designation on the
9 day after a building was completed if it
10 could be shown to be truly worthy.

11 So the word "historic" has
12 ironically become an oxymoron in an otherwise
13 very important preservation movement. The
14 historic landmark application was submitted
15 when the church was scarcely 19 years old.

16 Would one not think that an
17 historic landmark is considered a
18 contributing building in its own historic
19 district? The advocates for creating a lower
20 16th Street Historic District specifically
21 stated that the Third Church of Christ,
22 Scientist, is not a contributing structure to

1 the historic district. Why? Because it
2 wasn't 50 years old. So 50 years can be used
3 on the one hand, but not used on the other.

4 Why was 1991 the year of the
5 application? Why not 1973, a year after
6 completion? The staff report gives us two
7 reasons. The first is that the architectural
8 community needed time to develop an
9 understanding of the buildings contribution
10 to Modernism. The second is that the
11 Committee of 100 thought the building might
12 be sold in 1991, so it wanted to block any
13 effort to tear down the building. The
14 committee so hurried its application that it
15 invented theories for the buildings
16 importance.

17 As an ex-Christian Scientist, I can
18 tell you that the arguments regarding the
19 role of this building in the Christian
20 Science movement were sheer bunk. In
21 addition, I understand that testimony earlier
22 this year from the architect Araldo Cossutta

1 disputed the argument in the application of
2 this being a Pei-inspired building. While
3 there are obviously differences of opinions
4 on the architectural importance of a
5 building, we are dumbfounded that an
6 application for historic landmark status in
7 the nation's capital is pockmarked with
8 factual errors.

9 Why was the application for the
10 church's historic landmark status tabled 16
11 years ago? The staff report gives us the
12 reason. The church opposed this application
13 then as it does now. The report says that
14 the Committee of 100 was prepared to postpone
15 indefinitely its application in the hopes
16 that a mutually acceptable resolution of the
17 matter could be worked out. This was not
18 classic historic landmarking.

19 This, in our opinion, was outright
20 blackmail under the circumstances. The
21 church refrained from going forward with a
22 plan to tear down the building and the

1 Committee of 100 did not pursue the
2 application.

3 So why are we here today discussing
4 this 16-year-old application? We're here
5 because the church has indicated that it
6 intends to replace this building with a
7 smaller one on the same lot. In other words,
8 what we see as 16 years of blackmail finally
9 failed this year.

10 The Committee of 100 intends to
11 muscle the church into submission with this
12 application. Why wasn't a new application
13 drafted so that all the issues that have come
14 up over the 16 intervening years could be
15 addressed? An application based on 35 years'
16 perspective, instead of 19 years, would have
17 a lot more to say about Modernism, as the
18 staff report showed.

19 That is the idea behind the concept
20 of "historic" in the preservation movement,
21 that there is a sufficient lapse of time for
22 the community to come together in

1 understanding the importance of a building.
2 On the other hand, the regular landscape
3 affecting this property has also changed
4 during this interval.

5 For example, the staff report makes
6 no mention of the Religious Land Use and
7 Institutionalized Persons Act signed into law
8 in 2000 by Pres. Clinton. A few sections of
9 this law were cited in our letter to you.

10 Mr. Chairman, I'm not a lawyer, so
11 I don't know how precisely this law would
12 apply in this case. Have you asked the
13 district attorney for a legal opinion? And
14 if not, on what grounds would you refuse?

15 What do you make of this statement
16 in the law? "No government shall impose or
17 implement a land use regulation in a manner
18 that imposes a substantial burden on the
19 religious exercise of a person, including a
20 religious assembly or institution, unless the
21 government demonstrates that the imposition
22 of the burden on that person, assembly, or

1 institution is in furtherance of a compelling
2 governmental interest."

3 Well, the Third Church of Christ,
4 Scientist, has stated that this application
5 would impose such a burden. A dated, flawed
6 application held as blackmail for 16 years is
7 hardly evidence of a "compelling governmental
8 interest."

9 Moreover, long before Pres. Clinton
10 signed this law, the Committee of 100 signed
11 a letter on October 4, 1991, which I've
12 attached the copies that you have, that
13 pledged the following to the church:

14 "We have also stated explicitly
15 that it is not our intention to save physical
16 things if so doing means the loss of the
17 activities that gave them life." So how does
18 the Committee of 100 address this point given
19 that historic landmark status might destroy
20 this religious community and force it to
21 disperse to other Christian Science churches?

22 Mr. Chairman, how do you see the

1 constitutional issue of the separation of
2 church and state in this case? Pres. Clinton
3 did not sign his law in a vacuum. Everyone
4 knows that the state cannot tax church
5 property used for worship because the power
6 to tax is the power to destroy. But churches
7 come under all sorts of other pressures that
8 also have the power to destroy.

9 It is incumbent on the state, in
10 this case the D.C. Government, to make the
11 argument of compelling government interest
12 for an historic landmark designation. The
13 government did not see fit to do that in
14 1991. It would not even be considering the
15 matter today if the church had not taken the
16 initiative to challenge the application.

17 In the context of churches, I don't
18 think the test of a compelling interest is
19 the need to cocoon a controversial Brutalist
20 building under an historic landmark
21 designation. The way this application has
22 been handled is an abuse of state power.

1 I have not addressed the
2 architectural merits of the building. The
3 Dupont Circle Conservancy has done that.
4 What I have addressed, and what each of my
5 fellow commissioners is concerned about, is
6 our fear that the D.C. historic preservation
7 movement is following a path that will lead
8 to diminished community support. This is
9 becoming more evidence in Dupont Circle as
10 new approaches are added to get preordained
11 desired results that seem arbitrary to us
12 veterans of the preservation wars.

13 When I was a public policy grad
14 student at the Woodrow Wilson School, I
15 learned that the ends do not justify the
16 means in the public arena. We all know that
17 in a court of law technicalities may be all
18 that stand between justice and a false
19 outcome. As ANC commissioners, we believe
20 that a process that blackmails a church, that
21 ignores accuracy in presentation, that fails
22 to examine the special laws that apply to

1 churches must be challenged and stopped dead
2 in its tracks.

3 Mr. Chairman and members of the
4 Historic Review Board, this 1991 application
5 has been so incompetently handled from the
6 point of the public interest and public
7 expectations that this specific application
8 should be denied. You can deny it with
9 prejudice once for all or simply vote against
10 this specific document. We're not focusing
11 on the merits of the application.

12 However, to approve it as-is will
13 seriously diminish our respect for the D.C.
14 historic preservation movement.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. BOASBERG: Thanks, Mr. Meehan.
17 You raise a number of points and I won't
18 attempt to answer all of them, but we will
19 certainly deal with all of those points at
20 the discussion time.

21 And I appreciate the effort, 2:00
22 a.m. Hopefully, you get a good sleep

1 tonight.

2 MR. MEEHAN: I do want to commend
3 the writer of that staff report. I thought
4 that was a good piece of work. I wish that
5 the application had that kind of scholarship
6 and attention to accuracy.

7 I really appreciate it. It was
8 very helpful to me, because I could not make
9 heads or tails out of the 1991 record,
10 because there was no reason for what was
11 going on in my records.

12 MR. BOASBERG: Thank you, and thank
13 you for all the good work you do as an ANC
14 commissioner. I know it's not an easy job,
15 so we appreciate that.

16 Is there anyone else in the
17 audience who came to testify? What I'd like
18 to do is I'd ask -- thank you all. I'd like
19 to ask Tim Dennee to say a few words and then
20 let's agree on kind of a procedure for
21 following up.

22 Mr. Quin?

1 MR. QUIN: We have a very, very
2 brief rebuttal at the appropriate time.

3 MR. BOASBERG: Sure. Sure. I'm
4 going to give you a chance to come back an to
5 have oral presentation on the rest of it, so
6 I don't know if you want to have a rebuttal
7 now.

8 MR. QUIN: I think there's a very
9 short point he would like to make now, but
10 whenever you feel it appropriate.

11 MR. BOASBERG: Okay. Well, then
12 I've got to open it up to everyone else to
13 make a rebuttal to a rebuttal. So let me do
14 this. Let me ask Tim. You've heard a lot of
15 comments here today. I don't want to put you
16 on the spot.

17 (Laughter)

18 MR. BOASBERG: But -- because you
19 have your report to bury yourself in, and
20 obviously, you're not going to make any
21 changes to that.

22 MR. DENNEE: Yeah, can I just leave

1 now?

2 MR. BOASBERG: But what I think
3 makes sense to me is I think there have been
4 excellent points raised by Mr. Quin and by
5 others here in terms of an adequate time to
6 respond to what is a very detailed staff
7 report. I also feel that more time is needed
8 to ask the Applicant to file any kind of
9 supplemental materials that the Applicant may
10 wish to file in view of the passage of 15 or
11 16 years.

12 I think it might also be
13 appropriate to have a little bit of time to
14 see if there's any other testimony out there
15 in the architectural community or
16 architectural historians or writers or
17 developers or whoever else would like to
18 comment on such an important case, which I
19 think raises these issues. I think the Board
20 would like to focus on issues of these
21 timing.

22 And by the way, let me just say on

1 the 50-year rule, the National Register has a
2 50-year rule.

3 But even the Register will consider
4 buildings prior to the 50-year rule if they
5 are of exceptional significance. D.C., I
6 think in its wisdom, didn't put an arbitrary
7 rule in, but we do consider whether enough
8 time has passed in which to appropriately
9 judge the building. New York City, for
10 example, has a 30-year rule and they won't
11 consider things before 30 years.

12 To my knowledge, we haven't
13 considered anything earlier than 30 years,
14 and we surely have considered buildings like
15 the Watergate, like the Potomac Plaza in
16 Southwest, and other buildings less than 50
17 years, especially when there is an imminent
18 threat of demolition. I mean, that -- as the
19 gentleman once said about hanging, it
20 concentrates the mind. It's a very important
21 consideration.

22 So -- and as far as the historic

1 district goes, the reason the church was not
2 included in the historic district was not the
3 50-year rule, but because there's a period of
4 significance that the historic district had.
5 And that period of significance, the church
6 construction fell outside of the period of
7 significance. That's why it was not included
8 in the historic district. And we are
9 certainly aware of all of the acts and
10 ReLUIPA signed by Mr. Clinton. I teach it in
11 my law school class, and I guarantee you, I'm
12 quite aware of it.

13 There's also, as the church well
14 knows, a hardship provision in our law, which
15 would be a case that would be made to the
16 mayor's agent not necessarily with us, we're
17 just here, which would consider designation
18 or not. And there are many alternatives
19 after that.

20 So what I would like to do -- and I
21 understand that there is pressure that the
22 developer feels in terms of timeliness and

1 would like to get moving. I can certainly
2 understand that. My understanding is the
3 developer has tried to work with the other
4 parties and certainly shows good faith in
5 that effort, and we very much appreciate that
6 as well.

7 I, therefore, feel that we do need
8 some more time. And let me ask Tim if
9 there's anything that you might contribute on
10 this. I see us coming back here maybe in
11 November at a meeting, if we've got time, and
12 maybe having any further oral presentation;
13 or maybe December, with a cutoff date before
14 December, the week before December, to give
15 people a chance to get everything done and
16 having, you know, in effect, a continuation
17 hearing, maybe devoting an hour to that, and
18 then making our decision at that time.

19 So I don't know. Why don't you
20 talk about whatever you want to talk about
21 and then we'll -- I do want to say, we will
22 come back and you will have a chance to

1 discuss it thoroughly.

2 MR. DENNEE: Anything I want to
3 talk about? No. Well, I can talk about the
4 substance of the matter to the extent that
5 you want. I don't think, frankly, that I can
6 improve upon or substantially alter the
7 effect or the ideas given by the
8 architectural historians that have spoken
9 previously today.

10 I do want to point out one thing as
11 a clarification. That the delay, the
12 unprecedented long delay, was initiated by
13 the legal representation for the
14 then-property owner of this lot, which is not
15 presently involved in this case at all. So
16 it was essentially a request for an
17 indefinite delay and they expressed some
18 interest and hope that there would be an
19 amicable resolution between the parties at
20 the time.

21 I think that -- and it's funny how
22 a property can go from being quite new and

1 then to suddenly having -- suddenly being one
2 of the best-documented properties in the
3 city. I mean, certainly it's maybe fair to
4 point out that there were only a half a dozen
5 sources directly touching on the complex
6 cited in the initial nomination that was put
7 out 20 years after the building was built.

8 But I think that's not unnatural
9 for a 20-year-old building. But fortunately,
10 we've been able to draw upon the scholarship
11 that has been applied to this place since
12 then. You know, I thank people for -- you
13 know, kudos to the staff report, but
14 essentially I'm stringing together what has
15 been said about this building. And, frankly,
16 I think I owe Mr. Forgey and the Washington
17 Post a few bucks here.

18 But because -- I think that
19 particularly the -- I guess, I suppose,
20 ridiculously long citation that maybe goes
21 beyond fair use of Mr. Forgey's 1992 opinion
22 piece on this complex, I think lays it out

1 perhaps the best in terms of the overall
2 effect, the overall impression on a person of
3 this complex, inside and out, in its
4 totality, and I think reflecting the
5 intentions of the architect. And it's not at
6 all shy about talking about the obvious
7 shortcomings of the project either, which I
8 think are a natural outgrowth of the sort of
9 innovation sort of the period.

10 This is -- this complex itself I
11 think speaks for itself. I mean, we've said
12 a whole lot here today and there's been a
13 whole lot written now.

14 But I think ultimately when you are
15 looking at a building or a complex or any
16 other kind of resource for primarily its
17 architectural qualities, they have to speak
18 for themselves. And I think they do indeed
19 speak for themselves here. So you know, me
20 kind of trying to regurgitate that qualities
21 that the others have spoken about, they've
22 been articulated beautifully, but the

1 building and the complex themselves
2 articulate it far better than any of us
3 could.

4 And I think that Cossutta was
5 dealing with, you know, a myriad of problems
6 for any project. But I think the two
7 fundamental problems were how do you insert a
8 church today, in 1967, a today -- a
9 contemporary building, into a neighborhood
10 that is -- you know, has been, in the recent
11 decades up to that time, been taken over by,
12 characterized by, you know, larger,
13 rectilinear commercial buildings? It's the
14 contrast of, you know, the sacred and the
15 profane, the sacred and the secular.

16 And Cossutta, I mean, obviously
17 drawing on the -- his own influences, his own
18 upbringing, if you will, his own influence by
19 Le Corbusier, for instance, obviously
20 bringing his esthetic to this place -- and
21 when I say "this place," not only this lot,
22 but Washington, D.C. -- but creating a church

1 that stands up as a church. It's not
2 overpowered by taller buildings around. That
3 really reasserts the importance of the sacred
4 within the secular city. And I think it's
5 very successful in that.

6 He had not only the challenge of
7 putting a church into a setting of office
8 buildings, but also to insert another office
9 building into that same setting. And in
10 doing so, created many interesting and I
11 think successful tensions and connections
12 between the two buildings.

13 But foremost, you know, the
14 courtyard space has been, to some extent,
15 criticized. And I think some of it's valid
16 in terms of how it actually succeeded
17 programmatically, but it was really important
18 for him. I mean, we can see some of the
19 buildings that have been sort of subsumed by
20 later, larger construction. And he clearly
21 felt that this had to have sort of pride of
22 place on the corner and it had to have space

1 around it. You couldn't simply put it in a
2 slot on a street face.

3 And I think that ultimately the
4 argument is just -- I think its inarguable
5 ultimately that this is a really important
6 piece of architecture. You know, it's been
7 said that it's a building, not a sculpture,
8 but it is a building and a sculpture. It's a
9 sculptural building. That was clearly the
10 intent. And actually, I'm immensely pleased
11 and sort of thrilled with how interesting the
12 interior -- if you take, you know, a
13 sculpture and you -- and it's so confined to
14 a particular geometric form, how
15 interestingly and wonderfully he not only
16 handled the auditorium, but sneaked
17 interesting spaces elsewhere in the building.

18 I think that it's very
19 much -- Dr. Longstreth had referred to it as
20 a period piece or, you know, not merely a
21 period piece. It's very much of its period
22 in the sense that like a stone-bearing wall,

1 Richardsonian, Romanesque, that style will
2 never come again. The material will not be
3 used again in the same fashion. Things move
4 on. And it's so clearly a piece of its time.
5 And yet, if you look at that building,
6 particularly the way that the interiors were
7 handled, an awful lot of architects today
8 wish they could do as well as that building.

9 I don't want to get too much into
10 the other arguments, but I do want to say
11 with regard to the Pei connection, it's
12 clear, especially with the scholarship that's
13 occurred since the nomination went in, that,
14 you know, Pei was involved in most of his
15 projects in some fashion, but he had teams.
16 He had teams that did most and he had sort of
17 a chief architect in charge of those teams.
18 Drawing the line of how important his
19 particular role was is difficult.
20 PMr. Forgey pointed out in an article a few
21 years ago that apparently Mr. Pei is arguing
22 for having had more influence than

1 Mr. Cossutta wants to give him and vice
2 versa. And I don't think it's a necessary
3 even consideration.

4 Again, it comes down to the quality
5 of the work. And it's certainly an important
6 firm and Cossutta was obviously pushing the
7 firm in this direction, toward this Brutalist
8 expressionism of concrete.

9 MR. BOASBERG: Thanks, and I will
10 call you to. Mr. Quin, now, I'm used to your
11 grimaces by now, so I saw you grimace when I
12 mentioned December.

13 MR. QUIN: It's just my normal
14 look, I'm sorry.

15 MR. BOASBERG: And you represent
16 your clients extremely well.

17 MR. QUIN: I had indigestion, I'm
18 sorry.

19 MR. BOASBERG: I saw your clients
20 grimace at the same time, so obviously you're
21 on the same page. I'd like to solve this. I
22 myself feel that two weeks, to get everything

1 done in two weeks, to get the packages to us
2 a week ahead of time is too little time. If
3 you feel that December, whenever our December
4 meeting is is too far, I will ask the Board
5 if they will meet specially, you know, before
6 that time and get it done the first week of
7 December.

8 MR. QUIN: May I just caucus just
9 one second with the two parties? There are
10 two owners, as you know, and they each have
11 their views.

12 MR. BOASBERG: Absolutely. You may
13 have more than one second, yeah. Again, I
14 think what's important is to thoroughly
15 consider all of the materials which have been
16 submitted, the additions which are going to
17 be submitted, the points. There are a number
18 of a serious points which have been raised,
19 which do need to be thoroughly considered as
20 well. So you know, we need time to do that.

21 MR. QUIN: Five minutes?

22 MR. BOASBERG: Yeah, whatever you

1 want.

2 MR. QUIN: Thank you.

3 MR. BOASBERG: Enough to go to the
4 bathroom.

5 SPEAKER: (inaudible) December date
6 now?

7 MR. QUIN: Pardon me?

8 SPEAKER: Can we find that December
9 date?

10 MR. QUIN: Well, no, I think you
11 were saying that you would try to set a date
12 in December, early December.

13 MR. BOASBERG: If you feel that the
14 first week -- and I don't even know. I'd
15 like to --

16 MR. QUIN: We were actually hoping
17 for November the 15th, because you all came
18 here.

19 MR. BOASBERG: No, it can't be
20 November 15th. The reason it can't be
21 November 15th is we've got to get our packets
22 a week ahead of time and that only gives

1 people a week to -- its just not going to
2 work. So we could do it the first week of
3 December, if the rest of the Board would --
4 the six members would be willing to do that.
5 Would you?

6 MS. LEWIS: What's the date?

7 MR. BOASBERG: Well, we could do it
8 Thursday, the 6th of December? Yeah?

9 MR. SONDERMAN: I don't know.

10 MR. BOASBERG: Sixth?

11 SPEAKER: Although it's of such a
12 magnitude, we ought to have the whole Board
13 here.

14 MR. BOASBERG: Well, the whole
15 Board would have to read --

16 MS. JOHNSON: It's a very important
17 case.

18 SPEAKER: I agree.

19 MR. BOASBERG: Well, the Board
20 would have to read -- the problem here, the
21 Board -- there are two Board members.
22 There's one Board member who's conflicted out

1 and there are two other Board members, and
2 those two would have to read the transcript.

3 MS. JOHNSON: I think we should
4 give them that opportunity at least.

5 MR. BOASBERG: Well, we -- the
6 transcript is going to take at least two
7 weeks to produce. So we're already -- we
8 can't do it any earlier than the 6th of
9 December. The question is does the Board
10 feel that it can do it on the 6th of December
11 or does the Board -- huh? Can we do that?

12 Can we get that?

13 MS. JOHNSON: Can we ask the
14 Applicant to consider our December
15 whatever -- what's the date of our --

16 MR. BOASBERG: The December meeting
17 is December the 20th. I don't know. David,
18 will we have time on December the 20th?

19 MR. MALONEY: We can make time.

20 MS. JOHNSON: Why don't we ask the
21 Applicant if they can do that? I think
22 that's to everybody's benefit and not

1 (inaudible) try to accommodate them.

2 MR. SONDERMAN: We need to talk.

3 MR. BOASBERG: Can you hold off
4 till December 20th?

5 MR. SONDERMAN: I don't think so,
6 Mr. Chairman, but I want to get instructions.
7 I'm just the --

8 MR. BOASBERG: Well, why don't you
9 guys take a bathroom break and discuss it?

10 MR. SONDERMAN: Thank you.

11 MS. JOHNSON: I just think it's an
12 important enough case.

13 (Recess)

14 MR. BOASBERG: Well, let's get
15 started again. Mr. Longstreth, did you want
16 to speak?

17 MR. LONGSTRETH: I would be happy
18 to, Mr. Chairman.

19 MR. BOASBERG: Not rebuttal or
20 anything, but just in terms of procedure for
21 when we're going to hear.

22 MR. LONGSTRETH: Oh, no, sir.

1 MR. BOASBERG: Let's decide when we
2 can hear this. Where are you now, Mr. Quin?

3 MR. QUIN: All right, here's where
4 we are. One, we intent to order a transcript
5 on an expedited basis of these proceedings
6 and get it to you. So that will solve one
7 issue. About two weeks, you had mentioned.

8 Two --

9 MR. BOASBERG: Well, I don't know
10 if they'll do that, but anyway, go ahead.

11 MR. QUIN: We've ordered it many
12 times before. Number two, the site visit,
13 we'd like to make sure that we get as
14 promptly as possible a site visit.
15 Wednesdays are not good days, but other days
16 appear to be okay.

17 We would like, if at all possible,
18 to close whatever filings are -- as we
19 understand it, the whole purpose of the
20 continuation is to give us the right of those
21 people who need to respond to the report.

22 MR. BOASBERG: Well, no, it's not

1 only you. It's the Applicant as well to
2 update the report or any other comments that
3 might come in from people that are interested
4 in this case. So it's not just for you, it's
5 for everyone.

6 MR. QUIN: Well, I would just point
7 out, Mr. Chairman, that the rules say that
8 they cannot amend it after public notice. So
9 I don't know what we're -- it's like it's
10 just opening up everything.

11 MR. BOASBERG: Well, I mean, if we
12 keep the record open for a submission, an
13 additional submission, they can submit
14 additional materials. The application itself
15 may not formally be changed, but they can
16 certainly submit additional materials.

17 Other people can comment on it and
18 so forth, so go on.

19 MR. QUIN: Well, we'd like those to
20 be filed, if at all possible, by the 16th of
21 November.

22 And could we have the meeting, if

1 you all can accommodate it, the last week in
2 September -- November, which is a quieter
3 week, if that could be done. I don't see any
4 reason why we couldn't meet that schedule.
5 If we can, we would like to do it as soon as
6 possible.

7 MR. BOASBERG: All right. Then I
8 think that is pressing, that last week of
9 November, because of the holiday right before
10 it. I know people go away. Let's make it
11 the next week, which is the 6th. We'll make
12 the hearing the 6th. I will call the other
13 Board members. We will get the transcript to
14 them as soon as possible. We'll get Tim or
15 David to arrange a site visit, you know, as
16 soon as we possibly can. And so that we can
17 receive the materials, we'll make a cutoff
18 date of November 30th, that's one month,
19 November 30th for submission of any
20 additional materials.

21 MR. QUIN: We can make it much
22 earlier than that.

1 MR. BOASBERG: Well, that gives
2 four weeks, I think that's right, Friday the
3 30th. Yes, Tim?

4 MR. DENNEE: We'll do what we can.
5 It's really up to them, so we'll -- if you
6 say the 30th, I'll try and do the 30th.

7 MR. BOASBERG: Oh, they'll do it.
8 I'm sure that's not going to be a problem in
9 terms of -- we'll get the materials in. And
10 I think what would be best to do, Tim, is
11 we'll put this procedure out on an e-mail to
12 the parties who are here, the Committee of
13 100, the DCPL, obviously the developer of the
14 church, and so forth.

15 SPEAKER: ANCs.

16 MR. BOASBERG: ANCs. And then
17 we'll have a hearing on the 6th, and we'll
18 have an hour devoted to rebuttal of any kind
19 or presentation, a half-hour for each group.
20 Would that be enough? I mean, we'll have
21 some time, so.

22 MR. QUIN: I think the rules

1 provide for the owners to have rebuttal, if I
2 understand it.

3 MR. BOASBERG: I mean, as you know,
4 the procedure can be -- you know, adjusted to
5 each case, so we'll definitely have rebuttal.
6 And I want -- any additional testimony is
7 fine. We'll have the Applicant go first and
8 then we'll have the -- if the Applicant
9 chooses, and then we'll have the developer
10 follow with rebuttal. And then we'll have
11 the staff report in some details, I think
12 especially some of the questions which have
13 been raised about the 50-year rule, about the
14 office participation, whether the -- Cossutta
15 stands alone as an architect or as a master,
16 so forth, and so on.

17 Yes, Ms. Johnson?

18 MS. JOHNSON: Also, if I heard
19 correctly, the ANC did not have an
20 opportunity to take a formal vote on this.
21 Did I hear that correctly? So that if --

22 SPEAKER: That's correct.

1 MS. JOHNSON: I want to make sure,
2 I know they're not here, but I want to make
3 sure that they're aware so that if they do
4 want to have the opportunity to meet and take
5 a formal vote, they have that opportunity.

6 MR. BOASBERG: Okay. Yes, sir?

7 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: My apologies for
8 standing up. I'm sorry, Stylianos
9 Christofides again. Just wanted to alert you
10 that we are on the ANC calendar for the 15th,
11 and we've already --

12 MR. BOASBERG: Fifteenth of?

13 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: The 15th of
14 November, they are meeting.

15 MR. BOASBERG: Okay.

16 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: We are on their
17 calendar.

18 MR. BOASBERG: Great.

19 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: And both the
20 church and us will be presenting to the ANC.

21 MR. BOASBERG: Okay. Ask them to
22 get their report into us by the 30th of

1 November, so we have it.

2 MR. CHRISTOFIDES: I think you
3 actually heard the report today and their
4 signed letter, but absolutely, yes, sir.

5 MR. BOASBERG: Let me -- so that's
6 agreed.

7 Let me just say one thing. I know
8 how difficult this case would be to settle
9 because we do have conflicts. On the other
10 hand, I think as the eminent critic of the
11 Washington Post, quoted by the eminent staff
12 member, pointed out that in such cases as
13 this, reasonable leeway should be given to
14 the owners to adopt the properties to current
15 needs. And I think the Board feels very
16 strongly here.

17 The Board is obviously, like all
18 people concerned with the case of this
19 magnitude, is going to be probably divided as
20 to whether or not this should be a landmark.
21 I may be wrong on that, but my guess is that
22 there's certainly strong feeling maybe on

1 both sides. And I'm not as sure, and I think
2 most Board members feel today that they want
3 to hear all of the evidence, they want to go
4 to the site visit, and then they want to
5 reach a decision.

6 Like most people, they don't want
7 to reach a decision any earlier than they
8 have to. But they realize that they're going
9 to have to make a decision and they're
10 willing to make this decision.

11 As one of my colleagues once
12 soundly replied, he said that's why we get
13 the big bucks. And it's true, we get \$25 an
14 hour for these kinds of decisions.

15 So there is another alternative.
16 And that alternative is to try to work out
17 some kind of reasonable architectural design
18 compromise. David Maloney is our lead person
19 there. And I think that were there to be
20 submitted to him some kind of design
21 compromise that might save some of the
22 landmark potential or all of it or a portion

1 of it or whatever is important, but still
2 retain some of it and adapt this property for
3 current use, then we are under an admonition
4 in the statute to do both: to retain and
5 enhance landmarks and to adapt them for
6 current use. It's an inherent contradiction,
7 as so much in life is, and we have to deal
8 with that.

9 But we have had architectural
10 solutions. And in fact, the property that
11 you mentioned on 9th and F Street is a great
12 example of an architectural solution. I'm
13 not asking that you have to do that.

14 I'm saying that that was a very
15 interesting legal case, as you well know,
16 which was brought. I think it was by JBG at
17 the time. Maybe Mr. Quin was the lawyer, I
18 don't know. And that was a demolition issue
19 and the Board denied the demolition for it.
20 And they did work out, I thought, a brilliant
21 solution.

22 And I point it out to all of my

1 students and I know that Mr. Maloney does
2 when he does his tour. And I thought the
3 ingenious connection between the old and the
4 new is something else, which is just a very
5 elegant detail.

6 Would that we could do something
7 like that. I know you have a fine
8 architectural firm and I don't think it's too
9 much to ask that they produce that kind of a
10 solution as well.

11 So why don't you try? If you're
12 making progress on that, then you can have
13 the fate in your own hands. If you can't
14 make progress in it, we'll know. We'll make
15 our decision at our December meeting. And
16 there's life even after our decision
17 regardless of whether we decide to landmark
18 it. If we decide not to landmark it, it's
19 still subject to design review, as you
20 pointed out, whatever new construction goes
21 there. If we decide to landmark it, there
22 can be an appeal to the mayor's agent for a

1 demolition permit that was obviously
2 something that you would seek to bring on
3 hardship. And also, any alternatives,
4 additions, and so forth, we would also
5 welcome that.

6 What I'm trying to suggest here is
7 that we don't have to place ourselves in a
8 rigid box of either/or. It may be possible,
9 I'm not saying we can, it may be possible to
10 have elements of both. I won't say a win-win
11 because I hate that term. When you have a
12 win-win, nobody really wins. But maybe it's
13 better than a loss-loss. Maybe there's
14 something that can be achieved. And I know
15 no better person really than David can help
16 effectuate that. So we would be receptive to
17 that kind of approach.

18 We also will decide on the 6th one
19 way or the other, and we'll leave you your
20 decision at that time, which you're certainly
21 entitled to. Okay.

22 So thank you very, very much.

1 SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

2 MR. DENNEE: May I, before we go?

3 MR. BOASBERG: Mr. Dennee, yes.

4 MR. DENNEE: With regard to the
5 site visit.

6 MR. BOASBERG: Yes.

7 MR. DENNEE: Can I ask both the
8 Board and the property owner who might be
9 invited or permitted to attend that?

10 MR. BOASBERG: I would like --

11 MR. DENNEE: Does it include the
12 ANC, the Applicant, or --

13 MR. BOASBERG: If possible, I would
14 like just the Board.

15 MR. DENNEE: Just the Board, you
16 say?

17 MR. BOASBERG: Yes, just the Board
18 members and I would like -- and our staff,
19 but I'd rather not have anybody else there.
20 Because I think that makes -- if the property
21 owners going to be there, then the other
22 people want to go to make sure the property

1 owner doesn't say anything. If the property
2 owner's there, the lawyers want to go there,
3 and then the other lawyers want to go there
4 because they want the (inaudible). So if we
5 could just do the Board and whatever staff
6 that would be appropriate.

7 And let me also say on that account
8 that we realize that a landmark does not
9 landmark the interior, that what is being
10 asked for at this point is an exterior
11 landmark. And when we get into interior
12 problems, then you do get into constitutional
13 problems and we're not going that far.

14 On the other hand, we do certainly
15 recognize that the exterior is the exterior
16 of something, and that is the interior. So
17 we're obviously conscious of what the
18 interior is and the form that it takes.

19 Okay. Enough? Enough. Thank you
20 all very much.

21 The next case, we've got one more
22 case on 3519 Porter Street. I'm sure all of

1 you want to stay for that.

2 (Laughter)

3 SPEAKER: When are we going to
4 break for lunch?

5 MR. BOASBERG: But if you have to
6 leave, we'll accept it.

7 SPEAKER: Aren't we going to break
8 for lunch?

9 MR. BOASBERG: No, we're going to
10 hear this. It's 20 minutes.

11 (Whereupon, at approximately
12 12:18 p.m., the PROCEEDINGS were
13 continued.)

14 * * * * *

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

