

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Multiple Property Documentation Form**

This form is used for documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (National Register Bulletin 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

New Submission Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Subdivisions built by Edmund Bennett and designed by Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon in Montgomery County, Maryland, 1956 --1973.

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

- 1- The Bethesda District and City of Rockville: physical and social change, 1860-1975
- 2- Collaboration between home builders and modernist architects in the United States and the Capital Region, 1945-1975
- 3- Collaboration between Edmund Bennett and Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon, 1953-1973
- 4- Planned residential subdivisions in the United States and in the D.C. suburbs, 1945-1975
- 5- Modern residential architecture in the suburbs of Washington, D.C., 1945-1975

C. Form Prepared by

name/title Isabelle Gournay, School of Architecture, University of Maryland (in charge of research),

Mary Corbin Sies, Dept. of American Studies, University of Maryland

organization Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation,
and Emily Conners, Graduate Program in Historic Preservation.

date June 21, 2004; revised June
2014.

street & number University of Maryland, College Park telephone 301.405.6284

city or town College Park state MD zip code 20742

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

(See continuation sheet for additional comments [].)

State Historic Preservation Officer

Signature and title of certifying official

Date

State Historic Preservation Office, Maryland Historical Trust

State or Federal agency and bureau

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Signature of the Keeper

Date of Action

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 1

Page Numbers

- E. Statement of Historic Contexts** 1
(If more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)
- F. Associated Property Types**
(Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)
- G. Geographical Data**
- H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods**
(Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)
- I. Major Bibliographical References**
(List major written works and primary location of additional documentation:
State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local
government, university, or other, specifying repository.)

Primary location of additional data:

- State Historic Preservation Office
- Other State Agency
- Federal Agency
- Local Government
- University
- Other

Name of repository:

Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, School of Architecture, Planning & Preservation,
University of Maryland, College Park

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 120 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Projects (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

E. Statement of Historic Contexts

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 2

Summary statement

Spanning three decades, the collaboration between home builder Edmund J. Bennett and architects Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon (hereafter referred to as KLC) was consecrated by an award of honor jointly conferred by the American Institute of Architects (AIA) and the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) in 1961 for "excellence in their cooperative efforts to create better homes and communities for Americans."¹ This award was only in its second year; its first recipients had been Eichler Homes teaming with Anshen & Allen and Jones & Emmons. In the past few years, these Southern California partnerships have received a considerable amount of scholarly and popular attention. Although he built a much smaller number of homes, Edmund Bennett can be considered as the "Eichler of the East" and his output deserves the same type of scrutiny. Indeed the Bennett/KLC collaboration received sustained local and national attention. In addition to extensive and very positive coverage on the part of the home building, architecture, and shelter press, the subdivisions it produced were popular among architecture students and foreign delegations visiting Washington.²

From the late 1940s to the early 1970s, a small group of merchant builders who firmly believed in the aesthetic virtues, functional advantages, and commercial potential of modern architecture found their match in an equally committed group of talented and progressive architects, who were intent on putting their mark on the tract house market. Together they produced what are commonly referred to as "contemporary" homes. A particularly fortunate and enduring match was that of a "smart builder," Edmund Bennett, and a team of "top architects," Arthur Keyes, Donald Lethbridge, and David Condon, who not only designed Bennett-built homes but were also involved in the planning of Mr. Bennett's subdivisions.³

Taken individually, all four men were also leaders in their respective professions. Together, they designed and built isolated, independently commissioned residences; two groups of adjacent houses benefiting from golf course views (we shall study the second of these groups, in Kenwood Park); three

¹ "AIA-NAHB cites architect-builder team," *House and Home* (April 1961), 184.

² In 1960, a delegation of seventy Swedish architects visited Washington, at the time of a Stockholm exhibition at the AIA headquarters, were taken to visit Flint Hill (see Frederic Gutheim, "Stockholm Architectural Exhibit Offers Lessons to Area Planners," *Washington Post*, October 21, 1960, B3. See also *Washington Post*, October 13, 1962, D13, showing South African representatives of the International Union of Building Societies and Savings Association visiting Flint Hill, guided by Thornton W. Owen, chairman of the board of the Perpetual Building Association. According to a display ad carrying the title "On their recent trip here, what's the first thing Australia's leading builders wanted to see? The monuments? In a way, Edmund J. Bennett's Carderock Springs," published in the *Washington Post*, September 4, 1965, E3, "Edmund J. Bennett hosted leading home builders from Dusseldorf, Brussels and London." See *Washington Post*, November 10, 1962, D3 showing architect Arnold Kronstadt and his American University class in home construction at Carderock Springs and *Washington Post*, March 9, 1963, D7 showing Donald Lethbridge conducting a tour of Carderock Springs for a University of Virginia class in urban design.

³ "What happens when a smart builder gets together with a team of top architects? Every house is a prize winner," *House and Home* (April 1959), 157-161.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 3

small subdivisions nestled in the woods (Potomac Overlook, Flint Hill, and Carderock Springs South); and two major communities complete with sports facilities (Carderock Springs and New Mark Commons, the latter including townhouses). With the exception of six homes in Northern Virginia, Bennett/KLC tract houses are all in Montgomery County, MD.⁴ And with the exception of Rockville's New Mark Commons, and of a handful of isolated examples, all these houses are located within a two-mile radius, in the lower Bethesda district, one of the most affluent and desirable sections of the Washington suburbs.⁵ While Bennett/KLC operations grew in scale and planning sophistication, the design of homes was perfected but did not change significantly, remaining faithful to a syntax based on the tenets of "situated modernism."⁶

Bennett/KLC homes belong to a second generation of modernist tract houses in American suburbia: as needs of World War II veterans had been fulfilled and incomes were rising, these were larger, had more amenities, and cost considerably more than tract houses built in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Meeting a specific demand, readily identifiable but presenting many variations, Bennett/KLC homes were not inexpensive. However, designed to preserve natural scenery, and avoid waste of space and materials, they were reasonably priced for the quality of community and family life they procured. They were built solidly and have aged well, with the proper maintenance.

The Bennett/KLC homes and subdivisions present one of the most extensive experiments in "situated modernism" in the United States, an experiment which the Washington, D.C. suburbs, with their wooded, steeply sloped lots nestled in the stream valley system of tributaries of the Potomac River, helped nurture. This was a tight and long-lasting collaboration that allowed for the establishment of a consistent syntax for planning and design. Edmund Bennett did not "invent" a new type of landscape or house. He took best advantage of the experience acquired by other home builders who started their businesses in the late 1940s and improved upon models which Donald Lethbridge and Arthur Keyes had devised for two Northern Virginia builders.

While dramatically different from those built in most "baby boom" suburbs nation wide, houses and subdivisions by B/KLC pursued the promotion of the "simple life" (with all the assets of modern comfort, though) and of the "natural house," both major tenets of American domesticity since the late 19th century. Bennett/KLC subdivisions must be considered an important link in the "picturesque chain" of America's middle and upper-middle class suburban landscapes. Most owners of Bennett/KLC houses are aware of their visual quality and have proceeded to sympathetic additions and alterations. However, because they are built in attractive and conveniently located suburbs where land values have risen exponentially, the temptation is great to unwisely enlarge or transform these houses, even to demolish them and rebuild much larger homes (which has already happened at Potomac Overlook and in Flint Hill). As the tear down phenomenon is just starting in the Washington suburbs, an historical account and re-evaluation of the B/KLC subdivisions are timely.

⁴ Through an advertisement in the *Washington Star*, January 15, 1955, B-2, we have identified a house at 10712 Montrose Avenue in Garrett Park, which has been altered and is encroached with overgrown vegetation.

⁵ In this perimeter, Mr. Bennett also built KLC-designed houses at 3701 Burning Tree Road in 1955 and 7112 and 7113 Laverock Lane in 1957.

⁶ Sarah Williams Goldhagen and Réjean Legault, *Anxious modernisms: Experimentation in Postwar Architectural Culture* (Montréal: Canadian Centre for Architecture; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000).

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 4

The Bennett/KLC subdivisions described herein are significant under criterion C. They embody the distinctive characteristics of "situated modernism" developed into an aesthetically satisfying and efficient formula and applied at the scale of tract subdivision development in Bethesda and Rockville, Maryland. The formula includes site development and land planning to create an amenity-rich subdivision respectful of its natural surroundings, architecture in the form of livable and aesthetically pleasing modern houses, and economies of scale to make the entire package affordable to post World War II "baby boom" suburbanites. The work of developer Edmund Bennett, and architects Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon deserves to be acknowledged as the equal of better-known suburban design firms such as Eichler Homes of California. Nationally recognized in their own time for design excellence, the Bennett/KLC subdivisions more than meet the threshold of properties achieving significance within the past fifty years because of exceptional importance (Criteria Consideration G).

1-The Bethesda district and City of Rockville: physical and social change

Built during the final years of transition from rural to suburban encountered by the area spanning from Glen Echo to Rockville, groups of homes built by Mr. Bennett are historically significant because they clearly reflect changes and growth patterns experienced by the physical, social, and economic fabric of Western Montgomery County. Our discussion will focus on their precise locations: the Bethesda district and the City of Rockville.

Until the late 1960s, when he opened New Mark Commons in Rockville, Mr. Bennett built his houses in the southern and western sections of the Bethesda district. Historically, this area, where Mr. Bennett himself spent most of his life until he left the Capital Region, continued residential patterns that originated in the adjacent neighborhoods of Northwest Washington, D.C.; it represented a "natural" zone of upper middle class migration for those looking for a convenient commute to offices occupied by the federal government and national or international organizations.

1 A - Pre-suburban past.

The Carderock Springs subdivision is associated with Montgomery County's pre-suburban history in one significant way, as two-thirds of its acreage formerly belonged to the estate of Lilly Moore Stone (1862-1960), which Mr. Bennett purchased in 1961. According to the sales brochure for the first section of Carderock Springs, the very name of the subdivision comes "from one of the original land deeds" signed by the Moore family. In 1879, the Moores acquired Glenmore, a mansion built in 1864 by Charles Dodge, who had been paymaster for the Union Army. Glenmore's original Italianate exterior has been Georgianized and sheathed in field stone; its current address is 8311 Comanche Court, in a subdivision of traditional homes adjacent to those built by Mr. Bennett. Ms. Stone also owned Stoneyhurst, a house built in 1767, just off River and Seven Lock Roads. Her estate included mostly wooded areas. She also "ran four rock quarries in the Cabin John Creek Valley" that provided materials for building the C & O canal; one of them remains in operation.⁷ Ms. Stone, for whom Carderock Springs' "collector street" was named, holds a significant place in her county's history: she secured the adoption of its official flag for the DAR conference and, most importantly, she organized the Montgomery County Historical Society in 1944. Adjacent to Carderock Springs, the minute but exquisite Hermon

⁷ Carolyn B. Douglas, "Be it Ever So Humble, There's no Place Like Home," *Washington Post*, April 7, 1957, F 6.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 5

Presbyterian Church (7801 Persimmon Tree Lane), built in 1874, is a well-preserved pre-suburban landmark of great historic and architectural significance.⁸

Today, planning policies protect vestiges of Montgomery County's rural landscape.⁹ However, departure from an agricultural economy began as early as the mid-nineteenth century, as Washingtonians began to enjoy the county's natural beauty and the relief it procured from their city's suffocating summers. Resort hotels were established in places like Cabin John (close to Potomac Overlook) and Rockville (close to New Mark Commons), as well as large estates. The Carderock area became, and still is, famous for rock climbing. From then on, outdoor recreation and social exclusivity would orient the county's growth.

1 B - From the 1880s to World War I

After 1880, suburbanization started affecting Western Montgomery County. It was marked by patterns that had a long-lasting impact on the residential landscape of the county, including that promoted by Bennett and KLC. Given the Capital Region's limited industrial base, suburbanization was largely a middle and upper-middle class phenomenon. Since Mr. Bennett himself worked for the government before he became a home builder, it is worth noting that the men who developed Montgomery County suburbs in the 1880s and 1890s were frequently Northerners who had come to Washington as government clerks and turned into real estate brokers.¹⁰

In the Bethesda district, the first major development was that of Chevy Chase Village, where Mr. Bennett spent his childhood. In their planning and design, Bennett/KLC communities maintained the ideal of the exclusive but progressive suburb informing this pioneering undertaking. Chevy Chase was envisioned as a model suburb by its developers, who wanted to achieve a healthy and visually pleasant environment combining the assets of city and country. By choice, Chevy Chase's residential stock consisted exclusively of detached single-family homes; strict covenants regulated the landscape around them and helped achieve a small scale, village atmosphere. Community involvement was facilitated by well-designed amenities, in particular churches and schools.¹¹

Bethesda, located immediately west of Chevy Chase, was essentially a rural crossroads until it was first reached by trolley lines, in the 1890s. Thereafter, subdivision of farmland to build single-family homes occurred rapidly. By 1905, the incorporated village of Somerset, as well as Friendship Heights, were "thriving communities."¹² The combined movement of westward expansion and steady gentrification was pursued with the opening of Bradley Hills in 1912. In 1998, Philadelphia entrepreneurs Edmund and Edwin Baltzley purchased 20 acres further south, along the Potomac River. Two years later, they organized the Glen Echo Chautauqua Association. The Baltzleys also offered large lots in woodsy and hilly Glen Echo Heights, where Potomac Overlook is located. Adopting

⁸ Mary Lou Shannon, *A Look Back in Time*, typewritten document, 1999.

⁹ An excellent example is M-NCPPC's Rustic Roads policy; see Constance Terry, "Preserving a Cultural Landscape: The Rustic Roads Program in Montgomery County," M.A. Thesis, University of Maryland, 2001.

¹⁰ *Grateful Remembrance*, 209.

¹¹ Elizabeth Jo Lampl, Kimberly Prothro Williams, *Chevy Chase : a home suburb for the Nation's Capital* (Crownsville, Md. : Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission : Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission : Maryland Historical Trust Press, 1998).

¹² *Grateful Remembrance*, 225.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 6

a more rustic character than those in Chevy Chase, a few early 20th century houses have survived in Glen Echo Heights. In 1903, the Baltzleys sold their Glen Echo land, which was transformed into an amusement park, where a very large swimming complex opened in 1940.

Begun in 1912 and adjacent to Glen Echo, Cabin John was far less affluent than Chevy Chase, and many of its bungalows were bought from Sears catalogues. In the 1960s, differences in income level between Cabin John residents and their more affluent neighbors were still marked and directly influenced Mr. Bennett's Carderock Springs project. The Montgomery County school board approved a change in school district boundaries requested by Mr. Bennett, in order for children moving to Carderock Springs South to attend Carderock Springs Elementary School, instead of the more distant Clara Barton Elementary School. The latter establishment hosted fewer children and featured a greater mix of economic and racial backgrounds. Cabin John Citizens Association and the Clara Barton PTA fought the decision and succeeded in keeping Carderock Springs South children in their midst.¹³

1 C - 1918-1945

In the 1920s, Montgomery County began to experience phenomenal levels of residential growth. Its population rose from 34,961 in 1920 to 49,206 in 1930, a 41% increase; 3,506 houses were built during this decade, mostly between 1922 and 1926 and mostly in posh Bethesda and more affordable Silver Spring. Bethesda's growth pattern (and social life) revolved around exclusive golf clubs and their clubhouses. As land prices rose, houses became more luxurious, and were set on large lots. Pre-war plans for subdivisions were updated in a spirit of gentrification, with developers "combining small lots to make more attractive building sites" and "paying greater attention to winding roadways and landscaping."¹⁴

Bethesda's poshest subdivisions of the 1920s - such as Bradley Hills, Edgemoor and Battery Park, where many homes were bought by Army officers - were located in what became known as the Country Club District, where Mr. Bennett would eventually build most of his houses. The Chevy Chase (organized 1893), Columbia (1909), Kenwood (1927), Bethesda, and Burning Tree (1922) country clubs all predate World War II. The westernmost golf enclave, next to Potomac, was the Congressional Country Club, "the dream of two Indiana congressmen, Joseph H. Hines and George Moses,"¹⁵ which Carderock Springs adjoins. It opened in 1924 on a "406-acre tract in the Maryland hills overlooking the Potomac River."¹⁶ Membership was limited to 1,500 families and included the likes of Herbert Hoover and Secretary of the Navy Edwin Denby.

Considerably slowed down by the Depression, Bethesda's upscale residential growth resumed in 1935, driven by the same embrace of the dual advantages of city amenities and pastoral living. In the Country Club District, sprawling period homes were built, facing large landscaped yards; some lots were large enough to accommodate stables. Developed by R. Bates Warren, Bradley Hills Grove opened in 1936 on 350 acres of well-preserved wooded and rolling land. Kenwood was also developed, and was completely built up in the 1940s. Meanwhile, Montgomery County acquired the reputation of having

¹³ "Cabin John Has Dispute on School Boundaries," *Washington Post*, July 11, 1964.

¹⁴ *Grateful Remembrance*, 266

¹⁵ *Grateful Remembrance*, 266

¹⁶ "Plan New Clubhouse in Hills of Maryland," *Washington Post*, January 22, 1922, 3

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 7

superior schools, parks, recreation facilities, and police and fire protection.

1 C - Post- World War II growth

Triggered by the Federal Government's planned dispersal of employment across the Capital region, the population move to the suburbs, and the establishment of mass retailing and service industries along new highways, Montgomery County's demographic growth continued its upward spiral. Its population increased by 176,00 during the 1950s and grew by 53.3% during the 1960s, bringing with it tremendous pressures for housing, education, consumption and recreation.

In the 1950s, 11,241 units were built in the Bethesda district. The expansion of its northern section revolved around Wisconsin Avenue-Rockville Pike, which developed as a major corridor for commercial infrastructure, for federal employment (it served the Naval Hospital, opened in 1942, and the rapidly expanding National Institutes of Health), and for large apartment complexes. Closer to the Potomac River, in Lower Bethesda, zoning ensured the maintenance of communities of single-family homes. This territory of discreet affluence was inhabited by many progressive, enlightened, and socially active citizens. East-West roads -- from north to south, MacArthur Boulevard, Massachusetts Avenue, River Road, and Bradley Boulevard -- served as growth corridors that concentrated places of worship, shopping centers, as well as higher density housing closer to downtown Bethesda.

By the late 1950s, Montgomery County had one the country's highest median family incomes, with Potomac topping the scale, closely followed by Bethesda. The climax of the "baby boom," in 1957, coincided with Mr. Bennett's decision to step up the size of his subdivisions, from only six homes in the newly developed Kenwood Park district to a 19-unit project, Potomac Overlook, in Glen Echo Heights (where he joined forces with builder John Matthews).

As their number grew exponentially, Montgomery County's suburban cohort garnered local control over political affairs. In 1948, Montgomery County adopted Maryland's first home rule charter government. As a member of the board that brought this change, Edmund Bennett's own mother, Marie, was a key player in this radical transformation of governance.¹⁷ The county's political ethos was severed from that of the State Assembly. Suburban constituents clearly signaled their desire to govern themselves according to a "middle-class democratic ideal that pretended it was not political at all."¹⁸ Designed to put an end to corruption and traditional political organizations, a "better government" movement put forward by neighborhood improvement associations and suburban service clubs began playing a key role in Montgomery County politics, and helped implement a nonpartisan management of planning and environmental issues.

Although Montgomery County's suburban cohort remained almost exclusively white, a few African-American enclaves were in existence. Along Seven Locks Road between Bethesda and

¹⁷ See obituary, *Washington Post* January 19, 1967, B 6. Marie Bennett was born in Budapest, Hungary, came to this country as a young child and died at age 70 in 1967; she was the President of Montgomery County League of Women Voters from 1949 to 1952 and was vice president of the state organization in 1955 and 1956. From 1935 to 1941 she was chairman of the Chevy Chase Forum of the Chevy Chase Women's Club.

¹⁸ George H. Callcott, *Maryland & America, 1940 to 1980* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 20.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 8

Rockville, Scotland was one among these poor, tightly knit, communities. Located just over four miles from Carderock Springs, it encompassed 42 acres and housed descendants of post-Civil War settlers (whose 1954 median income was \$ 85 a week) in small substandard homes accessed through dirt roads, with no sewer connections. In the early 1960s, at the very same time Mr. Bennett built Carderock Springs, officials and reform-minded suburbanites began taking notice of Scotland, which they labeled an embarrassment in such an affluent county and targeted for improvement.¹⁹

Real estate drove the county's economy. Until the mid-1960s, the residential market remained in the firm grip of local home builders, like Mr. Bennett, managing small or medium-size operations. Alternatives to profit-based shelter production hardly existed. On a former golf course, Bannockburn cooperators conducted an interesting but singular experiment in cost-cutting cooperative construction. Montgomery County voluntarily shunned public housing until 1974, when it devised a very progressive inclusionary zoning ordinance to provide affordable shelter, the first such legislation in the nation.²⁰

Construction activity in Montgomery County followed national trends, experiencing three major phases. Between 1946 and 1955, FHA and VA loans made possible the erection of modest single-family houses by the dozens, if not by the hundreds. Undoubtedly, housing remained less affordable in the Bethesda district than in most sections of the county. However, ramblers and split levels were built everywhere - ranging from large and luxurious to modest in size, from semi-traditional to avowedly contemporary in style. The late 1950s and early 1960s witnessed a second home building wave, which catered to fuller pocketbooks, larger families, and generally more traditional aesthetic tastes. Land became more scarce and expensive in Western Montgomery County: for instance, in Glen Echo Heights (the location of Potomac Overlook), lot prices doubled from 1954 to 1958.²¹ The rapid increase in labor costs encouraged progressive builders like Mr. Bennett to adopt semi-industrial construction methods.

In the late 1960s, downtown Bethesda and Friendship Heights took on an urban character, with the construction of high-rise apartment buildings, office buildings and stores. Low-density residential districts around this core were essentially built up, and Montgomery County home builders catering to upper middle class buyers set their eyes on more distant suburbs. Mass builders started working in the county: Levitt built Stratford at Bel Pré; at Rossmor Leisure World in Olney-Norbeck, Ross Cortese imported the retirement community formula he had established in California. Despite increases in interest rates that jeopardized prospects of homeownership for the lower middle class and a rather restless social climate, the examples of Reston and Columbia encouraged developers to envision ambitious and more diverse planned communities. In particular in 1966, Kettler Brothers, a local company that had so far built

¹⁹ Walter B. Douglas, "Hope Growing in Scotland Community," *Washington Post*, August 19, 1965, E 7. Haiti/Martin's Lane, in Rockville, is another African American enclave of long duration in the county; see Peerless Rockville's website: http://www.peerlessrockville.org/peerless_places/peerless_places_haiti_cemetery_2.htm. For the national context on African American suburban settlements, see Andrew Wiese, *Places of Their Own: African American Suburbanization in the Twentieth Century*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

²⁰ In 1967 Mr. Bennett was one of the two members of a Zoning Committee for the Middle Income Housing Commission of Montgomery County. See *Interim Report of the Middle Income Housing Commission*, Montgomery County, October 17, 1967 (copy found in the Maryland Room, Enoch Pratt Free Library, XHD 7303.M3.M69)

²¹ "The Challenge in By-Passed Land," *NAHB Journal of Homebuilding* 12 (February 1958), 50

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 9

rather modest subdivisions, announced plans for Montgomery Village, a 2,000-acre project mixing various residential typologies. It is in this particular context that Bennett decided to build a "mini-new town" in Rockville.

Residential growth threatened the county's natural equilibrium. As a result, from 1971 to 1973, the State Secretary of health imposed a sewer moratorium on the Cabin John drainage basin, where Carderock Springs was located. As modernism had lost its glamour and vitality, but post-modernism was not yet popularized by the media, a "stylistic backlash" occurred and residential design oscillated between historicism and a massive, top-heavy and fussy neo-modernism that had little in common with the simple earnestness of KLC's designs for Bennett.

Montgomery County prided itself of being one of the best planned in the nation, a place where policies were informed by competent professional advice. Many planning decisions were monitored by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), a bi-county agency created in 1927 to cater to suburbs adjacent to the District of Columbia. Montgomery County's first zoning ordinance dates back to 1928. In 1934, subdivision regulations were adopted by its County commissioners. In 1930, M-NCPPC, in conjunction with its D.C. counterpart, NCPPC, published a Regional Plan for the scenic landscaping of the Potomac River banks and the establishment of Clara Barton Parkway as the Maryland pendant of Virginia's George Washington Parkway.²² After World War II, protecting the banks of the Potomac from residential and commercial encroachment would remain a priority for environmentalists. M-NCPPC, whose mandate was strengthened after 1950, was very successful in expanding its park properties, a measure widely supported by Montgomery County residents. It purchased land "unfit for building purposes" in stream valleys to create parks "which would attract upscale, single-family, residential development."²³ Thanks to Congressional funds, the sale of bonds, and money levied from local taxes, the total acreage of M-NCPPC parkland in Montgomery County rose from 4,342 acres in 1956 to 6,518 in 1961, and reached 18,082 acres in 1973. Of particular significance for this nomination is Cabin John Regional Park, across Seven Locks Road from Carderock Springs, which was already envisioned in the late 1920s: its 300 acres were acquired in several implements, ending in the 1960s. In addition, Glen Echo Park was acquired by the federal government in 1969.

Parks tempered the environmental impact of enlarged roads and new highways on the growth of the county. Adjacent to Carderock Springs, the Capital Beltway was completed in 1964. This same year, M-NCPPC adopted their "wedge and corridor" General Plan for the Maryland-Washington Regional District, suggesting the conservation of open space and the creation of satellite urban cores. Zoning ordinances, setback requirements, road specifications, and building codes all affected Mr. Bennett's subdivisions and homes. He was able to curb some of the rules, but his attempt at varying zoning to build 277 townhouses with a little lake adjoining the Beltway at Carderock Springs was not successful, "largely due to opposition by a large lot owner in more remote Potomac 'horse' country."²⁴ By the late 1960s, a slow-growth, or sometimes anti-growth, movement took hold in Montgomery County, where the County Council and M-NCPPC planners were reluctant to zone land for small home lots and where

²² This plan is illustrated in National Capital Commission, Frederick Gutheim, Consultant, *Worthy of the Nation*, Washington, D.C., 211.

²³ *Grateful Remembrance*, 342 and 287.

²⁴ Edmund Bennett, note to Isabelle Gournay, October 2003.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 10

apartment buildings and townhouse were often considered a necessary evil.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 11

1 D- Profile of Bennett homeowners

To sell homes, Bennett banked on the reputation of Montgomery County, which his advertisements characterized as "prestigious" and "famous for its energetic, youthful outlook, exceptional schools, and many successful residents."²⁵ The area comprised by the District Line, MacArthur Boulevard, the Capital Beltway, and Old Georgetown Road was the turf of businessmen, professionals, and high-ranking federal workers. With the Pikesville/Ruxton area north of Baltimore, it included the highest concentration of modernist houses in Maryland. Whether in traditional or contemporary styling, houses in the Country Club District tended to remain understated; their owners, who often held very public positions, did not want to attract negative publicity by openly showcasing their wealth.

Prices of homes built by Mr. Bennett were not extravagant, as buyers with truly high income did not consider acquiring a tract house.²⁶ Mr. Bennett knew he could rely on a group of men and women who shared his background and aesthetic tastes. In Western Montgomery County, socially liberal and culturally progressive inhabitants frequently favored modernist forms for their residences, banks, office buildings, and shopping centers, as well as their community structures. Mr. Bennett also knew he could bank on an influx of progressive newcomers from all over the country. Some of his buyers hailed from the West Coast and looked for the kind of informal, unpretentious atmosphere they had left. The County Club District also played host to many members of the diplomatic corps and employees of international organizations, such as the Word Bank. At Carderock Springs, a German-born sales person made brisk business with her countrymen, who were also attracted by the proximity of a German-speaking school.

The Bennett buyer was highly educated, and affluent, if not overtly wealthy. In the late 1950s, Bennett studied 26 of them: 96% were college graduates and 72% professionals who had done graduate work; their median income was \$ 12,000.²⁷ In 1967, Mr. Bennett defined the "typical" Western Montgomery County buyer as "a family with an average income of \$ 19,000, two and a half children, and 1.66 cars. The husband is a professional person, with 5 years of college education; his wife typically has 4 years of college. These are families who are buying their second or third home. Many are moving into the Washington area, transferred from elsewhere in the country or abroad."²⁸ In 1968, an advertisement in the *Washington Post* stated that "41% of all Carderock Springs' homeowners were professional-level government executives; 47 % are private professionals in legal, medical, education or other fields" and it was Mr. Bennett's own professionalism and that of his collaborators that attracted them to the community.²⁹ At New Mark Commons, buyers averaged "six years of college" and about half of the husbands worked for the government.³⁰

²⁵ *Washington Post*, February 24, 1968, D 17 and February 3, 1969, E 4.

²⁶ *Grateful Remembrance*, 358. In the late 1950s new houses, which were significantly larger than those built a decade earlier, cost an average of \$27,000 in Bethesda, \$46,500 in Potomac, and \$15,000 in Rockville.

²⁷ "This is Builder Ed Bennett," 156.

²⁸ Edmund Bennett, "Economics and the Visual Community," 47

²⁹ Display ad, *Washington Post*, April 20, 1967, C 15 (repeated April 27, 1968)

³⁰ John B. Willmann, "Open Space Comes High; Another Step Into Systems," *Washington Post*, October 16, 1971, C1.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 12

Edmund Bennett aimed at creating what he called "professional communities" where one's neighbor "may be a congressman, oceanographer, FTC attorney, foreign affairs specialist, diplomat, journalist, or architect." At a time when young middle-class mothers were not expected to hold a permanent job, he also believed his communities nurtured "stimulating rapport for wives who abhor the usual suburban fare of baby talk and daytime television."³¹ According to Arthur Keyes, buyers of contemporary homes were often newly weds or couples with young families who wanted something different. They were "leading the pack," or "showing off."³² Purchasing a Bennett/KLC house and community represented a very deliberate choice. Shortly after he signed his first contract for The Muppet Show, Jim Henson, while still an undergraduate student at the University of Maryland, bought an Overlook model in Flint Hill. He and his partner showed up wearing shorts; casual dress in those days was usually an indication that the person was not serious about buying and perhaps not respectable. Not only was Henson serious, but he paid cash for the house. He used the recreation room to make his puppets.³³

1 D- Moving to Rockville

The construction of New Mark Commons, from 1967 to 1973, is illustrative of a new chapter in Montgomery County's history. In the late 1960s, Rockville, the county's seat and one of its few incorporated municipalities, was experiencing a second growth spurt. Its first expansion, from the late 1940s to the mid-1950s, had given rise to the mini-Levittown that was Twinbrook. With the opening of I-270 between Frederick and Washington, Rockville stopped holding a peripheral position in Montgomery County's suburban spectrum and attracted more affluent home buyers. Professional-level government executives and private professionals moved there, as they were within commuting distance of downtown Washington, DC or worked in employment centers along the I-270 science-industry corridor.

The city of Rockville, which began its own recreation program in the late 1940s and entered the purview of M-NCPPC in 1961 only, had its own far-sighted planning office. In 1966, this office disclosed a very ambitious downtown master plan that it had commissioned from the Philadelphia architectural firm of Geddes, Brecher, Qualls, Cunningham (Robert Geddes partner in charge). Its proposed multi-functional megastructure represented the latest word in urban design.³⁴ That same year, Rockville won the American Institute of Planners Award for best comprehensive planning in cities under 50,000 population.

As large tracts of land had become almost impossible to secure in the Bethesda district, Mr. Bennett was not the first builder of rather high-priced homes to move to Rockville. This trend was pioneered by Monroe Warren Sr. and Jr., who in 1960 opened Woodley Gardens, located north of New Mark Commons, one mile west of Viers Mill Road, close to I-270. This 200-acre subdivision included 500 neo-colonial single-family homes designed by architects Bagley and Soulé, garden apartments,

³¹ Display ad for Carderock Springs South, *Washington Post*, November 25, 1967, E 3.

³² Arthur Keyes, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, March 24, 2003.

³³ Brenda Bennett Bell, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, April 2003 and Edmund Bennett, note to Isabelle Gournay, both October 2003

³⁴ "Rockville's multi-level mini-core," *Architectural Forum* 125 (December 1966), 56-61; *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* n.132, June-July 1967, 85.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 13

rental townhouses (the Warrens deemed "solid renting families" a "desirable part of a community"³⁵), as well as an elementary school, a commercial area, and a swimming pool. With the exception of New Mark Commons, upmarket homes built in the late 1960s in Rockville (such as Meadowhall Square townhouses built by J.G. Properties; the Artery Organization's Plymouth Village, Kettler Brothers' Fallsmead) adopted traditional designs.

2- Collaboration between modernist architects and home builders in the United States and the Capital Region, 1945-1975.

³⁵ "Monroe Warren Optimistic. Town Houses Planned for Woodley Gardens," *Washington Post*, January 20, 1962, D2.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 14

2- A - Rationale and major mechanisms

According to architectural historian Chris Martin, "at both the local and national levels, Washington, D.C., was a formative arena in the promotion of builder-architect collaboration in tract housing."³⁶ The alliance between Edmund Bennett and KLC represents a major case study for the collaboration between modernist architects and merchant builders. Through these partnerships, the public was introduced to affordable "contemporary" models, ranging from stylized ramblers to flat-roofed atrium houses, which shared many of the features of more expensive custom-built homes.

In Montgomery County (as elsewhere in the United States) an architect was most likely to make his mark in the tract house market when he teamed with an experienced home builder. Anticipating today's design/build formula, some architects tried to act as their own builder. Most of them were not in business for very long. Arthur P. Becker, a registered architect, was also an official in the Merrimack Engineering Corporation. He seems to have focused mostly on the business side of his practice and did little design work besides houses. In 1949, Merrimack offered what it called "Washington's first truly modern low-priced home" on Navahoe Drive in New Hampshire Estates in Langley Park, close to the border with Prince George's County.³⁷ In 1952, architect Hyman Cunin partnered with the Polinger Company to sell very modern homes in the Cool Spring neighborhood of Adelphi, in Prince George's County, very close to the border with Montgomery County.³⁸ In the early 1950s, Catholic University graduate Jack Cohen tried his hand at home building, but quickly decided he was better off designing for more financially secure merchant builders.³⁹ His firm, Cohen Haft, would design tract house models by the dozens, ranging from traditional and stodgy to modern and elegant, as was the case at Tusculum Woods (1960), an award-winning subdivision in Bethesda built by Melvin J. Berman.⁴⁰ Around 1955, Deigert and Yerkes designed and built, under the DYA name, a few homes in Tulip Hill, next to Potomac Overlook. Starting in the 1965, they designed homes built by Miller & Smith (Gordon Smith was a former Bennett employee), in the style of KLC's houses for Bennett. In the late 1960s, architect Neil Greene operated Contemporary Homes, Inc., which built a cluster of large houses on Edgevale Road, off Dale Drive in Silver Spring.

Among architects who worked regularly for Montgomery County home builders was Catholic University professor Joseph Miller. In 1952, he teamed with builder Bert Tracy and realtor Sidney

³⁶ Christopher T. Martin, *Tract-House Modern: A Study of Housing Design and Consumption in the Washington Suburbs, 1946-60*, Ph.D. Dissertation, George Washington University, 2000, 2.

³⁷ In 1951, Merrimack applied for a permit to build 22 one-story and basement brick and frame houses on Onondaga Road in Glen Echo Heights. For Becker's own house, located at 5915 Onondaga Drive, see "You'll Never Feel Squeezed In This Architect-Builder Designed Dwelling," *Washington Post*, February 1, 1953.

³⁸ "All under \$15,000. Builders Exhibit Bargain Dwellings," *Washington Post*, February 24, 1952, R 1.

³⁹ Jack Cohen, in conversation with Isabelle Gournay, Fall 2002

⁴⁰ Like Jack Cohen, several talented architects throughout the country gained a large portion of their income by working with home builders. For instance, in California, Edward Fickett, whose father was a home builder, designed thousands of homes, to the great satisfaction of merchant builders. See for instance "Is an Architect Worth his Fee? Banker finds \$75 design + \$10 color scheme = \$1,000 more value," *House and Home*, January 1952, 140-144. Another such architect was John Highland in Buffalo; see "What a builder gets from an architect for \$100 a house," *House and Home* 7 (February 1955), 134-139.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 15

Mensch to build elegant modernist homes at Rosemary Hills in Silver Spring. Miller also served as a consultant for Carl Freeman's Ridgeview Estates split-levels in Bethesda, although Freeman, a fairly large builder of houses and "Americana" apartment complexes, customarily used the services of anonymous architects on his permanent staff. It is also worth noting that Thomas Cushing Daniel, who operated with his brothers Standard Properties, a prominent local developing and building firm, received in 1934 the prestigious *diplôme* (M.Arch degree) from the Paris Ecole des Beaux-Arts. In addition, from the late 1950s to the early 1970s, Techbuilt kit houses designed and commercialized by New England architect Carl Koch, who was one of Arthur Keyes' design critics at Harvard, were erected in Garrett Park and Glen Echo Heights.

Cooperation between builders and architects (as long as each held on to their particular expertise) was encouraged by their major professional bodies, NAHB and AIA. For example, in 1953, the exhibit at the national AIA convention included a special category for builder houses. Builder/architect cooperation was actively promoted by *Architectural Forum* and by *House and Home*, an NAHB-affiliated journal. In August 1952, *Architectural Forum* mentioned:

A few years ago, it was very difficult to find architects who understood the merchant builder's problems, his techniques of repetitive construction, the economies which can be obtained through teamwork collaboration, the advantages of using standard-sized millwork, and other time- and labor-saving methods.

The situation had changed as

in all parts of the US today there are capable architects who are learning to work with merchant builders and who are realizing that this is a profitable and most satisfying field of endeavor. More and more builders find they can increase their profits through using the services of a capable architect, which either lowers the over-all cost of their houses or inevitably adds more value than the amount of the architectural fees.⁴¹

In December 1952, *Home Builders Monthly*, the organ of home builders in Metropolitan Washington, D.C., had the following comment on the collaboration between the Luria Brothers and Keyes, Smith and Satterlee and Francis Lethbridge:

This teamwork between builder and architects (...) proves that there is a steady market for contemporary design and that the new designs sell so much better than conventional houses which have been built without the advice and the technical knowledge of a registered architect. A great many builders during the last few years have shied away from employing an architect because they felt that the service of an experienced designer would run up the cost of their houses.

Home Builders Monthly stated that the Lurias spent \$125 per house for architects' fees, which was "not excessive for the vast amount of work done."

If the Lurias should use these same designs on a subsequent project, as it is most probable,

⁴¹ "New Frontiers for Homebuilders," *Architectural Forum*, August 1952, 131.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 16

their design cost would drop considerably. This proves that builders should pay skilled architects rather than salesmen because skilled architects make a long term contribution. For architects this development demonstrates that

1. They can well afford to spend time with merchant builders
2. Builder clients who begin with a few houses may go on buying architectural services: apartments, shops, office buildings, large houses.
3. Architects can sell many related services builders are happy to pay for.
4. By helping to create an entire community where people live well, architects can achieve a deep permanent satisfaction.

For builders it proves that:

1. In a competitive market, up-to-date design pays off in houses just as it does in the sale of every other product that people buy.
2. Experienced architects have a special talent for design that makes one group of houses, stores, or apartments stand out above others.
3. Architects brought in early can contribute many ideas that go far beyond the design of the building.
4. It is better to pay a skilled architect than to overpay a salesman. A well-designed house practically sells itself.
5. Once a builder gets a taste of the satisfactions that come from a fine community he will never do another ordinary project.⁴²

Award-winning architects and designs added appeal to tract housing. They made buyers (who may have wanted to hire their own architect, but could not afford, or were afraid, to do so) feel special. Snob appeal was certainly a promotional tool for the educated and worldly clientele targeted by Bennett. For instance a small advertisement he placed in the *Washington Post* for one of his large and expensive homes in Kenwood Park mentioned that a design by Keyes and Lethbridge (the denomination of the firm at the time) was "like Dior on the label of a gown."⁴³

Cooperation functioned within a common culture of peer recognition (bordering on self-congratulation) nurtured by a plethora of awards granted by professional organizations and magazines. Since Bennett was quite active in homebuilders' organizations, as was Lethbridge within the AIA, awards naturally came their way. Not surprisingly, *House and Home* magazine named Bennett and Lethbridge among the 12 Top Performers for housing throughout the United States for 1965.⁴⁴

2. B - Major precedents for the Bennett / KLC collaboration

If Mr. Bennett ever had "role models," these were Northern California's Joseph Eichler (1900-1974) and Northern Virginia's Robert Davenport (1906-2002). Like him, they had a clear vision of their mission, were socially progressive, and selected home building as a second career. Eichler Homes and Davenport's magnum opus, Hollin Hills, have been studied in monographs and articles, and have rallied many *afficionados* among their homeowners.⁴⁵

⁴² "Local Builders Team With Architects," *Home Builders Monthly*, December 1952, 16-17.

⁴³ *Washington Post*, December 8, 1956, C 10.

⁴⁴ *Washington Post*, November 20, 1965, E 13

⁴⁵ John Burns ed., *Hollin Hills, Community of Vision: A SemiCentennial History 1949-1999*, Alexandria, VA:

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 17

2 B - 1 / Joseph Eichler

Although his houses (a total of 12,000, more than 10 times what Bennett built) were designed by several architects, Joseph Eichler maintained particularly fruitful relations with two nationally known firms, Anshen & Allen and Jones & Emmons.

As was the case with Bennett and KLC, Eichler's first collaboration with Anshen & Allen was purely personal. After having lived for two years in one of Frank Lloyd Wright's Usonian houses, Eichler, a transplanted New Yorker who had received a business degree from New York University and had worked in Wall Street, hired in 1949 University of Pennsylvania graduate Robert Anshen to design his own house. The following year, he commissioned Anshen & Allen to design prototypes for five of his subdivisions, in an effort to raise the level of design of his models, which he had previously entrusted to a competent but rather uninspired draftsman. In 1950, Eichler Homes received the prestigious Subdivision of the Year award from the magazine *Architectural Forum*:

The architects' painstaking blueprints have eliminated the costly construction mishaps which ate into profits in the old days when Eichler's own draftsmen prepared plans. Their planning skill has also made it possible for Eichler to offer more variety than most builders, yet profit from standardization of structure, materials and detailing on each tract.⁴⁶

Eichler hired A. Quincy Jones for the first time in 1951. Anshen & Allen and Jones & Emmons established a "very balanced collaboration that Eichler found extremely useful for fostering new ideas":

The Eichler house design was improved over time through a process that involved careful analysis of past projects while searching for ways to improve their designs. This resulted in a continual reworking of the plans, a task Eichler himself particularly enjoyed. The two firms met almost weekly during the early period (...) Jones, Anshen and Eichler would walk through completed tracts and appraise their successes and failures (...) By observing how people lived in the houses, they found out what people had to do to make the houses accommodate their lives.⁴⁷

Each firm "made unique contributions to the designs" but "the success of the homes as a whole depended upon a consistent set of principles."⁴⁸

Any builder tempted by modernism could learn a few lessons from Eichler, Anshen, and Jones. They understood the California ethos (just as Bennett and KLC understood the spirit of Montgomery County). They offered a distinctive product, delivering houses that retained the look and feel of much more expensive custom houses (something Bennett and KLC would also accomplish).⁴⁹ They popularized the idea of the open plan for living, dining, and kitchen areas. Eichler Homes were

Civic Association of Hollin Hills, 2000

⁴⁶ *Architectural Forum*, December 1950, 80

⁴⁷ Paul Adamson and Marty Arbunich, *Eichler: Modernism Builds the American Dream*, Gibbs Smith, 2002.

⁴⁸ Adamson and Arbunich, 68.

⁴⁹ Adamson and Arbunich, 100.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 18

designed with fast and easy housekeeping in mind and featured many space-enhancing devices. They were built on a single level, with very large expanses of glass at the back, and 10-foot ceiling compensating for small surfaces. Eichler did not hesitate to hire talented landscape architects. He also commissioned experimental designs. For example, in 1955, he unveiled a steel prototype entrusted to architect Raphael Soriano. Eichler was media savvy and maintained the services of a talented photographer, two good lessons learnt by Bennett. Eichler's demise came when he tried to venture in urban and high rise development. Four Eichler subdivision have been nominated to the National Register of historic Places: Green Gables (1950, Anshen and Allen, 62 homes) and Greenmeadow (1954-55, 243 homes) in Palo Alto; Rancho San Miguel (1955-59, 339 homes) in Walnut Creek, and a section of the Terra Linda subdivision in San Rafael.

2 B - 2 The Davenport / Goodman collaboration at Hollins Hill

Robert C. Davenport hailed from Nebraska, where he also went to college. Like Bennett, his first career was as a civil servant. From the mid-1930s to the 1950s, he was an administrative officer in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Like Bennett, he first ventured in home building to secure better housing for his family, forming the housing cooperative of Tauxemont in Northern Virginia, where he built five very modern prefabricated houses in aluminum right after World War II. Davenport's total output was modest, approximately 500 houses, nearly all located in Hollin Hills, south of old Alexandria, where he lived for many years. While Eichler had at his disposal flat land and a balmy climate, Davenport worked on the same rough Potomac Valley terrain as Bennett. One major difference, though, was that he did not act as builder of his own projects, delegating this part of the business to C. R. McAlley. Additionally, Davenport does not seem to have intervened in design decisions to the same extent as Bennett did. Indeed, his architect, Charles Goodman, had a difficult character and did not like to share responsibilities.

A financial and media success, published not only in professional journals, but also in *Life* and *Parent's Magazine*, Hollin Hills certainly empowered architects and builders tempted by Modernism. Begun in 1949, it already had 75 houses the following year. Construction of the 463 houses on 300 acres lasted until 1971. For Mr. Bennett, "notwithstanding the strong appeal of Goodman's Mondrian architecture," the abundance of glass walls in this designer's houses presented two major drawbacks: excessive heat loss, or gain, and lack of privacy.⁵⁰ Arthur Keyes believes that Charles Goodman "was trying for something a little bit slicker," "more abstract" than what his own firm was trying to achieve. Goodman's designs were more urbane, less into nature. KLC looked at Goodman's work, but not to imitate it. The detailing on Goodman's houses, for example, was "sparse" and "rigid". His houses were not "comfortable looking;" they did not convey much sense of domesticity. Goodman thought of himself as more ahead of the curve than other area architects; "some of it was so ahead that I don't think it was very good."⁵¹

Despite these criticisms, it is undeniable that Hollin Hills was an eye opener for both Bennett and his architects, and for many compelling reasons. Davenport was the first builder in the Capital Region to sell a modernist package, offering Knoll furniture, and Knut Versen fixtures at builder's discounted prices. Assisted by talented landscape architects (Lou Bernard Voight and subsequently Dan

⁵⁰ Edmund Bennett, note to Isabelle Gournay, October 2003.

⁵¹ Arthur Keyes, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, March 24, 2003.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 19

Kiley), Davenport and Goodman devised a site planning strategy which was "guided by three considerations: existing contours, economic utility distribution, and capitalization on scenic vistas."⁵² The park areas backing lots related to storm drainage patterns and the topography dictated the design of uphill and downhill models. Charles Goodman helped propel the construction of small homes towards new technical and aesthetic levels of excellence and innovation. Thinking in terms of cost-saving, logical "building systems," he devised simplified carpentry or grouped utilities in a central core. His plans provided the "absolute minimum of lost space."⁵³

In Montgomery County, Davenport (under the Hollinridge Company name) built a subdivision of 33 Goodman-designed homes in Potomac, which opened in 1960. Goodman also worked for builders Paul Burman and Paul Hammond, designing two small, inexpensive, projects, Hammond Wood and Hammond Hill in Wheaton, completed in 1950 and 1951 respectively,⁵⁴ as well as Wheatoncrest.⁵⁵ For the Bancroft Construction Company, headed by Herschel Blumberg, Goodman also designed 76 houses in Kensington's Rock Creek Woods, which opened in 1959.⁵⁶ The almost square model "offered on a semi-custom basis" was called the Pineview, a name used by Bennett.⁵⁷ Altogether, "there are 900 Goodman-designed houses in the Washington area."⁵⁸

2 B - 3 - Collaboration between the Lurias and Keyes, Lethbridge, and their associates in Northern Virginia

Mr. Bennett was not the first builder for whom Lethbridge and Keyes contributed home plans. In fact, their collaboration with Bennett should be understood as the continuation of their work for Gerald and Eli Luria in Fairfax County.⁵⁹ Prior to building houses, Gerald was a jeweler and Eli was primarily an investor with some experience in apartment house development. In 1951, they "switched from conventional to contemporary design."⁶⁰ Through their cousin Nathan Shapiro, they made the acquaintance of Donald Lethbridge and his then partner, Nicholas Satterlee.⁶¹ In the early 1950s, the demographic and socio-cultural profile of Fairfax County resembled that of Western Montgomery County. A cohort of well-educated middle-class professionals was anxious to settle in its pleasant natural surroundings and in easy-to-maintain, unpretentious, and cheerful modern homes. McLean was not unlike Bethesda; the new Lake Barcroft area welcomed modernist designs.

Built on a 135-acre abandoned farm about eight miles from downtown Washington, Holmes

⁵² "Builder's project combines intelligent land planning..." *Architectural Forum* 93 (December 1949), 82

⁵³ "A Transition from Conventional to Contemporary," *Washington Post*, March 22, 1953, R 8

⁵⁴ "Trim Design and an imaginative site plan are the easy-to-sell products of architect-builder collaboration," *Architectural Forum* 92 (June 1950), 130-131, *Architectural Forum* 92 (June 1952), 120-123 and "Builder housing: Wheaton, Maryland," *Progressive Architecture* 33 (May 1952), 88-92

⁵⁵ *Architectural Forum* 95 (December 1951), 126-129

⁵⁶ "A square shape pays off in this hillside house," *House and Home* (November 1959), 132-135.

⁵⁷ Display ad, *Washington Post* (May 2, 1959), C 9.

⁵⁸ David Morton, "Heart of Glass," *Washington City Paper*, September 5, 2003, 24

⁵⁹ Martin, *Tract-House Modern*, 143

⁶⁰ "A Transition from Conventional to Contemporary," *Washington Post*, March 22, 1953, R 8

⁶¹ Martin, *Tract-House Modern*, 141

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 20

Run Acres opened in 1951 and its first section was completed the following year.⁶² Altogether it had 280 units. Cheaper than Hollin Hills, because of its more distant location from downtown Washington, D.C., it answered the need for small, economic homes on the part of returning veterans and their young families. The first houses designed by Satterlee and Lethbridge had only 873 square feet, two bedrooms, one bath, and were placed on 10,000 square-foot lots, the minimum size allowed by local zoning at the time. Carports and basements were offered as options. Savings were achieved by using standardized dimensions for lumber and pre-cut components. Holmes Run Acres' commercial and media appeal was in great part due to its thoughtful site planning, devised by the architects. A community swimming pool was planned in 1952 and opened the following year.

Early residents of Holmes Run Acres often heard criticism of their modernist abode from relatives and friends; these negative comments reinforced community spirit among those who had espoused their unpretentious, cabin-like design. However, Holmes Run Acres was widely published and acclaimed in the media.⁶³ It received the *Washington Post* House-of-the-Year Award for 1951 and the much coveted Certified Quality Design seal of approval of the Housing Research Foundation of the Southwest Research Institute. Satterlee and Lethbridge extended Holmes Run to the East with an adjacent 65-house subdivision built in 1954-55. Although Holmes Run remains a very desirable neighborhood, most of its original homes have been enlarged and altered beyond recognition.

In November 1952, the collaboration between Luria Brothers and the new firm of Keyes, Smith and Satterlee, for which Lethbridge acted as Associate, was already heralded in *House and Home*, although few houses had actually been built.⁶⁴ The new Pine Spring development was located three miles from Holmes Run Acres, beyond Seven Corners. At 1,030 square feet for the basic unit, models complied with the increasing market demand for three-bedroom homes. The 125 houses ranging in price from \$15,250 to \$20,500 (including basic landscaping) were located on lots averaging 14,000 square feet. At Pine Spring, the Lurias also built garden apartments, designed by the same architects, as well as a row of stores.

Pine Spring received significant coverage and considerable praise. In 1954, photographs of the project not only graced the pages of *House and Home*, but also of FHA's *Insured Mortgage Portfolio* and Great Britain's *Architect's Journal*.⁶⁵ *House Beautiful* noted "the architect's ingenuity in turning

⁶² Martin, *Tract-House Modern*, 150

⁶³ "Local Builders team with architects," *Home Builders Monthly* December 1952, 16-17. Katharine Morrow Ford and Thomas H. Creighton, *Quality budget houses; a treasury of 100 architect-designed houses from \$5,000 to \$20,000* (New York, Reinhold Pub. Corp, 1954). According to Martin, *Tract-House Modern*, 184, "Lethbridge recalled that *Popular Mechanics* magazine advertised Holmes Run house plans, available by mail for five dollars, resulting in a large volume of sales throughout the country to builders and individual owners. See also Sarah Booth Conroy, "After a 25-Year Run, Holmes Run Is Still Ahead," *Washington Post*, September 12, 1976, M1 and M3.

⁶⁴ "Lesson for builders: to sell houses, get a fine site plan, fresh designs; [Lesson for] architects: one design job for builders can lead to others," *House and Home* (November 1952), 140-147. Lethbridge was credited for designing the original houses at Pine Spring, in an advertisement published in *House and Home* in January 1953, 28.

⁶⁵ "Architectural Design under the FHA Program," *Insured Mortgage Portfolio*, Spring 1954, 4. *The Architects' Journal*, February 18, 1954, 222-226.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 21

building economic into design assets" and how they had "carefully calculated every piece of material to do the job required of it, and no more."⁶⁶ Pine Spring received a commendation from the Southwest Research Institute, an NAHB award of merit. In 1953, it was the only subdivision to receive an award in the biennial architectural competition sponsored by the Washington Board of Trade. In 1953 as well, Pine Spring received an Honor Award for Outstanding American Architecture from the AIA. The jurors, who included Texas architect O'Neil Ford and Edward Durrell Stone of New York City, called the subdivision "fresh and stimulating after miles of poor colonial copies ... well above average in any American city"; for them, "unnecessary variety in shapes, windows, glass, wood and brick panels" were a "minor defect."⁶⁷ Photographs of Pine Spring were on view for two weeks at the gallery of the AIA headquarters in Washington, D.C., in August and September 1953.⁶⁸ The extremely modern and elegant garden apartment Keyes, Smith, Satterlee and Lethbridge designed at Pine Spring also received much praise and coverage; unfortunately, its front facade has been remodeled beyond recognition.⁶⁹

Donald Lethbridge and Eli Luria were among the six architect/builder teams (including that of A. Quincy Jones and Joseph Eichler) invited to exhibit a house in the highly publicized "Research Village" sponsored by the United States Gypsum Corporation and erected in Barrington, Illinois.⁷⁰ According to Chris Martin, Eli Luria relocated to California shortly after the first section of Pine Spring was completed. We found subsequent mentions of houses built by Luria Brothers, but these had none of the modernist crispness found at Holmes Run Acres and Pine Spring.⁷¹ Two groups of homes designed by Lethbridge and his partners insured the transition between their early work at Holmes Run and Pine Spring and the Kenwood Park houses they devised for Bennett in 1956. In January 1952, builder Charles Luria (working with the Highpoint Corporation Development Company) ventured in the orbit of Bethesda's upscale Country Club District. He offered a dozen houses on Massachusetts Avenue, 1.2 miles from the District Line, designed by Keyes, Smith, Satterlee and Lethbridge. Realtors were Luria Brothers. A second transitional precedent is the 30-unit section of Holmes Run Acres, which Lethbridge and his associates built for Joseph and Anthony Gaddy. Both projects are described at the beginning of part 3.D.

⁶⁶ Mary Roche, "A house for the family with \$ 7,000 a year," *House Beautiful*, June 1953, 137-139.

⁶⁷ *House and Home*, June 1953, 43.

⁶⁸ "Two Virginia Developments Rate Honor Housing Exhibit," *Washington Post*, August 23, 1953, R 7.

⁶⁹ See for instance *Mid Century Architecture in America. Honor Awards of the American Institute of Architects, 1949-1961* (Batlimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961), p.223.

⁷⁰ Other teams consisted of architect O'Neil Ford and builder Frank Robertson (Texas); Hugh Stubbins and Leonard Frank (Hampstead, New York); Harris Armstrong and Don Drummond; Gilbert Coddington and Alex Simms (Dayton, Ohio). See "a proving ground for new ideas - U.S. Gypsum's 6 'Test Tube' Houses, *American Builder* (March 1954), 234 and *Progressive Architecture* (May 1955), 131-132.

⁷¹ Martin, *Tract-House Modern*, 188.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 22

3- The Bennett/KLC collaboration, 1953-1973

3 A- Biographies

3 A. 1 - The architects

We shall begin with the architects since their involvement with home building preceded that of Edmund Bennett. Arthur H. Keyes, Jr. was born in Rutland, Vermont in 1917. After secondary school at Deerfield Academy, he studied at Princeton University, receiving a Bachelor of Architecture degree in 1939, and at Harvard University, earning a Master degree in architecture in 1942. The same year, he received a certificate in Naval Architecture from MIT. At Princeton, he discovered architecture through his roommate, initially took basic courses in drafting, perspective, freehand, and mechanical drawing, as well as architectural history and declared his major during his junior year. Mr. Keyes was very impressed by the special issue that *Architectural Forum* devoted to Frank Lloyd Wright in 1938 and decided to visit Taliesin West with two of his friends. On the drive back, they visited many of Wright's designs (from a list of 66 given to them by his secretary), zigzagging back east in his Ford convertible. Among the houses they visited was the "Usonian" Jacobs House in Madison, Wisconsin (1936-37).

While Princeton's architecture program was, in Mr. Keyes' own terms, "submerged in Beaux-Arts classicism," its counterpart at Harvard reflected new ideas and was a magnet for the most

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 23

progressive, enthusiastic, and talented professors and students. When Mr. Keyes entered the program in 1939, newcomers Walter Gropius and Marcel Breuer had already put their stamp on the curriculum. However, he did not feel coerced into Bauhaus or International Style orthodoxy. Instead he recalls a climate of open-mindedness and tolerance: Gropius would say "start from scratch, start with a white box and then try to think out something logical and do it differently. That was a surprise." Working on a project for a "large house," Mr. Keyes submitted a design influenced by Frank Lloyd Wright and still got a good mark for it. He was also very impressed by Finnish architect Alvar Aalto, when he heard him speak at MIT. In 1941, he married Lucile Sheppard, the daughter of then Texas Senator Morris Sheppard (he had met his fiancée in Cambridge). The ceremony took place in Washington, D.C., where the bride had spent her childhood. Mr. Keyes worked for the Navy for almost four years, first as a draftsman for the Boston Navy Yard, then in Washington, D.C. in the Bureau of Ships. He remained in the nation's capital after the war.

From 1946 to 1948, Mr. Keyes worked in the office of Berla and Abel, and moonlighted for Burket, Neufeld, and de Mars on plans for Bannockburn Cooperators. As we shall see, both experiences prepared him well for his future work with Edmund Bennett. Mr. Keyes' early commissions included a house for Harry N. Hirschberg, a high official in the Hecht Company who wanted "a modern house with some stonework."⁷² Located in Bethesda, the home, which Mr. Keyes qualifies as "rustic and simple," was visibly influenced by Aalto and was published by *Architectural Record* in November 1951. It received an architecture award from the Washington Board of Trade.⁷³ For his own house, located at 2605 31st Street, N.W in Washington D.C., Mr. Keyes and his partners produced another design of note.⁷⁴

Francis Donald Lethbridge was born in Hackensack, NJ in 1920 in a family that counted several architects and builders. He studied at the Stevens Institute of Technology in Hoboken, NJ from 1937 to 1940, the University of Colorado Engineering School in 1941, then enrolled as a pilot in the US Naval Reserve. In 1945, he went to Yale University, earning an M.Arch degree two years later. Upon graduation, Lethbridge moved to Washington to help his older brother "redesign a line of prefabricated houses he had a franchise to market."⁷⁵ For the same company that manufactured rather traditional homes, Lethbridge also designed temporary prefabricated dormitories for public universities in New York State. Two years later, he secured employment with Berla & Abel, where he stayed approximately one year and met Arthur Keyes. He went to work for another progressive local firm, Faulkner, Kingsbury and

⁷² Arthur Keyes, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, March 24, 2003.

⁷³ *Architectural Record* 110 (November 1951), 135-137. The article also credits Basil Yurchenko, a Russian-born architect who, according to Mr. Keyes, did little actual design work on this house.

⁷⁴ See "an upside-down plan for a growing family," *House and Garden*, August 1952, 54-55, and Katherine Morrow Ford and Thomas H. Creighton, *Designs for living; 175 examples of quality home interiors* (New York, Reinhold Pub. Corp., 1955), 92. In 1957 Arthur Keyes built a house for himself on 16 acres, two miles west of Potomac Village, overlooking the river at 11920 River Road. The house had a cantilevered deck over the water. Mr. Keyes used a 4-foot module throughout and experimented with a series of trusses, all identical. Every room had a river view. The first level was stone and concrete. Unfortunately, the house was sold recently and the current residents bulldozed it, tore down surrounding trees and put in an 18th century colonial style house.

⁷⁵ William Bushong, Judith Helm Robinson, Julie Mueller, *A centennial history of the Washington Chapter, the American Institute of Architects, 1887-1987* (Washington: Architectural Foundation Press, 1987), 89.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 24

Stenhouse, until 1950. For a little more than a year, Lethbridge partnered with Nicholas Satterlee (Rochester, NY 1915- Washington, D.C. 1974), who was an architecture student at Harvard at the same time as Mr. Keyes and a former Berla and Abel employee (1946-48).

In 1951, Keyes and Satterlee joined forces with another former employee of Berla and Abel and a militant modernist, Chloethiel Woodard Smith (Peoria Ill. 1910- Washington, D.C. 1992).⁷⁶ They soon included Lethbridge into a rather informal partnership. The young and energetic team, which Lethbridge described as "almost like a confederacy," kept busy with local commissions and received significant notice in the specialized press.⁷⁷ For instance, the Therapy Building at Chestnut Lodge, a psychiatric institution in Rockville's historic district completed in 1954, which Mr. Keyes attributes essentially to Chloethiel Woodard Smith, was published the following year in a study *Architectural Forum* devoted to small health buildings.⁷⁸ The talented foursome attracted the attention of the Department of State, and was entrusted with the design of the Office Building and Embassy Residence in Asuncion, Paraguay.⁷⁹ Their first venture in tract housing was for N. Nathan Shapiro, a cousin of the Lurias, for whom they designed modernized ramblers at Forestvale, in Silver Spring, one block from the intersection of Georgia Avenue and Forest Glen Road, which opened in early 1951. According to Lethbridge, Shapiro "wanted something like Levitt only better."⁸⁰ Keyes, Smith, Satterlee and Lethbridge also built a large flat-roofed house at 2533 North Ridgeview Road in Arlington for Gerald Luria, which featured glass transoms and a patio-solarium, and can be regarded as a precedent for the atrium houses at Carderock Springs.⁸¹

In 1955, Satterlee and Smith formed a separate office while Keyes and Lethbridge established their own. Two years later, they were joined by David H. Condon (Pasadena 1916 - Chevy Chase 1996), a graduate of the University of California at Berkeley, who had worked for Charles Goodman between 1945 and 1952.⁸² In 1961, Colden Ruggles Florance (born Baltimore, 1931, A.B. Princeton, 1952, M.F.A. Princeton, 1955) joined the office, after having spent two years as job captain for Satterlee & Smith. KLC became an important training ground for young architects interested in residential design. For instance, Hugh Newell Jacobsen worked there in 1957-58, after a stint in Philip Johnson's office

⁷⁶ Smith earned a B.Arch degree from the University of Oregon in 1932 and an M. Arch from Washington University in 1933. Her initial expertise was in housing. In 1935, she came to Washington, D.C. to work for the Federal Housing Administration; in 1939 she was promoted to Chief Architect and Chief of Planning, for the Large Scale Housing Division of the Federal Housing Administration. Between 1940 and 1946, she accompanied her husband, who was working for the Foreign Service, to Canada, Burma, and Bolivia, where she taught architecture in La Paz. She played a key role in the redevelopment of Southwest D.C. She was a member of the US Commission of Fine Arts, from 1967-1976, and became FAIA in 1960.

⁷⁷ Bushong et al., *A centennial history of the Washington Chapter*, 90.

⁷⁸ "A Normal Building for Restoring Mental Patients to Normal Life," *Architectural Forum* (September 1955), 133-135

⁷⁹ "Architecture to Represent America Abroad," *Architectural Record*, May 1955, 188

⁸⁰ Martin, *Tract-House Modern*, 236

⁸¹ " 'Festival of Homes' Exhibit Houses Reflect New Trends," *Washington Evening Star*, August 28, 1954, B-1 and B-8

⁸² The house David Condon designed for himself on 6805 Georgia Street in Chevy Chase is illustrated in *House & Home* (February 1969), 88.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 25

and before establishing his own practice in the Nation's Capital. Lethbridge left the partnership in 1975, embarking on a second career as a restoration architect.⁸³ The firm was renamed Keyes, Condon and Florance and still exists as the Smith Group.

During their partnership, Arthur Keyes, Donald Lethbridge, and David Condon were also noted for their remarkable individual achievements. They were all elected Fellows of the American Institute of Architects in the 1960s. Well read, aware that architects had a role to fulfill in society, very concerned with the idea of "conservation," Lethbridge, who was responsible for the design of the US embassy in Lima, Peru, was the most "public-oriented" personality of the three.⁸⁴ From 1960 to 1962, he served as a member of the new AIA Residential Architecture Committee; in 1962 he chaired the AIA Committee on the Homebuilding Industry (other members included Carl Koch and A. Quincy Jones). In 1964, he served as President of the Washington Chapter of the A.I.A. He co-authored with Hugh Newell Jacobsen *A Guide to the Architecture of Washington, D.C.*, published in 1965. He was also Chairman of the Joint Committee on Landmarks for the National Capitol and a member of the Potomac Planning Taskforce for the Department of the Interior. In 1968, Lethbridge was one of the jurors for the Awards for Design Excellence attributed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. He was a member of the Society of Architectural Historians and National Trust for Historic Preservation.

In the 1950s and 1960s, KLC was essentially active in the District of Columbia, where it had its office, Montgomery County, and to a lesser extent Northern Virginia.⁸⁵ They set high standards for modern architecture in the Capital Region. In the District of Columbia, their office buildings include the Forest Industries Building (1619 Massachusetts Avenue, 1962) and the Sunderland Building (1320 19th Street, NW, 1969). In the pilot urban renewal operation for Southwest, D.C., KLC won the competition for Tiber Island (1961-1963), a residential community that received an AIA national award, and the adjoining Carrollsburg Square apartment and townhouse complex (completed 1966). In the renewal area of Foggy Bottom, the firm designed Columbia Plaza (1963, in association with deMars and Reay). Mr. Keyes was particularly involved in KLC's multi-family housing commissions. In 1968-69, KLC devised a Master Plan for the project for Fort Lincoln New Town (in association with planner David Crane).

Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon contributed to bringing high quality modern architecture to Montgomery County. They designed at a rather domestic scale two Unitarian churches in Bethesda, adopting the same "woody" and natural spirit as in their houses. Mr. Bennett was a member of both churches and assisted in buying land, and selecting the architects and the contractors.⁸⁶ Cedar Lane

⁸³ See *Property Development Plan for the Decatur House*, prepared for the National Trust for Historic Preservation by Francis D. Lethbridge and Associates; with Shirley Maxwell Massey, Constance Werner Ramirez, 1980, and *Property Development Plan for the Woodrow Wilson House*, prepared for the National Trust for Historic Preservation by Francis D. Lethbridge and Associates and Emily Hotaling Eig, 1980.

⁸⁴ See Jane C. Loeffler, *The Architecture of Diplomacy* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998), 165 and 170, fig. 145.

⁸⁵ See, for instance, St Patrick's Episcopal Church in Falls Church Honorable Mention, illustrated in *Potomac Valley Architect*, June 1958, 12.

⁸⁶ John B. Willmann, "Contemporary Homes Built to Fit 'Bethesda Family Profile'," *Washington Post*, May 26, 1962, B2: Bennett "built a parsonage as his contribution to the building fund, taking only overhead and supervisory expenses".

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 26

Unitarian Church was built in two phases, in 1960 and 1968, with Pietro Belluschi acting as Associated Architect.⁸⁷ The design of Cedar Lane is not overtly religious, its assembly room, with a beautiful window in Belgian stained glass designed by Condon, being used for many purposes. Lethbridge was the partner in charge for River Road Unitarian Church (first phase completed in 1966).⁸⁸

Both built in the early 1960s, two custom designed homes by KLC received media attention: in Potomac, a rustic residence for J. Gibson Semmes⁸⁹; in Bethesda, a Demonstration House sponsored by the Hoo Hoo Club, a fraternal group of lumbermen in cooperation with the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association, which showcased many samples of wood ranging from tongue in groove mahogany to redwood.⁹⁰ In Bethesda, KLC also designed Ayr lawn Elementary School (currently owned by YMCA), built on the site of a dairy farm, the tower of which was preserved. They also designed two youth centers for M-NCPPC, thanks to their connections with the chairman of the Montgomery County Planning Board, J. Newton Brewer, Jr.: one on Walsh Street, just off Wisconsin Avenue, in downtown Bethesda (First Award PVC-AIA 1962); the other in Wheaton on Georgia Avenue (Award of Merit, PVC-AIA 1964).⁹¹ KLC were commissioned to design the twin-towered Administration Building at the National Institute of Health (with Richard Collins and Associates)⁹² and an office building for the Hydrospace Research Corporation in Rockville (which received an Honor Award, from the Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce and Potomac Valley Chapter of the AIA in 1970).

3 A.2 - Edmund J. Bennett

Among Maryland's home builders, Edmund J. Bennett was certainly one of the best educated, most articulate, and media-savvy. He was born in the District of Columbia in 1920. Soon after, his parents moved to 4119 Leland Street in Chevy Chase. His father, James V. Bennett (who, in 1956, moved to a house built by his son, located at 5840 Marbury Road in Kenwood Park), was Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons for 27 years.⁹³ Mr. Bennett had two sisters: Brenda and Ann, who both worked for him. Edmund J. Bennett attended Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School and Mercersburg Academy, started college at Brown University in Providence, but decided to move to a warmer climate, selecting

⁸⁷ "Four Houses of Worship," *Progressive Architecture* 40 (June 1959), 119-121

⁸⁸ First Award PVC-AIA 1966 (PVA 11-12 1966) "Unforced Simplicity for a Unitarian Church," *Architectural Record* (January 1967), 129-132; *AIA Journal* (July 1966), 50-51. River Road Unitarian Church received an AIA National Award in 1966.

⁸⁹ This house received a First Award from the Potomac Valley Chapter of the AIA in 1962 and was reproduced in the May 1962 issue of *Potomac Valley Architect*.

⁹⁰ See "Warmth and Comfort are Modern," *Architectural Record Houses of 1961*, New York, 1961, 104-107; "This house uses wood in traditional forms," *House and Home* 19 (March 1961), 110-111; *Journal of Homebuilding*, June 1951, 73; *Potomac Valley Architect*, January 63.

⁹¹ Arthur Keyes, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, March 24, 2003, mentioned having designed two little libraries around 1975. One was in Twinbrook (Rockville), clinging to the edge of a shopping mall, at the southside of the parking lot. The other was in Holton Arms; it was an octagonal building with a skylight.

⁹² This building won the Oliver Kuhn cup awarded from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce. See "NIH Office Wins Award in Bethesda," *Washington Post*, January 6, 1962, B2.

⁹³ J.Y. Smith, "James V. Bennett Dies; Reformed U.S. Prisons," *Washington Post*, November 21, 1978, C6.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 27

Stanford University, where he was awarded a bachelor's degree in Business Administration and Political Science. The modern architecture of the Bay Area, and of the West Coast in general, appealed to him a great deal.

From January 1943 to June 1946, Mr. Bennett was in the Army.⁹⁴ He subsequently was a civil servant, first in the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, then in the Department of State where he was a management analyst. From 1951 to 1953, during the Korean War, he was recalled to active duty and worked as Deputy Executive Officer of the Psychological Strategy Board (in the Executive Office of the President), which was chaired by the head of the C.I.A. As Secretary, his role was that of a "scribe," recording meetings with key military and political leaders. He, and other board staff members, kept an eye on General MacArthur's performance on the Korean War front. Mr. Bennett also earned a Master's Degree in Public Administration from American University in 1950, and started working towards a Ph.D. in this field. His government experience in management analysis was an unusual but useful prelude to home building. As stated by *American Builder*, Bennett was applying in his second career "the same principles of sound management that he once used for Uncle Sam." Bennett was intent to excel in the five fields he saw proper to homebuilding activity: "planning and organizing; land development; production management; financial management; and merchandising."⁹⁵ He acquired a national reputation among homebuilding professionals as a consummate manager.

In 1953, Bennett wanted to build a five-bedroom house for his family "on one of two south-facing lots overlooking a fairway at the rear of the Bethesda Country Club" on the 7700 block of Bells Mill Road (this road was discontinued in the 1960s with the construction of Democracy Boulevard). Earlier that year, he had seen Charles Goodman's Hollin Hills and Donald Lethbridge's work at Pine Spring. Mr. Bennett approached Lethbridge and requested he modify his five-bedroom two-story design for Pine Spring. His plan was to build and sell the second, adjoining home, to help pay for his own residence.⁹⁶ As the latter was being completed, someone asked to buy it. The \$6,666 profit from the sale of his house served as capital to start a homebuilding business.⁹⁷

Edmund Bennett's firm carried several names: Bennett Construction Company from 1954 to 1962; Bennett & Matthews Construction Company from 1962 to 1965; and Edmund J. Bennett Associates from 1965 to 1975. Mr. Bennett built two houses in 1953, six a year from 1954 to 1956, eight in 1957, fourteen in 1958, twenty in 1959, and sixty in 1963. In 1959, his payroll included a secretary, a field supervisor, four carpenters, and three utility men.⁹⁸ At the time he was building

⁹⁴ "Gala Round of Parties Honor Miss Peck and Captain Bennett," *Washington Post*, May 23, 1946, 10.

⁹⁵ "Government Analyst," 86

⁹⁶ Edmund Bennett, note to Isabelle Gournay, October 2003. Two Bennett-built "Solar Houses with a View" on "half-acre wooded lots in scenic community" -- a "3-bedroom rambler with bath, powder room and recreation room" for \$25,750; and a "5-bedroom rambler with 2 baths, powder room and recreation room" for \$27,550 -- were advertised in the *Washington Evening Star* on January 2, 1954, section B and *Washington Post*, January 31, 1954, R 7. Morris E. Trotter, ASLA was mentioned as the landscape architect and planning consultant. Mentioned features were a "huge pine-paneled recreation room with fireplace," a "large brick terrace partly under roof," a "carport and storage shed," "bathroom vanities, aluminum windows, large closets," and "breezeway 12x26 partly roofed and screened from street".

⁹⁷ "This is Builder Ed Bennett," 152. KLC designed a spectacular summer home for Edmund Bennett in Rehoboth Beach and in the 1960s, another residence at 10215 Fernwood Road in Bethesda.

⁹⁸ "This is Builder Ed Bennett," 152 and 153.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 28

Carderock Springs, Bennett had 75 persons on payroll and nearly 300 on subcontracted work.⁹⁹ The size of his firm was rather typical of the Washington, D.C. suburbs until the early 1960s. Even then, industrial scale builders like Levitt and Sons (who, besides an 8,000-unit community in Bowie, built relatively small subdivisions in the region) did not dominate this market.

Bennett's professional leadership at the local and national levels is undeniable. He was President of the Suburban Maryland Builders Association in 1960-61, Director of the NAHB Research Institute, and the NAHB Environmental Design Institute from 1967 to 1972, a member of NAHB's community design committee, and the "Washington area building industry representative to a *House and Home Magazine*-sponsored organization of innovative builders (about 25) from across the U.S. known as the 'Young Turks.'"¹⁰⁰ Bennett received numerous personal awards. He was on the cover of *American Builder* in June 1964 (plate 1); the companion article noticed that "his unorthodox ideas and strong convictions had sparked a steady growth of business."

Bennett had a "strong instinct for selling."¹⁰¹ He wrote in trade journals in an earnest and clear prose.¹⁰² Maryland homebuilders were a rather sophisticated group, but Mr. Bennett saw himself as better traveled and more cosmopolitan. As one of his advertisements explained: "When they want new ideas, most builders go no further than the house next door. Edmund J. Bennett goes to Stockholm, Copenhagen, Mexico City, Sussex. And his houses show it."¹⁰³

From 1969 to 1974, Bennett built a total of 850 garden apartment units and 400 town houses in Reston and Columbia.¹⁰⁴ In 1971, he developed 174 town houses in the Phelps Luck neighborhood in the village of Long Reach; clustered around courtyards, they had traditional design by the Bethesda office of Patterson and Worland. In January 1972, the *Washington Post* announced that financing was being completed by the Rouse Corporation for a 300-unit 221(d)4 garden apartment complex in Columbia, "developed by Bentana Park Associates Limited Partnership with Edmund J. Bennett Development Corp. of Rockville as general contractor."¹⁰⁵

In the fall of 1971, Mr. Bennett sold his company to American Cyanamid, "a national chemical company that aspired to fast profits in the expanding housing industry" and which acquired another local building firm, Croyder-Irvin. In Northern Virginia, Bennett developed the Bentana Woods townhouses and Bentana Park garden apartments in Reston (1972-73), two "rustic-modern" designs by Cohen Haft. In 1974, he opened Alexandria Overlook, a series of condominium garden apartments on a wooded site.¹⁰⁶ Ironically, Mr. Bennett's final collaboration with KLC was also in Northern Virginia:

⁹⁹ Bennett Talks of Building 'New Town,'" *Washington Post*, July 25, 1964,

¹⁰⁰ Edmund Bennett, note to Isabelle Gournay, October 2003.

¹⁰¹ John Matthews, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, March 24, 2003.

¹⁰² For instance, Letter to the editor of *House and Home* August 1962 regarding article July 1962 "59 Research-Tested Ideas" regarding copyrighted house designs.

¹⁰³ Display ad, *Washington Post*, September 18, 1965, E7.

¹⁰⁴ Edmund Bennett, note to Isabelle Gournay, October 2003.

¹⁰⁵ See "Bentana Park Financed," *Washington Post*, January 22, 1972, D12.

¹⁰⁶ "Overlook Does Brick Business," *Washington Post*, July 29, 1973, 13. An advertisement in the *Washington Post*, December 29, 1973, B 3 for the Reston, Columbia, and Alexandria projects also showed small images of Carderock Springs and New Mark commons with the caption "Bennett does it Better."

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 29

Pegram Place (1974), six houses, based on Carderock Spring's Overlook and Pineview models, which are still extant.¹⁰⁷ As "high interest rates emerged and impacted the industry negatively," Cyanamid sold off its land inventory and left the business.¹⁰⁸ From 1975 to 1978, Mr. Bennett assisted 2 REITs in completing distressed housing projects in several southeastern states. Then he moved to Arizona, where he lived for many years before passing away on March 10, 2013, at the age of 93.

3 A.3 - Other persons associated with Bennett/KLC subdivisions.

At Potomac Overlook, Edmund Bennett was associated with Matthews and Potter; John Lee Matthews also worked with him on the first 77 houses at Carderock Springs. He was born in Akron, Ohio in 1921. In the 1930s his family moved to Washington, D.C, living in Georgetown before it was fashionable. His father had the Seven Up franchise for the region. Mr. Matthews studied engineering at Catholic University, served as surveyor with an Army artillery division in Italy during World War II, then went to work for an engineering firm in Silver Spring, also as a surveyor.¹⁰⁹ Around 1950, Matthews told us he designed and built himself a first "Cape Codish" type of house on the section of Wiscasset Road that was never paved (we were not able to locate the house). He drew up his own plans, and got the appropriate permits. The house had large steel casement windows at the corners, 4 panes wide. It had a living room in the front and a dining room in the back.

Matthews learned the trade by building his own house and then he "learned as he went." He joined Lloyd Potter, who owned a sawmill and supplied some of the lumber for Potomac Overlook houses. They hired the skilled workers they needed as they went. They had two or three carpenters working for them. Mr. Matthews used to spend a lot of time just going from site to site to supervise construction. He estimates that he has probably built about 500 houses in all. He "went to contemporary houses" because "that was just his instinct" and because he "loves to see out."

Among the eight or so houses Matthews and Potter built in Bannockburn, one (at # 7103 Laverock Lane, 1959) was designed by KLC.¹¹⁰ In Bannockburn, Mr. Matthews also worked with Donald Drayer, a D.C. architect who designed a large number of apartment complexes and whose archives are in the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress. After 1963, Matthews-Schwartz continued building distinctive homes, working essentially with the firm of Cross and Adreon. However, KLC designed for Matthews-Schwartz the two models for Timberwood of Virginia, a 22-unit subdivision near Holmes Run Acres, which opened in 1968.

Aware he needed to delegate certain responsibilities to expand his business and focus on what he did best, Mr. Bennett surrounded himself with very competent collaborators. For the managerial and commercial end of his operation, he hired several graduates of Harvard Business School. One of them was Gordon V. Smith, who later started his own building firm and now heads a major development company. Bennett's sister, Brenda Bennett Bell, worked as a sales associate for her brother's

¹⁰⁷ Display ads, *Washington Post*, May 18 and 25, 1974, E 29 and E 7.

¹⁰⁸ Edmund J. Bennett, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, April 2003.

¹⁰⁹ John B. Willmann, "Contemporary Homes Built to Fit 'Bethesda Family Profile'," *Washington Post* May 26, 1962, B2

¹¹⁰ For 7103 Laverock, see the display ad in the *Washington Post*, May 4, 1960, B8 where the three-bedroom, two-bath home was offered at \$37,500.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 30

developments in 1960-61 and after 1967 as Sales and Merchandising Manager, the only woman to hold such a position in greater Washington at the time. Because the majority of his sales agents were women with strong personalities, Mr. Bennett felt he needed another woman to supervise and organize them.

Mr. Bennett regularly worked with landscape architect Thurman Donovan (1924-1984). Donovan spent almost all of his adult life in Maryland, living in both Silver Spring and Boonsboro. He received his Bachelor of Science degree in Horticulture from the University of Maryland in College Park and his Master of Landscape Architecture degree from the University of Illinois. After fighting in Belgium during World War II, Donovan worked as a landscape architect in the office of Sandy Sanders. He established his own practice in 1959. In 1977 the firm was renamed Donovan, Feola, Balderson & Associates and still exists, with offices in Montgomery Village. Thurman Donovan worked on the Wheaton House garden apartment complex (1962, Cohen Haft), the Evergreen Garden Apartments in Hyattsville, Pooks Hill Apartments in Bethesda, and Green Acres Nursery and Elementary School in Rockville, as well as on larger projects such as Rossmoor Leisure World, Sumner Village, Crystal City, Montgomery Village, and the Van Ness Center. He was also very interested in golf course design, which he studied in Scotland. In Maryland, he designed the Red Gate, Enterprise, and Washington National golf courses. Donovan and his firm received several awards though they did not believe in going after the praise. The American Association of Nurseryman awarded Donovan its Plant America Award in 1960, its Industrial Landscaping Award in 1966, and its Commercial Landscaping Award in 1967. In 1964, Donovan received a Federal Housing Administration Award of Merit for Residential Design for his work on Georgetown South.¹¹¹

3 B - The Bennett/KLC synergy

The Bennett/KLC synergy was based on mutual respect and a shared vision. Edmund Bennett did considerable market research to identify typical purchasers, hiring consultants to that effect. He declared to the *Washington Post* that he had "a 100-page study of how American suburban families like to live" and that he "may know more about the things people really want in a house than they do."¹¹² Bennett was architecturally and urbanistically savvy. For Potomac Overlook, he gave KLC a list of standards such as floor area limits and minimum sizes for rooms, which he had assembled with some market input. For Carderock Springs, he provided "a fourteen-page memo outlining his thinking on every phase of his operation".¹¹³ Arthur Keyes feels that his firm was constrained by the pressures of economizing: "Bennett was very opinionated. He knew what he wanted and you couldn't talk him out of it." But among home builders, he was one of "the most devoted to protecting land, contours, and trees" and showed a keen interest in the process of home building and the quality of materials.¹¹⁴

Edmund Bennett's educational and professional background had taught him how to assemble systematically data and documentation. *House and Home* mentions that his sources included "books and reports by Architect Robert Wood Kennedy, merchandising consultant Stanley Edge, the Small Homes Council, ACTION, the Women's Housing Congress," and the Housing and Home Finance

¹¹¹ Andy Balderson. Interview with Liz Creveling, June 25, 2003.

¹¹² Ruth Wagner, "Seek an Area and a House That Suit Your Family," *Washington Post*, March 20, 1966, F 16.

¹¹³ "This is Builder Ed Bennett," 157.

¹¹⁴ Arthur Keyes, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, March 24, 2003.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 31

Administration.¹¹⁵ Bennett's trust in market research and in analyzing customer preferences was shared by most of his colleagues. He also believed in targeted, sophisticated publicity and excellent professional photography (essentially performed by Robert Lautman and John Alexander). His advertisements displayed good graphic quality; his brochures adopted the same uncluttered look as his houses and, for greater objectivity, relied on photography more than on renderings. His houses did not have any prearranged FHA-insurance and Bennett's company organized mortgages and helped prospective homeowners to finance their purchases.

Donald Lethbridge was the partner in charge for Carderock Springs, David Condon for New Mark Commons. Arthur Keyes recalls that all members of the trio would intervene in the design process but, in case of disagreement, the partner in charge had the last word. John Matthews recalls that when a problem occurred with the architects' plans, he reached out to Lethbridge, whom he deems "an excellent architect": not only were the houses well-designed, but the specifications were good, and all the necessary information was on the blueprints for plans, elevations, and details.¹¹⁶ KLC-designed houses achieved a successful combination of brand identity and flexibility, a rather unusual occurrence in tract housing. As noted in *American Builder*, "houses are so flexible in plan that they are attractive on all four sides and may be turned end-wise to the street, reversed and modified to adapt to any hillside problem."¹¹⁷

KLC and Bennett Construction Company copyrighted their architectural plans "after a suburban Virginia builder 'pirated' them to build a few houses in Vienna, VA, without their knowledge" and "a law suit stopped further misappropriation."¹¹⁸ The architects' design fees averaged 2% of the sales price of the house.¹¹⁹ Buyers of tract houses could request limited variations on prototypes, at an additional charge but, according to Bennett, "these instances were quite infrequent."¹²⁰

3 C-- Common characteristics

Edmund Bennett believed in "the importance of establishing and maintaining identity,"¹²¹ a feat that could be achieved by a "complete architectural integration of street layout, siting, design, varied elevation, color, texture, cedar roofing materials, landscaping, and even interior details and finish."¹²² As people and homes needed to achieve "more prominence than the automobile and the streets," Bennett promoted the concept of a "visual community," which he contrasted with "ordinary" subdivisions and which catered to buyers "seeking a home and community differentiated from the more anonymous mass of suburbia."¹²³

¹¹⁵ "59 research-tested ideas," 147. See Robert Wood Kennedy, *the House and The Art of its Design*, New York, 1953.

¹¹⁶ John Matthews, Interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, 24 March 2003.

¹¹⁷ Mason, "Problem sites," 63

¹¹⁸ Edmund J. Bennett, notes to Isabelle Gournay, October 2003.

¹¹⁹ "This is Builder Ed Bennett," 153.

¹²⁰ Edmund J. Bennett, notes to Isabelle Gournay, August 2003.

¹²¹ Edmund J. Bennett, "Economics and the Visual Community," 47

¹²² Brochure for the first phase of Carderock Springs

¹²³ Edmund J. Bennett, "Economics and the Visual Community," 47

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 32

3 C. 1- Planning and landscaping

Edmund Bennett believed that "the difference between an average subdivision and an outstanding one is the way the land is planned."¹²⁴ Environmental friendliness is common to all KLC-designed and Bennett-built houses and subdivisions. The sales brochure for the third section of Carderock Springs claimed: "We agree with Frank Lloyd Wright that the house should be 'of the site and not *on* it' (emphasis in text)." While most mass builders tried to erase accidents in the natural terrain if they were in the way of fast and cheap construction, Bennett did not hesitate to purchase heavily wooded and rugged sites that abounded in Western Montgomery County. He used sections that were impossible or difficult to build upon for open or recreational space.

Edmund Bennett's strategy was to "avoid paying too much for land" as "too many builders go broke that way."¹²⁵ He declared to *American Builder*: "Problem sites make my best sellers"; this journal published by NAHB admired how Bennett's "planning-building skill converts rugged terrain from a liability to a sales asset."¹²⁶ Compliance with soil erosion and drainage regulations did not come cheap. Bennett and KLC took advantage of the sloping terrain to offer cost-saving and space-efficient two-story plans, while preserving the feeling of "lying low on the land," which was a characteristic of most post-World War II modern houses.

Tree preservation was a major concern for Bennett and his architects. In addition to moral and emotional benefits, there were also practical advantages to wooded home sites. Not only did they protect privacy, but they also attenuated the noise of vehicular traffic (Carderock Springs and New Mark Commons are adjoining major highways) and preserving trees saved "the buyer considerable expense in landscaping his property."¹²⁷ At Potomac Overlook, branches were trimmed and a few trees cleared in order to provide a view of the Potomac River from every house. In heavily wooded sites, a majority of the underbrush and spindly trees were cleared but the bigger trees were preserved. Whenever possible, the forest floor was conserved. Houses were amply setback from the street, but instead of a manicured and fertilized lawn, front yards featured shade-loving and natural-looking ground covers and bushes.

At Carderock Springs, a topographic survey of the entire property involved locating every tree with a diameter of at least 12 inches: "The survey was imposed on a topographic map, and all houses and roads were sited to save as many trees as possible. In addition, an inspection is made after a house is staked out, and the siting is changed if it will save a particularly attractive tree or clump of trees."¹²⁸ Greenhorne and O'Mara, a highly respected engineering and surveying firm based in Riverdale, Prince George's County, worked from aerial photographs secured from the Soil Conservation Service. As these photographs had been taken in winter months, pines could be easily recorded and differentiated from hardwood trees, which Mr. Bennett wanted to spare.¹²⁹ At New Mark Commons, this kind of census recorded 653 trees at least 12 inches in diameter.

¹²⁴ "This is Builder Ed Bennett," 155.

¹²⁵ "This is Builder Ed Bennett," 154

¹²⁶ Mason, "Problem Sites."

¹²⁷ Mary Roche, "A house for the family with \$7,000 a year," 138.

¹²⁸ "Good land, made better by skilled planning," 90.

¹²⁹ Edmund J. Bennett, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, April 2003.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 33

Edmund Bennett was much more methodical and thorough in his approach to land planning than most home builders. In its July 1962 issue, *House and Home* appraised the first section of Carderock Springs:

On a single enlarged geodetic survey map, he [Bennett] plots pertinent data from up to a dozen other local maps. Topographic data help him avoid land with gradients of over 20% (generally too costly to develop) (...) Zoning information steers him from land where big-lot zoning (over ½ acre) makes volume building unfeasible (...) Soil conservation maps help him find wooded land (which he likes). And planning-commission maps tell him if his plans jibe with the over-all county plan. The result? Fast and thorough land appraisals. Instead of spending hours - or even days - checking out a prospective piece of land, Bennett can decide whether it is desirable in a matter of minutes. And he uses the time that's saved to work up a preliminary land plan, analyze development costs, figure what he can afford to pay for the land, and submit the bid quickly.

Edmund Bennett

starts with a detailed topographical survey showing contours every two feet. He and the two engineers on his staff hike over and study the actual site conditions and prepare their own rough approach to street layout, following the land contours and avoiding as much cutting and filling as possible. The preliminary studies are then turned over to Thurman Donovan, land planner and landscape architect, who perfects and completes them.

Similarly, the actual siting of houses is first done by Bennett and his own staff, then turned over for final study to Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon.¹³⁰

Minimizing the impact of the automobile was another key priority. Bennett wrote:

It is far better for dollars to be spent on such things as swimming pools, landscaping, and walkways than for the same dollars to be spent in excessively wide streets, needlessly graded right-of-way, and rigidly stereotyped utility line layouts.¹³¹

Garages were not systematically part of the Bennett package, maybe on the assumption that, as intellectual workers, home buyers would not be handy, and that low-maintenance landscaping did not necessitate storing many gardening tools. At Flint Hill, the Woodside model had a carport deep enough for automobiles to be parked out of sight.¹³² At Carderock Springs and New Mark Commons, automobiles were not allowed to remain permanent fixtures in driveways. Although visitors were not allowed to park on street curbs, this regulation was unenforceable and was recently eliminated by the New Mark Commons Board of Directors during a rules update.¹³³

¹³⁰ "Research tested ideas," 158

¹³¹ Edmund J. Bennett, "Economics and the Visual Community," 47

¹³² "What happens when a smart builder gets together with a team of top architects? Every house is a prize winner," *House and Home* (April 1959), 161.

¹³³ Email correspondence between Mary Corbin Sies and John Hansman, President of the New Mark

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 34

The connector street and cul-de-sac networks and ensuing picturesque clustering of homes at Carderock Springs and New Mark Commons are described in Sections 3-F and 3-H. Donald Lethbridge did not believe in building scattered detached houses at a density greater than three per acre. If there are more, you must go to a concentrated cluster.¹³⁴ To animate the streetscape, house models were alternated and roofs formed contrasting masses. In all Bennett-built and KLC-designed subdivisions, homes, even when they are set at regular intervals, form harmonious groups.

Edmund Bennett persuaded the Potomac Electric Power Company "to bury its primary lines, put secondary lines along the backs of its lots (where they are partly hidden by trees), use small poles without cross bars for secondary lines, and drop distribution boxes from the tops of poles to pads on the grounds." He "agreed to do all primary-line trenching at a cost of about \$50 a house." Carderock Springs was the first large subdivision in which the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company buried its lines.¹³⁵ Bennett was also aware that, "when you build your merchandising around environment, every detail is important".¹³⁶ At Carderock Springs and New Mark Commons, street signs used materials "which relate to the homes and the natural terrain."¹³⁷ New Mark Commons was the first Bennett/KLC community to include sidewalks.

3 C.2 - Buildings

Combining sophistication and rusticity, alluding to the imagery of the cabin, all houses by Bennett/KLC belong to the same family. Designed in a "style combining warm textured materials with clean disciplined design,"¹³⁸ they were subjected to a type of Darwinian evolutionary process: a restricted number of models was proposed. Those that did not sell well were eliminated; commercial successes, in particular the Overlook model, were refined and enlarged over the years.

According to Mr. Bennett, "the key to our design is a clean and crisp approach all the way from interior living space to exterior leisure space - all of it functional, all of it simple"¹³⁹ Model homes appeared free of clutter both outside and inside, and devoid of ostentation. Their modified open plans, large expanses of glass forming Mondrian-like rectangular rhythms, indoor/outdoor living features (balconies and patios, accessed by sliding glass doors) made them clearly modern but in an effortless, unassuming way. Their colors, overhanging roofs, wooden or brick exterior and interior finishes blending with the surroundings placed them in the category of "situated modernism" as opposed to hard-edged International Style.

Commons Board of Directors, 22 June 2014.

¹³⁴ Sarah Booth Conroy, "From the Folks Who Brought Us Contemporary Architecture," *Washington Post*, December 8, 1974, H 3

¹³⁵ "Research tested ideas," 158-159.

¹³⁶ "Good land, made better by skilled planning, helps this development sell itself," *House and Home* (May 1967), 88.

¹³⁷ Edmund J. Bennett, "Economics and the Visual Community," 48

¹³⁸ Display add, *Washington Post*, October 12, 1963, D 5.

¹³⁹ "Carderock Springs Grand Opening Offers Contemporary Home Design," *Home Builders Monthly* (June 1962), 44.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 35

With the exception of Carderock Springs' seven atrium houses, all Bennett/KLC houses had a two-slope roof, the low pitch of which precluded attics but made possible space-enhancing and homey cathedral ceilings, as well as glazed transoms. The "traditional" roof also reassured both lenders and buyers as to resale values. Room configuration and fenestration were flexible enough to adapt to the topography of each site. By "digging into the hillside," Bennett and KLC added "a lot of usable space at relatively low cost per sq. ft."¹⁴⁰ With very few exceptions, houses adopted a two-story layout. In Washington's close suburbs, where lots were relatively small, this cost-saving, stacked configuration was more prevalent than that of "ramblers." In a recent interview, Mr. Bennett stressed his concern for proper solar orientation.¹⁴¹ He favored south or southeast exposures for the major living spaces and tried to minimize western exposures as much as he could. In addition, he tried to make sure that glazed areas would not interfere with either family intimacy or energy conservation.

Edmund Bennett, who had studied factory production and fabrication methods at Stanford University, was among a number of progressive mid-twentieth century builders who, in his own words, switched from "stick-to-stick" to "component building": "When I learned that three carpenters quit the trade for every one that enters, I saw the handwriting on the wall. I don't build anything on the site now that I can get economically delivered."¹⁴²

Bennett wanted to speed construction (at Carderock Springs, houses were delivered for occupancy 75 days after their ground had been broken) and, to a lesser extent, to save money (in 1959, an estimated \$ 2,000 per house in direct and indirect costs). He believed greater quality of workmanship could be achieved by using firms specializing in a particular element: "For example, the mill that builds our stairways does a far better job than we could do at the site." Another reason was to give his houses a slicker look.¹⁴³ Describing Potomac Overlook, NAHB's *Journal of Homebuilding* quoted Bennett:

We use mill-built wood window bucks with aluminum sliders and screen hardware already mounted ... Our stairways and stair rails are mill built; birch kitchen cabinets, Formica-topped vanities, and medicine cabinets are designed by us and mill-built to our specifications. All our exterior and some interior walls are fabricated lying flat on the deck and then tilted into place complete with exterior siding; we do not build scaffold to apply exterior material or trim. We use plywood roof sheathing and drywall on interior walls, including some of the exposed soffits. We use pre-assembled door units. A spotnail stapler nails our roof sheathing in about 45 % of the time we formerly took with 6 or 8-penny nails. Our outlookers at the eave end of the house are integral parts of the rafter. The bottom side of our plywood roof sheathing becomes the soffit.¹⁴⁴

Upon completing Flint Hill, Bennett told *American Builder*:

¹⁴⁰ "It looks like a one-story - but a daylight basement doubles its area," *House and Home* November 1960, 119.

¹⁴¹ April 2003

¹⁴² "The challenge of right now: How to succeed with today's serious buyers," *House and Home* (January 1960), 129

¹⁴³ "This is Builder Ed Bennett," 155.

¹⁴⁴ "The Challenge in By-Passed Land," *NAHB Journal of Homebuilding* 12 (February 1958), 50

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 36

I use every component technique that's available in my area and economical for my 26-house-a-year volume. These include: roof trusses, stairs and stair rails; plywood roof and floor sheathing; plywood siding-sheathing; door and window units; kitchen cabinets; bath vanities; precast shower floors; and drywall.¹⁴⁵

Above concrete foundations, houses had a simplified wood frame.¹⁴⁶ Using trusses permitted KLC/B to have cathedral ceilings and non-loading interior walls, consisting of a pre-assembly of 2"x3" studs. The roof overhang was formed by the extension of the truss. At Flint Hill, the soffit was eliminated, replaced by a 6" fascia and gutters were semi-circular. In the first section of Carderock Springs, 8" fascia and flat gutters were used to "accent the architectural lines" of the roofs.¹⁴⁷ Panels for Carderock Springs houses were fabricated at the Admiral Homes Plant in Pittsburgh and trucked to the site overnight.¹⁴⁸ Initially, they were first hauled by manpower, but Bennett came up with the idea to "put hooks on the top and get cranes to help with the assembly's idea."¹⁴⁹ According to Arthur Keyes, these panels were well made. At Carderock Springs South and New Mark Commons, Mr. Bennett had to revert to conventional on-site assembly because transportation cost had become too high.

Mr. Bennett used window walls which came "pre-glazed with aluminum sliding windows"; lower sections could be glazed or filled with painted panels.¹⁵⁰ Component construction applied to the stairs, which Lethbridge had designed. Each flight came pre-assembled: the risers measured 7.9 inches; the soffit was made of ¼" mahogany plywood, the stringers of 2 x 12 wooden board, balusters were ½" wrought-iron bars painted white, and the railing was made of oak. Starting with Carderock Springs, adhesive-nail-on drywall was used to "achieve smooth planes and curved ceilings."¹⁵¹ It was directly fitted to slotted door jambs and windows frames, in order to cut cost and labor.¹⁵² At Carderock Springs, the chimneys were prefabricated and plastic shower receptors were built in one piece. At New Mark Commons, Bennett used one piece molded fiberglass bath and shower units manufactured by Universal-Rundie. At Potomac Overlook, bubble plastic-dome skylights were used on bathroom ceilings; at Carderock Springs a new kind of invisible, double-layered plexiglass skylight measuring 2 feet by 3 feet was used to illuminate bathrooms, as well as some halls and kitchens.

Outside, wood was treated as vertical boards with batten joints or, less frequently, as horizontal beveled siding.¹⁵³ It was either stained or painted in colors selected by Edmund Bennett himself in

¹⁴⁵ "Government analyst," 90.

¹⁴⁶ "Government analyst," 91. Bennett was described as the first builder in his area to use the idea of "integral slab-footing," which saved him \$ 100 per basement at Flint Hill.

¹⁴⁷ "59 research-tested ideas," 149.

¹⁴⁸ Mason, "Problem sites," 63.

¹⁴⁹ John Matthews, Interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, 24 March 2003.

¹⁵⁰ "Government analyst," 90. At Potomac Overlook, John Matthews had his carpenters make window walls on site.

¹⁵¹ "Continued advance of drywall construction," *Home Builders Monthly* 19 (August 1962), 6-7. Mr. Bennett's drywall contractor was Charles Immer, who chaired the Technical Committee of Gypsum Drywall Contractors International.

¹⁵² "Government analyst," 90

¹⁵³ John Matthews, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, 24 March 2003, mentions that one of the houses he built at Potomac Overlook had mahogany siding, as this was the only type of wood available at the

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 37

consultation with Donald Lethbridge and later with David Condon. Brick can be regarded as a concession to local traditions, but it was handled in a crisp, modern way. Bennett and KLC were partial to a light pink shade and a rustic texture. At Carderock Springs, previously used bricks -- "kilned before 1911" -- were brought from Baltimore.¹⁵⁴ As opposed to many builders, who used wood for the top portion of a brick gable, Bennett used brick up to the top: "A wood-covered gable would be cheaper, but it would also look cheaper," Bennett decreed to *House and Home*, which approvingly mentioned that his buyers "never have to worry about painting the hard-to-reach gable end."¹⁵⁵

For the roofs, Mr. Bennett was partial to hand-split cedar shakes, which were mostly used on the West Coast but were "approved by fire underwriters in Maryland and 23 other states." Convinced of their superior "aesthetic appeal" and cooling effect on attics, he did not mind the extra cost (averaging \$ 230 per house in the first section of Carderock Springs).¹⁵⁶ In March 1965, the *Esoterica* newsletter noted:

Most visitors to Carderock Springs comment on the natural beauty of the cedar shingles and shake roofs.

What many don't realize is that in addition to its aesthetic qualities, cedar is the finest material available for residential roofs.

The absence of pitch and resin in cedar is responsible for its lack of flammability. At the same time its natural oils contribute to its extreme resistance to decay under most adverse conditions. In fact, cedar roofs often outlive the structures which they protect (...)

Cedar also has exceptional insulating qualities. Its cellular structure retards the passage of heat through the wood and therefore reduces heating and cooling bills.

Moreover, the length and rigidity of the cedar shingles and shakes add to the strength of the structure (...)

Finally, the cedar roofs in Carderock are almost immune to damage by hail or high winds, which frequently destroy roofs of flexible asphalt shingles or of brittle material as slate.

Original roofing has been overwhelmingly replaced with less expensive artificial shingles.

Windows had slender aluminum frames set in white wood surrounds, which created another chromatic contrast. Their grouping, sometimes on two levels, formed broad geometric patterns. Cantilevered balconies were a Bennett/KLC trademark; they added "visual depth to a facade and prestige to a house" and permitted floor-to-ceiling operable windows.¹⁵⁷ Mr. Keyes attributes their modest width (four feet) to code requirements. At Carderock Springs, balconies and interior stairs had steel railings composed of flat horizontal members and of vertical rods measuring 3/8" in diameter.

Edmund Bennett was partial to rectangular footprints on two levels. A vast majority of his houses had four or five bedrooms and three full, compact, bathrooms (placed back-to-back to save on

time. For his own house at Potomac Overlook, Mr. Matthews used Texture 111, which has grooves every four inches and is 5/8 inches thick.

¹⁵⁴ Display ad for Carderock Springs, *Washington Post*, October 7, 1964, C 12

¹⁵⁵"59 research-tested ideas," 148.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 148.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 149.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number E Page 38

plumbing costs). In nearly all models, living and dining spaces were combined, generally in an L-shape configuration, and provided with "extra high vaulted ceilings."¹⁵⁸ Dining areas were screened from direct view from the front entry. Houses were "zoned for family living."¹⁵⁹ One or two bedrooms with a small bath would generally be placed at the lower level, along with a large recreation room, which compensated for relatively small children's bedrooms and was directly accessible from the front or back yards. Advocated by residential experts, this "separate, walled off family room" was "where young people can congregate without disturbing parents who read newspapers and books."¹⁶⁰ Closed storage as well as laundry rooms were also provided. At Carderock Springs, the fourth downstairs bedroom was planned as a "get-away" room; in model homes, one of its walls was paneled with mahogany "to emphasize its potential use as a den or study."¹⁶¹ Fully equipped kitchens were large enough to accommodate a breakfast table; some had access to a patio. In many of these kitchens, cabinets and appliances were placed to insure "a natural line for food to move from the refrigerator to the cutting block to the sink to the counter top to the stove and to the dining room."¹⁶² A major asset of most models was the naturally lit entry-stair hall combination, with elegant and space-enhancing open risers and minimalist balustrades. Interiors gave a general impression of simplicity, clarity, and airiness. Radiators were conspicuously absent, replaced by forced air systems. A wood burning fireplace, consisting of a simple, mantel-free hole inserted in a brick or wood panel wall was found in all living rooms, and in most recreation rooms. A few fireplaces had freestanding cylindrical flues, acting as a sculptural element both inside and outside the house. Some fireplace walls also had "built-in wood boxes."¹⁶³

Interior finishes extended the natural look of the exteriors, but in a less rugged way. At Potomac Overlook, Mr. Bennett hired an interior designer "to select interior colors and furnishings" of exhibit houses and to "coordinate color schemes" for buyers.¹⁶⁴ For the National Home Week open house, the Riverview model hosted \$11,000 worth of furniture (including Harry Bertola's famous wire chairs in the recreation room) from Modern Design, a store in Chevy Chase.¹⁶⁵ At Flint Hill, model homes were furnished by another store, Ursell, with slender coffee tables and Scandinavian furniture by Arne Jacobsen and other well known designers. Interior designer Dorris M. Harris worked on Carderock Springs' model homes, using furniture sold at Modern Design. In the fall of 1963, Carderock Springs' Valleyview model displayed custom furniture by well-known wood carver George Nakashima, who was established in Bucks County, PA.¹⁶⁶ One of the initial model homes at New Mark Commons was furnished by the interior design staff of KLC, the others by Modern Design.

At Carderock Springs, entry halls had quarry tiles (in a fawn color), which were also used for the

¹⁵⁸ Sales brochure for Carderock Springs, third section, 1963.

¹⁵⁹ Robert J. Lewis, "This Plan is Clean, Compact," *Washington Evening Star*, August 4, 1956, B-1 and B-6

¹⁶⁰ John B. Willmann, "Contemporary Homes Built to Fit 'Bethesda Family Profile'," *Washington Post*, May 26, 1962, B1.

¹⁶¹ "59 research-tested ideas," 151.

¹⁶² John B. Willmann, "Contemporary Homes Built to Fit 'Bethesda Family Profile'," *Washington Post*, May 26, 1962, B1.

¹⁶³ Display ad, *Washington Post*, October 12, 1963, D 5.

¹⁶⁴ "This is Builder Ed Bennett," 152

¹⁶⁵ "The Challenge in By-Passed Land," *NAHB Journal of Homebuilding* 12 (February 1958), 50.

¹⁶⁶ "Nakashima Furniture Seen Here," *Washington Post*, November 16, 1963, E 2

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 39

hearths of fireplaces. Light fixtures -- "free-form globes and brushed-chrome or aluminum holders" -- added another modern touch.¹⁶⁷ In kitchens, plastic-faced cabinets had hidden hinges and magnetic catches; Formica backsplashes and countertops, with integrated hardwood chopping boards; and the floors were in linoleum. In bathrooms, floors and wall sections had scored American Olean ceramic tile and countertops were in laminated plastic.

Described in detail in parts 3-F and 3-H, the community buildings at Carderock Springs and New Mark Commons adopt the same character as the houses. Promoting community spirit was important to Mr. Bennett: for instance, he threw a large party for those who built, and lived in, Potomac Overlook, when the subdivision was near completion. At Carderock Springs, he showcased paintings by residents who had already moved to the subdivision in the second series of model homes and was one of the judges in the "spruce up for Spring" contest.¹⁶⁸ On the day the pool at New Mark Commons opened, he and his sister Brenda were photographed on the diving board. He also was the driving force behind *Esoterica*, an attractive "insider newsletter published by, for, and about the residents of Carderock Springs, Flint Hill, and Potomac Overlook," which was printed from 1964 to approximately 1968. In its second year, *Esoterica* published a lavishly illustrated "Special Recreation Edition," which informed residents of resources offered close to their homes, along the Potomac River and C & O Canal, from Great Falls to Roosevelt Island, as well as of the opportunity to watch polo games at close-by Travilah.

The subdivisions that we describe in Section F followed a long tradition of post-occupancy environmental control in exclusive suburbs. They were regulated by strict aesthetic covenants, drafted by KLC and Edmund Bennett, who were convinced that they encouraged sales. Forbidden were "such eyesores as exposed television antennas, or unapproved exterior change."¹⁶⁹ For Carderock Springs, covenants stipulated that clothes dryers and lines needed to be placed "within a screened enclosure of an approved design of attractive rustic wood not over eight feet square and not over six feet in height," that fencing would be "either horizontal rustic, unfinished split rail or vertical split cedar" and would "not extend beyond the front wall of any house and be within forty feet of any publicly dedicated street in the case of a corner lot." Special authorization was required for the removal of hardwood trees.¹⁷⁰

4 - Evolution of residential planning in the United States and in the D.C. suburbs, 1950-1975.

Summary of significance The subdivisions built by Edmund J. Bennett, with site plans and home designs by Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon, are culturally and historically significant. They play an

¹⁶⁷ "59 research-tested ideas," 151.

¹⁶⁸ "New Section Opened at Carderock Springs," *Washington Post*, October 12, 1963, D 15.

¹⁶⁹ Sales brochure for Carderock Springs, third section, 1963.

¹⁷⁰ *Conditions, Covenants, Restrictions, and Easements Affecting Property of Edmund J. Bennett Associates, Inc* September 10, 1962.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 40

important role in the evolution of planned communities of single-family homes in the United States in general and in metropolitan Washington, D.C., in particular. Houses in these communities are important examples of Modern Movement residential architecture packaged for a mass middle or upper-middle class suburban audience without sacrificing design or construction quality. In particular, the Bennett/KLC tract subdivisions and dwellings are noteworthy nationally for the following Modernist features and innovations:

- brilliant alternative to the bulldozer approach to conventional site planning.
- sophisticated examples of comprehensive community and subdivision planning
- pioneering experiments in land conservation
- successful semi-industrialization of assembly and construction
- models were the outcome of very systematic interior planning work and generated tremendous customer satisfaction

Starting with the Pineview model at Carderock Springs, KLC's designs for Bennett evolved toward a greater degree of symmetry, as panelization had to be abandoned due to the prohibitive expense of shipping the components. Some models became entirely sheathed in brick, but those that remained attuned to the woodsy tradition of situated modernism shared many principles of contemporary "Deck Houses" and designs by architects such as Charles Moore and William Turnbull, of Sea Ranch fame. The fact that Bennett/KLC houses reflect divergent trends adds to their significance and added to their appeal for their suburban clientele.

4 A - Landscape preservation

Around Washington, D.C., as elsewhere in the nation, tract house construction placed a large burden on natural resources in the three decades following World War II. However, regulatory obstacles to preserving the natural landscape were numerous and hard to overcome. For example, the FHA balked at insuring homes with driveways sloping more than 5%. Edmund Bennett deplored the "entrenched attitude on the part of many public officials, particularly those in public works" that hampered "innovative community concepts."¹⁷¹ His groups of homes are significant from a planning and landscaping standpoint because they offered a brilliant alternative to the bulldozer approach to site planning.

Mr. Bennett belonged to a small but significant category of mid-century builders who, for reasons that were not only ethical and aesthetic but also practical (they sought to provide privacy and shade, for instance), took the conscious decision to interfere minimally with natural site conditions. Because this approach was more costly than bulldozing, and made the most visual sense on relatively large lots, it was more likely to be adopted in upmarket subdivisions, like those built by Bennett. His attitude reflects a more pervasive state of mind that was associated with the advent of the new discipline of ecology. By the early 1960s, when Carderock Springs was being planned, concerns over environmental protection had reached the general public. Interestingly enough, a Montgomery County resident, Rachel Carson (she lived in Silver Spring from 1936 till her death in 1964) was a figurehead for the ecology movement.

¹⁷¹ Edmund J. Bennett, "Economics and the Visual Community," 50.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 41

Pre-World War II neighborhoods in Montgomery County's posh Country Club District may have been nestled in wooded settings, but front lots were landscaped in a way that required high maintenance and houses kept a formality which made them stand out from, more than blend with, their surroundings. Begun in 1949, Robert Davenport's and Charles Goodman's Hollin Hills subdivision in Northern Virginia was the first subdivision in the Capital Region that tied minimum intervention on the existing landscape with the introduction of land-hugging, modern architecture.

What did landscape conservation involve? Respecting existing topography was certainly a key factor. According to Francis Lethbridge, "if you're going to preserve anything of the natural cover, you've got to preserve the contours."¹⁷² Popular sentiment rose in favor of tree preservation, a trend that was not restricted to modernist builders, as evidenced in Levitt and Sons' refashioning of the Belair estate in Bowie.¹⁷³ Landscape preservation also called for the placement of utility wires and poles underground. By the early 1960s, the added expenditure this placement involved became less taxing for home builders, as utility companies were increasingly willing to bear some of the cost themselves. In January 1964, the *Washington Post* reported this trend, illustrating Carderock Springs as an example: "Uncluttered streets without overhead wires provide only the aesthetic argument for putting wire in the earth. Another, and possibly more important, motivation is the prevention of damage by snow and wind storms to the spaghetti-between-poles."¹⁷⁴ Carderock Springs acted as a testing ground for Montgomery County's 1965 decision that cables should be buried in all new subdivisions. In 1968, the Maryland Public Service Commission ordered that power and telephone lines be placed underground for residential subdivisions of five lots or more throughout the state. Three years later, Maryland was the first state in the nation to require that all power and telephone lines for all new construction (including mobile homes) be placed underground.¹⁷⁵

The anti-bulldozer approach entailed the adoption of house plans adapted to major differences in grade. Hillside housing was already a major residential sub-type in California, in both the San Francisco and Los Angeles regions. There, steep site conditions challenged modernist architects and helped them devise some of their most innovative and spectacular designs. A good example is Richard Neutra's seminal Lovell Health House, completed in 1930.¹⁷⁶ By the early 1950s, as availability of flat land dwindled near most large metropolitan centers, hillside construction was recognized as an

¹⁷² "Area Author Pleas for Tree Preservation," *Washington Post*, January 28, 1961, A 21.

¹⁷³ Julie H. Ernstein, "Landscape Archaeology and the Recent Past: A View from Bowie Maryland" in Deborah Slaton and William G. Foulks, eds. *Preserving the Recent Past II*, Washington, DC, Historic Preservation Education Foundation, National Park Service and the Association for Preservation Technology International, 2000, 2/97-2/103.

¹⁷⁴ According to John B. Willmann, in "Some Area Home Builders Join Trend to 'Buried Cables,'" *Washington Post*, January 25, 1964, E1, this trend was particularly important in Northern Virginia. In addition to referring to and illustrating Carderock Springs, the article mentions wire-burying for 3,000 homes by Levitt in Bowie's Belair. The estimated cost of underground wiring at Carderock Springs was \$ 400 for each house. The debate about whether burying cable should be required by FHA and who should carry its cost was ongoing in the 1960s. See John B. Williams, "Nobody Knocks Buried Wires," *Washington Post*, March 12, 1966, E 1

¹⁷⁵ "Maryland orders builders and utilities to put all new wiring underground," *House and Home* 40 (October 1971), 28

¹⁷⁶ See Dominique Rouillard, *Building the slope: hillside houses, 1920-1960* (Santa Monica: Arts + Architecture Press, 1987).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 42

important sub-category of tract housing and was discussed in specialized magazines. For instance, an article in the September 1954 issue of *American Builder* explained that a hillside house "can be perched to look out over long distant vistas, or it can be placed so that the view of tree tops offers seclusion," that its "basement becomes fully livable," and that it "appears to have more space between it and its neighbors than do houses built upon level terrain." While offering savings on expensive excavation work, hillside planning "encouraged fresh thinking to create new and interesting design."¹⁷⁷

4 B. New planning concepts: clustering, Planned Unit Developments, new towns

Carderock Springs, Carderock Springs South, and New Mark Commons are important and original illustrations of cluster development, which challenged the notion of a uniform fabric for tract housing, consisting of lots of even size and shapes and of streets of similar width. Clustering single-family homes instead of spreading them evenly on available land led to grouping them around dead-end streets. Cluster planning was perceived as advantageous on several grounds: it helped enforce contour and tree preservation; it lowered sales prices as it shortened the length of utilities and streets; it facilitated child rearing and fostered community spirit by providing internal parkland.

The systematic exploration of ways in which to configure cul-de-sacs, driveways, and lots, and to provide pedestrian-friendly communal green space was pioneered by developers of early 20th century planned, exclusive suburbs, such as George Woodward in the Pastorius Park development of St. Martin's, Philadelphia.¹⁷⁸ These innovations first garnered widespread public attention, however, with the superblock plan devised by Henry Wright and Clarence Stein in Radburn, New Jersey (begun 1927). Cluster design was most popular among planners and developers from the 1950s to the 1970s, during Edmund Bennett's tenure as a home builder. Then, cul-de-sacs and superblocks came in all kinds of shapes and sizes, but the solutions devised by Bennett and KLC - triad and quad courts, landscaped knobs, and townhouse clusters - were among the most unobtrusive and attractive.

After clustering, the next logical step in the battle against suburban blandness and sprawl was to find alternatives to exclusively residential subdivisions. Change was made possible by the planning and legal concept of the Planned Unit Development (PUD). By the early 1960s, NAHB and ULI, two organizations with which Mr. Bennett maintained close ties, were at the forefront of the PUD advocacy movement. Treating a tract of land as a single unit rather than on the basis of individual lots, guidelines for PUDs were drafted and legally endorsed at the local level. In addition to relaxing restrictions on minimum lot sizes and setbacks, and to encouraging cluster plans and the provision of common open space, these guidelines allowed more flexible and integrated land uses. They authorized the combination of a variety of residential types and densities and often allowed commercial activity. The philosophy behind PUDs was generally progressive: by mixing lot sizes and housing typologies, people of varying incomes and ages could live in close proximity to one another. The social, urbanistic, and programmatic goals of PUDs could be achieved regardless of stylistic choices for their buildings. In fact, many well planned PUDs in the Capital Region, like those at Crofton and Northampton built along the D.C.-Annapolis corridor, had traditional-looking homes.

¹⁷⁷ "Building on hillside lots," *American Builder* 76 (September 1954), 82-83. See also Fred W. Marlow, "Let's take to the hills for building sites," *Practical Builder*, August 1957, 121-123.

¹⁷⁸ Harold D. Eberlein, "Pastorius Park, Philadelphia and its Residential Development," *Architectural Record* 39 (Jan. 1916): 24-37.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 43

Modernist home builders in the D.C. region had anticipated the PUD wave, but with very limited success, in the absence of a favorable legal framework. In 1946, a 200-member cooperative, essentially formed by professional government workers, purchased at a public auction the Bannockburn Golf and Country Club near Glen Echo. According to the *Washington Post*, this "new venture in community planning" was followed by planners and housers nationwide as it promised to "set a future housing pattern for families in the middle income group."¹⁷⁹ A master plan was commissioned from Vernon de Mars (whose previous work for the Farm Security Administration was regarded as a model of successful community planning) and local architects Reese Burkett and Joseph Neufeld. It called for "detached homes, semi-detached homes, garden duplexes, and three elevator apartment buildings, plus complete community facilities," but the rezoning request was defeated.¹⁸⁰ Only the most acceptable elements of a neighborhood unit plan, the elementary school (on land donated by the cooperators to the county), the community pool, and tennis courts were implemented. Robert Davenport's plan for a convenience store at Hollin Hills was also defeated by neighbors. The Luria Brothers achieved a limited success in the early 1950s when they were able to build garden apartments at the outskirts of their Pine Springs development, but zoning regulations prevented them from erecting a shopping center. Edmund Bennett himself was not able to fully achieve his vision: he lost zoning battles for his proposed townhouses at Carderock Springs (near the school), and a commercial center with office space at New Mark Commons. Kettler Brothers' Montgomery Village in Gaithersburg, which included an 18-hole golf course, and Rossmoor Leisure World were the largest PUDs built in Montgomery County in the late 1960s, but their site planning and architectural design did not achieve the distinction of New Mark Commons.

In terms of PUDs, the precedent that inspired some of Mr. Bennett's thinking for New Mark Commons was the village of Cross Keys in Northern Baltimore, near Roland Park. In 1961, the Community Research and Development (CRD) Corporation, headed by James W. Rouse, purchased 68 acres from the Baltimore Country Club. The site plan was entrusted to Richard Stauffer, the staff architect for CRD. Through rezoning, Rouse was able to mix townhouses, garden, mid-rise, and high-rise apartments (initial plans called for 600 residential units), and to build a Village Center, with shops and Rouse's own offices above. The landscape architect was Lewis Clarke of Raleigh, N.C. The rolling terrain and presence of mature trees informed the site plan and reinforced privacy for each residential cluster. Designed by Collins and Kronstadt of Silver Spring, the first 98 townhouses opened in 1964, achieving a density of 10 units per acre. They were grouped into four "hamlets" with central parking courts in the front of the units and private wooded areas in the rear. Varying in width from 16 to 23 feet, each unit included screened front and back terraces.¹⁸¹ The site strategy and insertion of parking were less sophisticated than at New Mark Commons, and the facades less varied. At Cross Keys, the first of two planned swimming and tennis clubs opened in the summer of 1964, when construction on the Village Square began. The first apartment opened in the spring of 1965

Many PUDs featured club-type, year round recreation facilities that included community

¹⁷⁹ "Work Starts at Bannockburn," *Washington Post*, January 16, 1949, R4

¹⁸⁰ See Vernon de Mars, "Bannockburn Cooperators, Inc.: Montgomery County, Maryland," *Progressive Architecture*, February 1951, 65-67; and The Bannockburn Community Club, *Bannockburn, The Story of a Cooperative Community*, Bethesda, 1978.

¹⁸¹ "Townhouses designed to fit on an open, rolling, site," *House and Home* 28 (July 1965) 64-65.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 44

buildings. Family life, especially in the summer, tended to revolve around pool activities. Again, the idea was not unprecedented: recreation facilities were not only a staple in affluent suburbs, they also have been erected by the federal government in PWA and defense housing projects, as well as in Greenbelt. A notable post-war example is the series of neighborhood swimming pools that served as major social and visual anchors for the Levittowns. For home builders in Montgomery County, democratizing and extending the healthy but glamorous life style of the Country Club District by including a pool, tennis courts, and a multi-purpose club house in their subdivisions made both practical and financial sense. These amenities were a magnet for families with small children, who wanted to walk or bike to the pool. But erecting sport and community facilities could easily become a logistical nightmare and a financial ordeal for builder-developers, as their cost was not always recouped in home sale prices. Some builders preferred to delegate construction and funding to homeowners' associations.¹⁸² As a result, for communities of the size of Carderock Springs and New Mark Commons, a modest cabana was more likely to be built alongside the pool than a large, multi-purpose building. Both in programmatic and aesthetic terms, the clubhouses built by KLC for Bennett are truly exceptional and deserve protection.

PUD legislation encouraged the construction of townhouses, a market that took off in Montgomery County in the late 1960s. In terms of planning and design, few townhouses achieved the distinction of those at New Mark Commons. Indeed, they posed a particular aesthetic challenge with regard to the automobile: parking space incorporated into the bulk of the lower level was convenient, but had an adverse impact on facade design. The presence of driveways marred the landscaping, detached garages were awkward in terms of scale, and on-street parking entailed large surfaces of asphalt.

Mr. Bennett also acknowledged his indebtedness to the Finnish and Swedish new towns that he visited in 1962 (and again in 1973 and 1980). They offered humanly scaled, user-friendly civic, commercial, and cultural amenities, and non-intrusive solutions to parking. Tapiola near Helsinki was a particularly successful example of Situated Modernism, which preserved wooded scenery, offered extensive open space, and a great diversity in housing types; its central district on an artificial lake was an inspiration for the new town of Reston.¹⁸³

Indeed, the presence of an artificial lake came to be considered the ideal compensation for the higher density of townhouse design. Water views became a major selling argument not only in Reston but also in James Rouse's new town of Columbia, whose preliminary plan was unveiled in 1964. In addition to Whittlesey and Conklin's ultra-modern semi-circular "village" of superimposed shops and apartments, Reston's 30-acre Lake Anne hosted Waterview Cluster, a 15-acre complex of 90 townhouses that opened in late 1965. Designed by Cloethiel Woodard Smith & Associates, it had the same architectural character and price range as townhouses at New Mark Commons. In Maryland, townhouse architecture rarely matched the distinction and originality achieved by the best designs for free-standing tract houses. An exception to this rule was Hugh Newell Jacobsen's Tidesfall at

¹⁸² See "The community swimming pool," *Practical Builder*, February 1964, 94-97.

¹⁸³ See Frederic Gutheim, "Stockholm Architectural Exhibit Offers Lessons to Area Planners," *Washington Post*, October 21, 1960, B3 (This article was very positive on the "introspective" and "self-effacing" quality of Swedish architecture but negative on Vallingby); Rasa Gustaitis, "'Dream Suburb' Built in Finland," *Washington Post*, November 23, 1963, C 4; Wolf von Eckardt, "Finland Leads Way in Urban Planning," *Washington Post* December 1, 1963, G 5; Wolf von Eckardt, "Sweden is a Fun Place for Children," *Washington Post* August 30, 1964, G 6.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 45

Columbia's Village of Wilde Lake, built by the Page Corporation, which was completed in 1970 and featured bold silhouettes and multi-level, open plans.¹⁸⁴

5 - Development of Modern Residential Architecture in the Washington, D.C. suburbs, 1945-1975

5 1 --- National context for modern tract houses

Since the days of Andrew Jackson Downing, excellence in "small house" design has always been a major pursuit on the part of American designers and critics. Through plans published in pattern books or magazines, such as those by Frank Lloyd Wright in the *Ladies' Home Journal*, high end design was adapted to the life style and pocketbooks of the middle class. In the 1930s, this tradition was revisited by protagonists of the International Style and Situated Modernism. A few avant-garde designers (Richard Neutra in particular) and progressive manufacturers envisioned small homes as kits of industrialized parts, with clean, mechanical lines. In the San Francisco Bay Area and Pacific Northwest, regionalist architects such as William Wurster and Pietro Belluschi combined local traditions with Scandinavian and modernist influences. Their goal was to streamline and stylize the domestic vernacular of board and batten construction. Their clean and crisp facades in dark wood with light-colored trim and warm interiors, both lofty and intimate, belong to the same school of thoughts as houses built at Potomac Overlook, Carderock Springs, and New Mark Commons. Upon their arrival in New England, German immigrants Marcel Breuer and Walter Gropius also devised houses representing a middle ground between the Bauhaus legacy and America's nature-anchored domestic tradition.

Frank Lloyd revisited his own legacy for small homes in his single-story Usonian houses, a very fine example of which was built in Falls Church, Northern Virginia in 1940 (the Pope-Leighy house has since been transferred to the Woodlawn Plantation). Usonian houses featured a simplified wood assembly, a carport, no radiators, a unified living-dining space, all characteristics to be found in Bennett/KLC models. Each Usonian design was unique but they all shared standardized construction and planning principles. Wright had a knack for making small spaces look more generous and for ennobling simple materials like brick and wood, and his Usonian designs served as a departure point for many home builders, including Joseph Eichler.

During World War II, defense work designed in, or coordinated from, the Nation's Capital, for such places as Vallejo (Wurster), Aluminum Terrace (Gropius and Breuer), Great Locks, CT (Stubbins), and Channel Heights (Neutra) helped democratize and disseminate pre-War experiments in modern small homes and using wood in novel technical and aesthetic ways. At the time Mr. Bennett became a home builder, modern designs for American single-family houses went in two general directions. The first direction consisted of variations on the minimalist flat-roofed glass box, emphasizing ideals of lightness and transparency and using industrialized materials and construction methods. This type was best adapted to, and most popular in, warm climates and resort locations, as, for example, in Southern California, where John Entenza's Case Study Houses Program (Eames House, Santa Monica, 1949), attracted considerable press attention. Examples of this modernist direction in Maryland are relatively sparse. We can mention Harold Esten's dwellings in Maryland's D.C. suburbs, such as the

¹⁸⁴ See *Architectural Record* (May 1971), 92-93 and *House and Home* 39 (June 1971), 34

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 46

Residence of George Katinas, in Bethesda (c. 1959).

The second general direction, which was adopted by KLC, included expressions of "new regionalism" that might be considered modern interpretations of vernacular design. These were more numerous and more popular than the minimalist boxes. They looked less radical and more acceptable to FHA inspectors and to lenders, as a vestigial low-pitched roof was generally necessary to secure an advantageous loan. Modified modern houses appeared light, buoyant, and strove for livability. Often, as was the case at 5838 Marbury Road in Kenwood Park, their interiors conveyed more radical modernist values than their facades, with flexible spaces, open and flowing into one another. They featured an intimate indoor-outdoor relationship, enabled by glass walls, balconies, patios, or interior courts, and other inventive ways of bringing nature into the living spaces. Some houses reflected their designers' interest in passive solar energy, achieved by using overscaled eaves. This second direction took its cue from the work of Finland's Alvar Aalto, whose use of brick and wood, masterfully expounded at Saynatsalo's Town Hall and Civic Center in Finland (1949-52), appealed to KLC's design sensibility.¹⁸⁵ And, as we saw with Bennett/KLC houses, this second direction in home building was not only championed by many architecture and homebuilding journals, but also by more mainstream interior design magazines (*Condé Nast's House and Garden*, *Better Homes and Gardens*) and the feminine press (*McCall's*).

An architect whose work anticipates and then parallels that of KLC for Bennett was Carl Koch, with whom Arthur Keyes studied at Harvard. Keyes recalls visiting Snake Hill, a 1940 subdivision of eight houses, including one Koch built for himself, in Belmont: "The houses were very charming, very unique. There would be a big outcropping of rock and he would put the fireplace on it or he would place the living room and let some rock come in where you could put plants. It was a lot of fun."¹⁸⁶ In Concord, Carl Koch and Associates designed the Conantum subdivision, which opened in 1953; the 100 cabin-like homes were "built from standard elements with slight variations in plan," preserving the existing woods, the development was "laid out along curving roads that follow the topography."¹⁸⁷ Another distinguished subdivision of modern homes in the Boston suburbs, which was close in spirit to Bennett/KLC communities, was Five Fields (1947-1950) in the Six Moon Hill area of Lexington, planned and designed by The Architects Collaborative. Established on a hilly dead end road, this was a "community of eleven relatively low-cost private houses for some of the members of the Collaborative and their friends."¹⁸⁸ The 1951 edition of *McCall's Book of Modern Houses* featured three Koch designs that relate to KLC's later work: one built of concrete blocks; another in the country, designed with Huson Jackson; and a Hillside House that featured a cantilevered balcony off the living room and a large multi-purpose room with a fireplace at the lower level, a picture window, and an outside door.¹⁸⁹ In

¹⁸⁵ Aalto's furniture was on sale at D.C.'s America House in 1940; see "New Decorator's Shop Shows Work of Famous Finn," *Washington Post*, December 1, 1940, V7. See "Widely Imitated, Finn is Pioneer of Modern Furniture," *Washington Post*, April 30, 1950, R9. An exhibition of postwar Finnish architecture was held at the Octagon House, owned by the AIA, in 1955.

¹⁸⁶ Arthur Keyes interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, 24 March 2003. Snake Hill is illustrated in *Architectural Forum*, June 1941, 392-393 and Elizabeth Mock's *Built in USA Since 1932* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1945), 54-55.

¹⁸⁷ Conantum is illustrated in Joan E. Goody, *New Architecture in Boston* (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1965), 90-91.

¹⁸⁸ Kate Ellen Rogers, *The Modern House U.S.A* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 36-37.

¹⁸⁹ Mary Davies Gillis, *McCall's Book of Modern Houses* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1951), 16-21, 26-31

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 47

the 1950s, Koch began designing and selling his Techbuilt pre-cut, semi-custom, homes which local representatives commercialized and assembled. Techbuilt homes shared the clean and woodsy syntax of B/KLC models; in Montgomery County, examples were erected in Garrett Park and Glen Echo Heights. As soon as the war was over, California had taken the lead in tract house modernism and its homes monopolized media attention. Mr. Bennett, who studied at Stanford University, and some of the homeowners we interviewed see a kindred spirit between the relaxed and opened character of their homes and those on the West Coast. It is true that Bennett homes also have cathedral ceilings, post and beam framing, and free flowing plans. However, tailored to different life styles and climates, they maintained a higher degree of formality than their West Coast counterparts. For example, they always featured enclosed kitchens.

5 B - Local Context: Modern Tract Houses in the D.C. Suburbs

We estimate that, from the mid-1940s to the early 1970s, "contemporary" designs represented approximately 15% of all single-family homes built in Montgomery County, a ratio significant enough to betray important aesthetic and societal change.¹⁹⁰ In his dissertation, Christopher Martin has noticed the broad range of modernist expressions among merchant builders in the Capital Region and their constant search for improved quality in design.¹⁹¹ Experiments in modern tract housing began around D.C. in 1946. They blossomed between 1952 and 1962 and Bennett became a home builder at the peak of this period. They were followed by a more eclectic phase where modernism survived and evolved but lost its commercial edge.

Homes in the Capitol Region remained overwhelmingly traditional until the late 1940s. The local public was nonetheless informed about new domestic trends by the national and local press. In particular, the *Washington Post* published throughout the 1930s many articles on modern homes built in other parts of the country and the world.¹⁹² Even with very few examples of progressive domestic design - all custom built, needless to say - we see two tendencies emerge in and around Washington: a mechanistic imagery of crisp dematerialized volumes and flat roofs, and a more earth-bound look using natural materials and residual roofs.

The first brand of modernism was adopted in some high-end commissions. Edward Durrell Stone designed a Moderne house for George Preston Marshall and Corrine Griffith in Northwest D.C. in 1939.¹⁹³ Two non-traditional designs were built in Montgomery County's Kenwood district. In 1936, a twelve-room, three-bath "Motohome," built of panels of compressed cement and asbestos mounted on a steel frame, was erected for automobile distributor Lee D. Bulter at 101 Brookside Drive. The *Washington Post* commented:

and 112-121.

¹⁹⁰"Contemporaries," either custom-made or on "spec" were an exception (one could even say an aberration) in Prince George's County.

¹⁹¹ Martin, 222.

¹⁹² See for instance "Radical Changes Are Seen for single Family houses," *Washington Post*, October 19, 1930, R 2, and "Homes now built nearer the ground," *Washington Post*, February 8, 1931, R1.

¹⁹³ Eliot Nusbaum, "Polishing Stone," *Traditional Homes*, May 2002, 64-72

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 48

The simplicity of its straight line design, in which the familiar decorative devices, and furbelows are noticeably absent, may at first impress one as being rather cold and too much simplified. Upon becoming more familiar with its unusual departures from orthodox modes of design and construction, the beauty of this simplicity of line become increasingly more evident and more pleasant to the eye. Straight line construction is new in home design, but not in architecture. Designers of some of the most beautiful business structures in the country have taken advantage of it and used it generously.¹⁹⁴

In February 1942, *Pencil Points* published an elegant design by Alfred Kastner for a hilly and wooded site, with the following comments.

Dr. Teichman intended to build a residence along contemporary lines, but had bought property subject to the customary real estate restrictions requiring traditional design types. The architect describes the house as a "compromise of both types.... The stucco used around the entrance door contrasts with the light buff brick exterior walls and green roof of Vermont slate."¹⁹⁵

More closely related to the homes Lethbridge and his associates would design for Mr. Bennett are two relatively small houses built in Bethesda around 1940 and published in *Architectural Forum* and *Architectural Record*.¹⁹⁶ Their designer was Francis Palms, Jr., who subsequently shared office space with Keyes and Lethbridge. They were set in heavily wooded and rugged lots, had a low-lying profile, and roofs with a relatively low pitch. Textured brick dominated on the outside, but redwood, treated as clapboard or vertical siding, was used to cover gables and one side wall. The overall effect was far from mechanical, conveying a rustic and understated character. The compact plans, rendered more complex by the recessed or diagonal placement of several rooms, were extended by generous decks that allowed mothers to supervise children's outdoor play from the kitchen. In one house, the sloping terrain enabled the designer to create a bedroom and garage/recreation room under the deck. In the other, the garage was tucked into the slope.

A series of custom built homes, often small and simple enough to serve as inspirations for tract houses, introduced new ideas to the Nation's Capital and its suburbs. In the late 1940s, Keyes, Lethbridge, Satterlee, as well as Chloethiel Woodard Smith, all worked for Berla and Abel. Although its specialty was apartment design, this firm produced a few progressive and elegant custom-built houses

¹⁹⁴ "Prefabricated Home Attracts Attention Here," *Washington Post*, January 12, 1936, R 4; see also "2-Story of 'Motohome' Type Started," *Washington Post*, October 20, 1935, R 9. Henry Ward Jandl, *Yesterday's Houses of Tomorrow*, 153 and 155. The house, which had a basement recreation room with a fireplace, was radically altered in 1988.

¹⁹⁵ *Pencil Points* 23 (February 1942), 78. Note that a recreation room with a fireplace was also built at ground level, opening onto a terrace. Next to it was a maid's room.

¹⁹⁶ *Architectural Forum* 74 (June 1941), 420-421 and *Architectural Record* 90 (November 1941), 70. Francis Palms, Jr. (Detroit 1910- Monterey 1982) received his B.Arch degree from the University of Michigan in 1933. The following year, he spent four months researching apartment design in Holland, Belgium, France, and Germany. He then moved to DC. to work for the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and established his own practice in Falls Church in 1939. He worked on the War Production Board during World War II, then was associated with Cloethiel Woodard Smith and Louis Justement on the renewal plan for Southwest D.C. Palms moved to Carmel, CA around 1952 (source: obit. *Monterey Peninsula Herald* 5/20/82, AIA Archives).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 49

that were noticed in the press. Those built in the Northern Virginia suburbs, in Langley for Mason Barr and Stanley S. Surrey, and in Alexandria for Mr. and Mrs. Peyton Armstrong Kerr,¹⁹⁷ helped transplant the rustic modernism of San Francisco's Bay Area Style. In 1946, Berla and Abel also designed a house and a chinchilla farm for Stanley Pangborn, who was also a painting contractor in Glen Echo Heights, at 5435 Mohican Road (still in existence).¹⁹⁸ Exterior walls of cinderblock were plastered; the overhanging roof adopted a single, shallow, slope. The front facade was extremely understated; in the back, the living room had two fully glazed walls, with mullions creating an attractive geometric composition that extended to the adjacent, lower screen porch. Beyond was a terrace with a gently curving plan. The fireplace and mantel were built in rough stone, which extended to the entry steps. Ingenious, streamlined built-ins included a dresser in the bedroom and a work desk in the L-shaped kitchen.

In 1950-51, Arthur Keyes designed two modern homes showing great promise. The Hirschberg House, which he characterizes as "rustic and simple," was visibly influenced by the architecture of Alvar Aalto.¹⁹⁹ In Mr. Keyes's own house, located at 2605 31st St., N.W in Washington D.C., the design of the stairs, with their open risers and slender metal balustrade, and the placement of the "children's playroom," anticipate detail and planning for Mr. Bennett.²⁰⁰ Arthur Keyes and Francis Lethbridge helped establish working drawings for Bethesda's Bannockburn cooperative, a project that we have already mentioned. The first section of 24 homes was begun in early 1949, the ground breaking ceremonies taking place on January 15, with a "large crowd of prospective home owners, Congressmen, and housing officials."²⁰¹ Seven home styles (with or without basement) were offered, including a "rambler-bungalow." The four Bannockburn houses illustrated in the February 1951 issue of *Progressive Architecture* were not conceived as a unified series, but they shared many characteristics that would be found in Bennett/KLC models. As terrain was very uneven, decks outside the living room took the shape of balconies. Exteriors mixed brick and horizontal wood siding, with white trim for windows. Roofs adopted a low pitch. The massing and fenestration reflected a bipartite separation between day and night spaces; the combined living/dining space was illuminated by large windows (generally floor-to-ceiling glazing). One of the living rooms had a cathedral ceiling.²⁰²

In the second half of the 1940s, Washington area home builders saw modernism as merely intriguing. In their journal, *Home Builders Monthly*, articles were entitled "Tomorrow's Windows Will Be Larger, Insulated Beauty Features," or "People Are Clamoring for 'Outdoor Living' suburban Locations - More Terraces, Porches - Show Trend" or "Tremendous Daily Throngs Crowd N.Y. Museum of Modern

¹⁹⁷ *Architectural Forum*, August 1946; William H. Hennessey, "Expandable for Growing New Family in Alexandria," *American Home* 39 (January 1938), 56.

¹⁹⁸ "Oak Hill - Maryland Chinchilla Ranch," *American Home* 38 (November 1947), 69-71 and William J. Hennessey, *America's Best Small Houses* (New York: Viking Press, 1949), 34-37.

¹⁹⁹ *Architectural Record* 110 (November 1951), 135-137. The article also credits Basil Yurchenko, a Russian-born architect who, according to Mr. Keyes, did little actual design work on this house.

²⁰⁰ See "an upside-down plan for a growing family," *House and Garden*, August 1952, 54-55

²⁰¹ "Work Starts at Bannockburn," *Washington Post*, January 16, 1949, R4.

²⁰² Another small house with an ingenious, fluid plan, white window trim, and a large picture window in the living/dining space was designed in 1947 by Chloethiel Woodard Smith in Rockville (135 S. Van Buren Street). It was not published in magazines, however. See the nomination authored by Liz Creveling, Isabelle Gournay, and Mary Corbin Sies submitted to the Maryland Historical Trust, 2004.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 50

Art To See 'Those Eccentric House Designs!'." ²⁰³ By the early 1950s, modern forms for tract houses had become more acceptable. In 1951, *NAHB Correlator* published a "Design Clinic" entitled "What features of contemporary design have met with the greatest customer acceptance in your area," with the following "facts" related to the Eastern United States:

A) A one story plan or, where site conditions require it, a split level one; B) An opened plan with emphasis on function and dual use areas, this functionalism extending beyond the envelope to include the site in the overall planning; C) A roof pitch of no more than three inches to the foot, with a wide overhang over the walls, which are unadorned except for usually awning-type fenestration and large fixed-lites, properly oriented for climate and privacy.²⁰⁴

A few builders (such as Carlton Construction Company for Lustron) distributed and erected prefabricated houses in the Capitol Region.²⁰⁵ However, early "modern" tract houses in the D.C. suburbs were more likely to be streamlined versions of Cape Cod models, with more opened plans, abstracted facade compositions, and larger windows. In Montgomery County, this trend found its leader in Carl M. Freeman, who had worked for noted Los Angeles home builder Fritz Burns. In 1947, Freeman built 29 houses, according to plans by Berla and Abel, on two streets in the Carol Highlands district of Takoma Park, near what was then the end of New Hampshire Avenue. *Washington Post* real estate journalist Conrad P. Harness took note that "Unique, California Styled Bungalows Make Debut Here"; his article carried the subtitle "Low-Slung Homes Win Approval."²⁰⁶ The model, built on slab with incorporated radiant heat, offered only two bedrooms at the relatively high price of \$13,500. In 1948, Freeman raised the roof pitch (which rendered his houses more traditional-looking) to provide an expansion attic convertible into two extra bedrooms.

As stated in *Architectural Forum*, Freeman's street facades were "quietly conventional," so as not to "frighten the most timid customer."²⁰⁷ A touch of originality was conferred by the removal of tiles from the overhanging eaves above the kitchen window, to provide more light into this room. In the back, a large picture window, rising above a two-foot sill, ran the entire width of the living room. A glazed door opened onto a terrace. According to *American Home*, which offered the plan for purchase, such a compromise solution "should satisfy that vast growing public who, though wanting modern, just can't take it straight."²⁰⁸ The living and dining spaces formed an opened L. The fireplace was a simple hole in the wall, with no mantle (in the 1947 model, three long, flat Vermont slate stones protruded from the fireplace wall at different levels). In 1949, Freeman offered in Bethesda a "longer, lower and less boxy" model with

²⁰³ *Home Builders Monthly* (April 1945), 11 and 26; July 1945, 5-6; October 1945.

²⁰⁴ "What features of contemporary design have met with the greatest customer acceptance in your area," *NAHB Correlator* (March 1951), 1951, 115.

²⁰⁵ Conrad P. Harness, "Post Takes a Camera Tour of New Homes," *Washington Post*, January 30, 1949, R 1 illustrates a 2 bedroom Lustron bungalow selling for \$9,188. One of these was erected in the Calvert Hills district of College Park (4811 Harvard Road).

²⁰⁶ *Washington Post*, August 17, 1947, R 1

²⁰⁷ "Hillside Development," *Architectural Forum*, April 1949, 123.

²⁰⁸ William J. Hennessey, "The American Home Study Plan for May 1949," *American Home* 41 (May 1949), 39.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 51

ribbon windows, an extra bedroom but no expansion attic, designed by Sweeley, Heap & Gauger.²⁰⁹ It had a recessed front entrance, wide roof overhangs, a rear terrace, a 408-square foot attic accessible from a pull-down stair; the galley kitchen was turned sideways and included a dining nook facing the street. The house had no basement and no garage (a storage cabana for garden tools continued the roof slope in the back, providing privacy for the terrace). The model home featured Alvar Aalto furnishings,

Keyes, Smith, Satterlee and Lethbridge produced for Nathan Shapiro their own version of the streamlined Cape Cod (plate 66).²¹⁰ Silver Spring's Forestvale was a conventional, gridiron subdivision, and the architects had no say on the site planning. Complying with Shapiro's desire to provide a transformable attic, they designed a high-pitched roof. Red brick, redwood, and glass with white trim were massed to generate a non-traditional composition. The single dormer was treated as a ribbon window. All four bedrooms had cross ventilation, and a free standing fireplace separated the living and dining areas.

By the late 1940s, Montgomery County builders started erecting modernized versions of single-story "ramblers," with distinctive brick chimney walls and non-traditional fenestration. In the *Washington Post*, an advertisement by the Merrimack Engineering Corporation claimed that its New Hampshire Estates homes met the expectations of those who "wondered when the 'modern post-war' house in the home magazines" would come to the D.C suburbs and that they were "Modern in Every Way":

In Feeling ... the outdoors is brought indoors by use of large glass areas.

In Beauty ... clean, uncluttered lines replace fuss doodads and 'gingerbread'.

In Engineering ... the houses use the wintertime heat-saving, summertime heat-eliminating solar plan.²¹¹

Completed in 1949, Hollin Hills' first houses marked a much more radical departure from tradition than the modernized Cape Cods and ramblers. Charles Goodman was able to achieve a formula that was as avant-garde as one could get in the Mid-Atlantic tract housing market of the late 1940s and early 1950s. His houses featured floor-to-ceiling glazing, sometimes with a geometrical play of mullions; low-pitched gable roofs creating a strong sense of triangulation; no attics; play between board and batten painted wood; a nearly square brick wall hosting a fireplace inside; and ingenious planning to vary the placement of houses on the site and thereby gain privacy for the big-windowed houses. Everything was devised to make the houses and lots look more spacious than they really were. Hollin Hills' basic models were transferred, with no major modifications, to Montgomery County in the Hammond

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 122. See also "Distinguished plan gives privacy and convenience to a builder's small house," *Architectural Forum* (April 1950), 154-155. John Normille, "Better Homes & Gardens Five Star Home No.2010. Big enough for a family of four, five or six," *Better Homes and Gardens* 29 (October 1950), 60-61; "1949 Best Home for Family Living" Regional Award of Merit, *American Builder* (December 1950): 143-145.

²¹⁰ Advertisement, *Washington Post*, August 19, 1951, R 7. Note that Shapiro mentioned the name of the architects in his advertisements, which was very unusual at the time. Priced at \$18,000 in their fully finished four-bedroom, two-bath version, the Forestvale homes were relatively expensive.

²¹¹ Classified ad, *Washington Post*, September 11, 1949, F 11. Merrimack built the same type of houses in Bannockburn in 1950 (advertised in the *Washington Post*, December 17, 1950, R 7)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number E Page 52

Woods, Hammond Hill, and Wheatoncrest subdivisions. Hammond Woods' first section of 58 units opened in November 1950; its model home was decorated with antique furniture borrowed from the early American shop on Wisconsin Avenue. According to the *Washington Post*, the fireplace set in the large brick wall was "more than merely decorative. It is designed to circulate heat. On a sunny day, when the temperature is 50 or so outside, the sun's warmth and the fireplace are sufficient to heat the houses up to 65 degrees."²¹²

By 1952-53, modern tract housing, in its most temperate or more radical forms, took hold in the Washington region, at a time when demand moved toward larger and more expensive models. This acclimation coincided with the local formation of a "critical mass" of custom-built houses in both "high" and "situated" modernism. An architect who catered to both custom and speculative markets with uncompromisingly modern designs was Joseph Miller. In 1953, his Rosemary Hills group (20 two-story houses) in Silver Spring received design awards from the *Evening Star-Washington AIA*, *Parents Magazine* and NAHB.²¹³ Modern became a catchword among Bethesda's realtors. Several builders re-used the formula of the bi-level hillside house that Satterlee and Lethbridge had refined at Holmes Run Acres and Pine Springs - that of a lower "bonus floor" including a recreation room, a bedroom and bathroom, as well as utilities, "slid" under a three-bedroom rambler plan.²¹⁴ As split levels became popular, several builders strove to give them a modern twist, both outside and inside. Carl Freeman did so in Chevy Chase's Rollingwood Terrace: designed by architect Richard Collins, his "luxury split" had a nearly square footprint and a massive front gable encompassing a carport.²¹⁵ Competitors went for a two-wing composition related to that used by Bennett in Kenwood Park, without equaling the subtlety in massing and fenestration that Keyes and Lethbridge were able to achieve. Modified Cape Cods and ramblers acquired crisper lines, larger windows, and a distinct panelized look, as component construction was more widely adopted. Good examples of this trend can be found in Alvin L. Aubinoe's Wildwood Manor in upper Bethesda.²¹⁶

By the early 1960s, "contemporary" was a recognized stylistic option, but its cutting edge cultural and visual dimensions had worn off. Many home builders adopted an eclectic and opportunistic approach, which Mr. Bennett did not embrace. A case in point was Swedish-born Bertil Malmsted, head of Torpet Construction Company, Inc. Right after the war, his first ventures in home building were for modest dwellings in Prince George's County. In later years, most of his upmarket output in Montgomery County was traditional. However, in 1961, he opened with great fanfare Dada Woods in Potomac, with radically modern model homes designed by James Hilleary.²¹⁷ A subdivision offering

²¹² Robert P. Jordan, "Antiques Go Modern," *Washington Post*, November 19, 1950, R1. Charles Goodman and Robert Davenport ventured in the upscale Potomac market with the Hollinridge subdivision, Lloyd Road and Glen Mill Road, completed in 1960, which included a little more than thirty houses. See "You get good design from the interplay of structure, solids and glass," *House and Home* (November 1960), 123.

²¹³ "Bert Tracy Wins Parents Magazine Award," *Home Builders Monthly*, November 1952, 14

²¹⁴ See for instance houses built in High Point (near houses Keyes, Smith, Satterlee and Lethbridge designed for Charles Luria) by the Merrimack Engineering Company illustrated in Paul M. Herron, "'Homes of '52' will please Budgeters and Dreamers," *Washington Post*, August 24, 1952, R1 and R 6.

²¹⁵ "Luxury split has dignity and a new plan," *House and Home* (October 1955), 143 and *NAHB Correlator* 9 (July 1955), 200-203.

²¹⁶ *Washington Post*, September 18, 1952, R 15.

²¹⁷ Joseph B. Byrnes, "Why Call it Dada Woods," *Washington Evening Star*, June 10, 1961, B-1 and B-15.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 53

both contemporary models (including by Charles Goodman) and Colonials was Crest Park (1962) in Silver Spring. The objective of one of its builders, Leon Kahn, a lawyer by training, was "to create the atmosphere and the kind of community in which contemporary and traditional is acceptable."²¹⁸

In May 1965, *Washington Post* real estate writer John B. Willmann identified the atrium as the possible new trend on the "styling cycle" of tract houses, after the "Cape Cod Adaptation (1939-to-1947)," "Ranch or Rambler (1947-to-1955)," and the "Split-Level Version (1955-to-1963)." For Willmann, it was "significant that one of this area's leading home builders, Edmund G. (*sic*) Bennett introduced atrium models last year in his well-received Carderock Springs in Montgomery County." Willmann concluded that it seemed "somewhat unlikely that the atrium house will become highly popular in the mass housing market. But it does offer some interesting possibilities in the use of a small lot to provide outdoor privacy inside the house."²¹⁹ The atrium house is a major icon of High Modernism, of what is sometimes referred to as the Late International Style. A substantial number of custom-designed houses with interior courts were built in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s, and attracted significant press coverage. A good example is Philip Johnson's Hodgson Residence in New Canaan, CT, which received an AIA national award in 1956. In California, Joseph Eichler democratized the concept of the small central patio and made his fellow home builders appreciate its advantages: an atrium facilitated cross ventilation and views and the idea of borrowed space; it added natural light without compromising privacy; children could play outdoors under adult supervision. Examples of patio houses were very rare in the Capital Region, however. Charles Goodman designed one for Marvin J. Duncan in Kensington, Maryland, around 1958. It had 4,600 square feet of space on a single level, including a two-car garage and a recessed entry. The asymmetrically placed courtyard was faced by the living room, the master bedroom, and an L-shaped entrance gallery corridor.²²⁰ The house won an award for residential architecture from the *Evening Star* and Washington Chapter of the AIA. After 1955, home builder magazines presented examples of atrium houses built for year-round family living. In 1956, *House and Home* published a U-shaped custom-made patio house designed by John Johansen in Connecticut, with the same kind of trim found at Carderock Springs.²²¹ In January 1958, in a series entitled "Tomorrow's House," *American Builder* published a house in Flossmoor, Illinois, with a small pool in its interior courtyard, which was commended for "lend[ing] warmth and privacy" to this "striking house." In May 1959, the *Journal of Homebuilding* illustrated an elegant patio house built by Elliott Noyes in New Canaan.²²² In all cases, facades and interiors were strikingly photogenic but the plan itself was far from free-flowing. The impression was that atriums were more appropriate for custom built or upscale tract housing than for less expensive models. Nonetheless, the atrium house remained an enticing, if not exotic, proposition. In 1963, ULI produced a Technical Bulletin on The Patio House. In May 1965, *Practical Builder* reported that "atrium houses are springing up all over the country," illustrating modernist and traditional examples in California, Fort Lauderdale, and

Joseph B. Byrnes, "The Home Builders 'Finest For Family Living' Award Winners" *Evening Star*, Saturday, May 27, 1962. The project was a failure, though. Besides the four models homes, the other houses in this 22-unit development are traditional.

²¹⁸ "No 'Conflict of Interest' Seen," *Washington Post*, May 5, 1962, B 29.

²¹⁹ John B. Willmann, "Is Atrium Next? Mass Housing Tends to Follow Cycle of Styling," *Washington Post*, May 29, 1965, D 1.

²²⁰ "Restraint and Simplicity Characterize Two A.I.A. Award-Winning Houses," *Journal of Homebuilding* (October 1958), 43.

²²¹ "Patio in Connecticut," *House and Home* (August 1956), 136-137.

²²² "Architect's Informal Family Inspires Prize-Winning Home," *Journal of Homebuilding* (May 1959), 64-65.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 54

outside Detroit. The article highlighted a model that had just been erected by the Home Manufacturers Association in Northern Virginia near Mount Vernon. This "Manufactured House of the Year" was also featured in *Better Homes and Gardens* and *American Builder*.

F. Associated Property Types

(Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)

1 A – General description of projects and house models

Considered individually, each of the models described in this section does not attain "perfection" with regards to its proportions, fenestration or interior layout. However, in the subdivisions and communities we are about to present, one can hardly find a single instance of a house that is not well sited or does not engage in a rich dialogue with its surroundings. Bennett's trial and error approach to home design was pragmatic, based on studies as well as his own perception of market demand. He claimed that "80% of Washington, D.C. buyers want[ed] brick houses with basements" and was able to meet their expectations without compromising his preference for "clean and crisp" design.²²³ This section highlights the constant desire, on the part of the builder and his architects, to improve upon the floor plans of these suburban tract houses. The concurrent increase in size of models reflects an overall pattern of upward mobility among suburbanites in the Capital Region and the country in general.

Although continuity in landscape and design philosophies is a defining feature of the Bennett/KLC projects, each of their subdivisions has its own identity. No matter how small, each one served as a testing ground for their builder and designers. Three exceptionally well-preserved "visual communities" - if we use Mr. Bennett's own words -- are of outstanding significance, and complement each other in terms of their contributions to the history of modernist tract housing and residential site planning. Of the three, Potomac Overlook marks a peak in modernist design. Its models have the crispest, most geometrical

²²³ Edmund J. Bennett, "Let's Re-examine Program Plans and Assumptions," *Home Builders Monthly* 16 (February 1959), 46.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 55

detailing of all houses designed by KLC for Bennett. It is where the use of building components is most clearly expressed on the outside. Indeed, from a stylistic point of view, the late 1950s, when Potomac Overlook was built, can be regarded as the most radical phase of "situated modernism" in the Maryland suburbs and, to a great extent, in the United States in general. At Carderock Springs, the diversity of models, their siting and interior layout, as well as the design quality of the clubhouse and pool complex, are truly exceptional. New Marks Commons was, as initially planned, a very innovative experiment in community planning and, as built, achieves a remarkable degree of sophistication with regard to landscaping and town house clustering.

1 B – Precedents for the Bennett/KLC projects and house models

The "family tree" of tract houses by Lethbridge and his associates begins with those they designed for the Lurias in Northern Virginia. It is therefore necessary to introduce these precedents, as they served as departure points for KLC's work for Mr. Bennett.

- Holmes Run Acres, designed 1950 (see plate 2)

Designed by Satterlee and Lethbridge, Holmes Run Acres anticipated Bennett subdivisions in substantial ways. An unusual feature (which will be repeated in the other subdivisions we shall describe) was that the architects were responsible for the preliminary layout of the streets and lots (after this initial phase, Satterlee and Lethbridge worked out details with a civil engineer who acted as subcontractor).²²⁴ Streets at Holmes Run Acres did not include sidewalks, to preserve the rural character of the site. Streetlights, which were not required in Fairfax County, were also omitted. Some cul-de-sacs had "grassy play areas for children." The Lurias deeded ten acres to build a school and a community center (opened in 1953) and also gave four acres to create a stream valley public park. Some blocks had "interior areas with back yards left opened for a potential communal space," but individual lots were progressively closed off, especially to control pets.²²⁵ The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) objected to some aspects of the site planning but, in the end, requested only minor changes for approval.²²⁶ A major hardship, however, was complying with the county's setback restrictions on each lot. Also, Lethbridge insisted that he prepared site plans for no less than 20 units, in order to ensure privacy for each house, despite the abundant glazing. Privacy was reinforced by the erection of short wooden fences, designed by the architects, and the creation of berms and "small hillocks," made possible by minor grading.²²⁷ The budget for shrubbery was "barely enough to purchase the FHA minimum of eight plants per house," but the Lurias called upon a talented landscape architect, Lou Bernard Voight (who also worked in Hollin Hills) to suggest additional planting options for home buyers (Bennett would adopt and refine the formula of advisory landscape work at Carderock Springs).

Satterlee and Lethbridge devised one basic plan with five variations, resulting from the addition of a carport (with either a flat or a single-pitched roof) and/or of a basement level, which offered a recreation room, as well as a garage or an additional bedroom. The two-story houses, which appealed to local preferences, were built on the steepest lots; the version with the enclosed garage suited uphill sites. This

²²⁴ Martin, 161.

²²⁵ Martin, 216

²²⁶ Martin, 172

²²⁷ Martin, 162

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 56

formula of bi-level living, which could be either fully off the ground or half-sunken, always offered better daylight than traditional raised basements. On the upper floor, the rectangular layout was almost equally split between day and night sections: the former consisted of an L-shaped living-dining space and a kitchen adjacent to the eating area; the latter included three bedrooms and one bathroom. The bedroom adjacent to the living room could be used as a study or could be integrated into the living room, as separation was through a movable partition. The principle of "borrowed" visual space, from one public room to another, which was a major staple of modernist home design, allowed for small homes at Holmes Run Acres to appear more spacious than they really were. The formula of the compact, bifocal layout would be repeated in most houses Lethbridge and his partners designed for Bennett. Other enduring characteristics were the prominent display of brick inside and outside, variations in siding (vertical, horizontal, vertical with battens) of the upper floor and the role of the architect as coordinator for outside colors. Holmes Run Acres also anticipated Bennett's work in its use of standardized, pre-cut lumber components, prefabricated bedroom closets, and clear-span roof trusses (purchased from the Timber Engineering Company or TECO).

- Pine Springs, first phase, designed 1952

At Pine Springs, Keyes, Smith and Satterlee refined the Holmes Run Acres formula. The subdivision was named for the many pine trees preserved on its grounds. Both exteriors and interiors exhibited more harmonious proportions and sophisticated details than at Holmes Run Acres. Windows were larger; pine siding was replaced by more luxurious and durable redwood and cypress. Homes featured distinctive and prominent carports (found at Potomac Overlook in the John Matthews house). These carports - with a single-slope or a zigzag roof - formed an open air patio / breezeway off the dining area and kitchen, which could be used as an *al fresco* dining space (a solution found at Carderock Springs as well).

- Houses for Charles Luria on Massachusetts Avenue, designed 1951

In the late 1940s, Massachusetts Avenue, which used to end at Westmoreland Circle in the District of Columbia, was extended, giving rise to a new upscale neighborhood beyond the D.C. limits, Massachusetts Heights. A subdivision along the avenue, as well Osceola and Onondaga Roads, was called High Point and developed by a namesake corporation. Advertisements in the *Washington Post* indicate that Charles Luria built ten houses in High Point according to plans by Keyes, Smith, Satterlee and Lethbridge. They were all located along Massachusetts Avenue, which is currently a busy thoroughfare; some are set sideways on their lot, and only their gable can be seen from the street. They have all survived, but their visual identity is not very strong. Some have been painted white and a few negatively altered.²²⁸

At High Point, Pine Springs' bi-level layout was adapted to much larger dimensions. Major differences consisted in the projection of the day-section in the back, the central (instead of lateral) placement of the fireplace in the living room, and the consistent use of very large floor-to-ceiling windows on the upper floor, with thin geometrical mullions. Priced from \$30,000 to \$34,000, all High Point houses (plate 3) had the same plan, with four bedrooms, two and a half baths, and a recreation

²²⁸ For instance, at 5715 Massachusetts Avenue, the balcony was removed, windows were reduced in size and the garage and entrance doors have totally incompatible replacements.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 57

room, as well as "an automatic summer ventilator fan in the roof that draws cool air through the entire house during warm weather."²²⁹ Houses with upper level entrances, such as 5801 Massachusetts (photograph 1; balcony removed, otherwise intact) and 5805, had flat-roofed carports and lateral entrances; those accessed from the bottom floor had a built-in garage. The model home was furnished by W. & J. Sloane, a well-known local interior design firm. An advertisement in the *Washington Post* mentioned that "design elements which give increased spaciousness are the sloping ceilings, free-standing fireplace, skylit bedroom hall, folding doors at study-bedroom, and the big long pass-thru snack counter between dining room and kitchen."²³⁰ Outside, the only concession to tradition was a two-slope roof, albeit with a low pitch. End walls were in brick; the lower floor is half sunken and is expressed by an inconspicuous ribbon window.

- Houses for Gaddy and Gaddy at Holmes Run Acres, designed 1954 (see plate 4)

When the Lurias stepped out of home building, a new section of Holmes Run Acres was erected by Joseph and Anthony Gaddy. It consisted of 30 four-bedroom, two-bath houses of approximately 2,100 square feet on steep 100' lots, priced between \$19,250 and \$21,500. They all had identical plans. As mentioned in *American Builder*, the Gaddys did not succumb to the split-level fashion, estimating that "a cleaner design could be achieved with two-stories."²³¹ The Gaddy houses were in fact smaller than those at Pine Springs (while their width remained 26'-0", their length was 38'-3", as opposed to 41'-1/4"). Triangular transoms on gables were abandoned for strictly rectangular openings. The addition of a balcony changed considerably the character of the facade. The superimposed openings of the recreation and living rooms did not read anymore as a large unified (and modernist) window wall. Instead, the upper floor, painted a darker color than at Pine Springs, read as a separate, primarily horizontal entity. It is this new version that would serve as a starting point for Bennett's Highview model in Potomac Overlook, and for its subsequent transformations, under the "Overlook" denomination.

2 - Bennett/KLC Projects and House Models

2 A - Kenwood Park group, 1956

The first Bennett/KLC project that was extensively advertised, and received media attention and design recognition, was built in 1956 in Bethesda's Kenwood Park. This 300-acre subdivision was located in the southern section of the district comprised by River Road, Wilson Lane, Bradley Boulevard, and Goldsboro Road. On May 6, 1956, the *Washington Post* reported that 35 homes were already completed and that ultimately Kenwood Park would have more than 800 homes, with 60 builders constructing houses starting at \$35,000:

A permanent architectural committee controls the size and character of each house. To date the homes have been three, four and five bedroom structures with two or more baths. Architectural styles are colonial and contemporary.²³²

²²⁹ Display ad, *Washington Post*, May 4, 1952, R 6

²³⁰ Ibid.

²³¹ "How these Washington builders worked their idea of a foolproof house," *American Builder* (August 1955), 113.

²³² "Kenwood Park Takes Shape," *Washington Post*, May 6, 1956, G1.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 58

A few days later, the *Washington Post* noted that Kenwood Park would be "predominantly a community of modern ramblers with two-level houses permitted only where necessary by topography." "For Sale" signs were forbidden, as well as "the removal of any tree bigger than 6 inches in diameter that is not within the building area." Houses could be "contemporary but not modern," as "large expanses of glass" were not allowed on the street side. Builders were required to buy at least three lots.²³³ Kenwood Park soon had an active Citizens Association and attracted prominent politicians. For example, in 1957, the *Washington Post* mentioned that Senator Frank J. Lausche (D-Ohio) bought a \$40,000 rambler at 6916 Marbury Road, sight unseen.²³⁴ Mr. Bennett recalls that the house he built at 6704 Pemberton Street was acquired by Senator Frank Church of Idaho. One of Kenwood Park's most prolific builders was Robert L. Silverman. In 1956, he employed local firms Rinaudot & Coupard, Walter Durant Byrd, and Jack Cohen, as well as Baltimore architect Von Fossen Schwab, to build sprawling houses in the 6800 hundred block of Granby Street, ranging from \$ 41,500 to \$ 48,500.²³⁵ After two years, Silverman had sold nineteen such houses, designed in a moderately modern idiom and displaying limited curb appeal. In 1958, as well, Kettler Brothers bought 44 lots on and near Durbin Road, and built colonial models.

Mr. Bennett acquired six lots with direct views on the golf course of the Kenwood Country Club: four on the 5800 block of Marbury Road and two on an adjacent dead-end street, Pemberton Street. He was not able to purchase the corner lot, where a house of a different style was erected by another builder. This was Mr. Bennett's first attempt to create a harmonious but not repetitive group of houses, set on lots ranging from more than 10,000 to 21,000 square feet and priced from \$43,000. On May 13, 1956, Bennett ran the following advertisement in the *Washington Post*:

Bennett Contemporary Homes Announces a new group of distinctive split-level homes, designed by Architects Keyes & Lethbridge, AIA, in Kenwood Park ... the new prestige community overlooking Kenwood Country Club.

Emphasis is placed on appealing contemporary design, integration of indoor and outdoor living areas, orientation toward sun and golf course view, spacious room areas for comfortable living, fine materials, and quality workmanship under the builder's personal supervision.

Key features include:

- . four and five bedrooms
- . three baths
- . cantilevered balconies overlooking golf course
- . screened porches and patios
- . two-car garages
- . recreation rooms and studios
- . fully equipped General Electric kitchen with breakfast alcoves
- . spacious living and dining rooms with high-sloping ceilings
- . large landscaped lots with hardwood trees and dogwoods.²³⁶

²³³ "Plans for Kenwood Park," *Washington Post*, May 22, 1956, G5

²³⁴ "Senator Hasn't Seen it Yet. Lausches Moving into First House," *Washington Post*, September 23, 1957, B 4

²³⁵ "Homes for the Custom-Conscious," *Washington Post*, June 3, 1956, G 12.

²³⁶ *Washington Post*, May 20, 1956, I 11.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 59

Press coverage focused on the exhibit house located at **5848 Marbury Road** (photograph 2, plate 5), which was set on a 15,813.00 square-foot lot, comprised 2,810 square feet of living space, and was priced at \$ 47,000. Sparingly furnished by Modern Design Incorporated, it opened for public inspection in May 1956.²³⁷ A month later, the real estate section of the *Washington Evening Star* devoted a long article to the house, which had just received an award in the Second Annual Residential Architecture Competition co-sponsored by the newspaper and the Washington Metropolitan Chapter of the AIA. Jurors had commended "its very imaginative sense of space organization," its "overhead lighting" and deemed the plan "well organized."²³⁸ In early October, the *Washington Star* announced its coverage in the current issue of *House and Home* and inclusion in exhibitions at the National Housing Center in Washington, D.C. and at the annual convention of the National Association of Home Builders, to be held in Chicago in January 1957.²³⁹ Other awards came from the Potomac Valley Chapter of the AIA: one for architectural detailing, and a first prize for development houses.

Facades of # 5848 Marbury Road complied with Kenwood Park's restrictions; they were very simple, dominated by walls in pale red brick (which was new and sand-molded) and overhanging roofs (covered with white asbestos shingles). The reception rooms were as dramatic as the outside was unprepossessing. The L-shaped footprint was adapted to the terrain. At entrance level, the long wing sheltered the two-car garage, eat-in kitchen, living and dining rooms. These two reception rooms shared a cathedral ceiling soaring to 19 feet and were separated by a dramatic free standing fire place and, on the entry side, by a low storage unit. According to the *Washington Star*, "entering the living room from the low-ceilinged entry gives you something of the same small sense of shock and thrill that comes when you step into a high vaulted cathedral from a small entrance passage."²⁴⁰ The same pebble aggregate concrete was used for the floors of the front porch, the entry, and a small terrace on axis with the entry. A porch ran 38 feet long and 10 feet deep along the living, dining, and kitchen spaces, overlooking the golf course.

In the split-level fashion, the short wing had two floors staggered half a story up and down the entrance hall. The lower level included one bedroom, one bathroom, a family room giving access to a laundry room, and a utility room; all these spaces had outside windows. The upper level included three bedrooms and two bathrooms. Half a story above this main bedroom section, a long and narrow balcony led to an open study that looked over the reception rooms and was continued by an outside balcony. This balcony also led to a closed den, giving access to the attic. The addition of this top level created a very dramatic spatial experience, enhanced by the open and slender detailing of the stairs and of the interior and exterior balconies. Indeed, a more sophisticated interior rendition of the split-level formula would have been difficult to achieve.

Fenestration at 5848 Marbury Road complied with sun exposure. Floor to ceiling glazing in the living and dining spaces was protected by the deep overhang of the porch. On the side elevation that

²³⁷ "Dramatic Construction [photograph and caption], *Washington Post*, May 20, 1956, G 9.

²³⁸ Robert J. Lewis, "Award Winner. Center Hall is Hub Of 4-Level Plan," *Washington Evening Star* (Real Estate Section), June 30, 1956, B-1 and B-4. Another winning design was a Charles Goodman house in Hollin Hills.

²³⁹ Robert J. Lewis, "Three Homes in Area Chosen For Exhibit," *Washington Evening Star* (Real Estate Section), October 6, 1956, B-1 and B-4 (others were a house by Charles Goodman in Hollin Hills and one designed by Carl Freeman with architect Joseph Miller as consultant in Fairfax County).

²⁴⁰ Robert J. Lewis, "Center Hall is Hub of 4-Level Plan," *Washington Evening Star*, June 30, 1956, B-1

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 60

faced southwest, windows were kept small, with the exception of those fronting the terrace and the recessed balcony, which were protected by a deep overhang. Robert Lautman's photograph of the central portion encompassing the terrace and balcony (plate 5) was published in the *Washington Post* with the title "Dramatic Construction" and (a rare occurrence indeed!) as a full-page color inset in *House and Home*.²⁴¹ Partly concealed by landscaping, the Marbury Street facade (photograph 2, note that this view was not published in the media) encompassed the low, blind wing of the two-car garage and kitchen and the projecting two-story bedroom / family room block, where ribbon windows and spandrels of horizontal wood siding were framed by brick.

The October 1956 issue of *House and Home* featured 5848 Marbury Road in a four-page article entitled "Good design makes this a handsome split from any angle." This piece stressed all the great ideas "that would make most of today's split-levels more livable and better looking." The house was the living proof that "splits" were "best on sloping sites." It was a successful example of indoor-outdoor living and avoided the "banana split" exterior of most split levels, as it used "only red brick with white wood trim to get a warm simple exterior familiar in traditional Maryland houses."²⁴² Achieving the sophistication of a custom-built home, 5848 Marbury Road was not duplicated in other subdivisions built by Edmund Bennett. In addition to its relatively high price, it also had some planning inadequacies: for instance, the kitchen was dark because its windows opened onto two porches and the garage was connected to the main house solely by a covered porch. Currently painted green, 5848 Marbury Road appears to be unchanged.

As far as we know, the other five houses in Bennett's Kenwood Park group were not published and did not receive awards. Their front facades were designed to create a harmonious group. Next door to 5848 is **5852 Marbury** (photograph 3), which adopts the same proportions and layout. The front facade of the bedroom wing received a different treatment, however; its ribbon windows and wood panels (with vertical battens) span the entire width of this wing and are framed by a thin strip of brick marking the end of the side walls. The result is a crisper, less traditional composition than at 5848 Marbury Road. The brick walls are currently painted white. Also adjacent to 5848 is **5844 Marbury Road**, which adopts the same general massing but has a smaller footprint; its brick walls are currently painted brown. Next door is **5840 Marbury Road**, which was built for James V. Bennett, the builder's father, and for which we have only found an image of the back facade and yard, overlooking the golf course.²⁴³ It is presently painted bright blue and seems to have been considerably altered. Number **5836 Marbury** is not a split level but a two-level house with the garage below. The garage and bedroom wing has a gabled front; the brick has been painted gray. Number **6708 Pemberton Street** (photographs 4 and 5) adopts a massing related to 5848 and 5852 Marbury Road; however, the two-car garage is located on the lower level of the two-story projecting wing and there is no balcony on the side.²⁴⁴ At **6704 Pemberton Street** (photograph 6), the two-car garage is also located on the lower level of the projecting wing. Above, the gable runs parallel to the street side. The frontal glazing reaches all the way to the roof, creating the effect of a triangular transom. The entire second story is covered in wood, which has vertical battens on the side walls. On the lower wing, the end gable features narrow horizontal windows illuminating the kitchen and a triangular

²⁴¹"Dramatic Construction," *Washington Post*, May 20, 1956, G9.

²⁴² "Good design makes this a handsome split from any angle," *House and Home* (October 1956), 120-123

²⁴³ John B. Willmann, "Contemporary Homes Built to Fit 'Bethesda Family Profile,'" *Washington Post*, May 26, 1962, B1.

²⁴⁴ Advertisement, *Washington Evening Star*, January 4, 1957, B-4

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 61

section of contrasting horizontal siding.

2 B- Potomac Overlook, 1956-58

In 1896, Glen Echo was described as "the Rhine County of Washington," where the Potomac River "picturesque, wild and romantic, is shored by tall, abrupt, rock ribbed and forest covered hills." Glen Echo Heights is located between MacArthur Boulevard and Massachusetts Avenue, only a mile away from the District Line. Its eastern section was laid out in the 1890s with streets meeting at right angles and carrying picturesque-sounding names such as Tuskarawas and Wapakonta. A subsection of Glen Echo Heights received the name Mohican Hills and its narrow and extra steep curving roads were given Indian names. Even today, climbing Mohican, Walhonding, or Wiscasset Roads procures the feeling that one has left the polished world of upscale suburbia far behind, and has rejoined pre-industrial wilderness. The maze of narrow and steep roads serves bumpy, craggy, and heavily wooded lots where houses of different periods and styles nestle comfortably. The neighborhood is changing fast, however; its smallest houses are being replaced by pseudo-Victorian or Arts and Craft houses that are not designed with the rugged terrain in mind.

In the 1950s, small or large lots were put for sale by owners of Glen Echo Heights historic homes, and Bennett, who was still a budding home builder, purchased several of them. In 1954 and 1955, he built, after plans by Keyes and Lethbridge, four houses on adjacent lots on Wiscasset Road (6220, 6216, where he lived with his wife and four children, 6212, and 6210). These houses, which have all survived, were downhill models; their single-story front elevations are rather inconspicuous. Alterations make it difficult to see whether they were all exactly the same model.

Information can be found on **6210 Wiscasset Road** (plates 6 and 7), whose original owner was Franklin Newhall, because it won an award in the 1956 Annual Residential Architecture Competition sponsored by the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter of the AIA and the *Washington Evening Star*, which described it at length.²⁴⁵ Outside walls mixed redwood tongue-and-groove siding and used brick. Drywall construction was used inside. The roof originally had white coral chips. The lot sloped from the street. The single-story front facade (with the kitchen in median position) looked very inconspicuous, as it was shielded from view by a wooden fence made of a frame slightly raised from the ground and of vertical louvers which were 5'8" tall. Much more spectacular was the back elevation, set amidst rocks and trees, and ending in a deck. Measuring 38 by 36 feet, 6210 Wiscasset Road had four bedrooms, three very small baths, and a "multi-use" room off the kitchen. It included 1,818 square feet of finished space and 850 square feet of unfinished space. The lower floor had a very large recreation room (25"x13"), a basement/laundry room measuring 36"x14", a fourth bedroom, and a bathroom. A detached carport ended with a storage closet. One entered the upper floor laterally, coming directly into the dining room, which was separated from the living room by a stair hall. Domed skylights in plastic, which were quite new at the time, were used for the upstairs bathrooms. Chimneys had a brick base and two cylindrical metal flues, allowing for an uninterrupted glass transom. With this experimental house, Bennett and his architects whetted the appetite of prospective customers, but its fence has been removed and windows have apparently been altered. The carport has also been modified.

Potomac Overlook took two years to plan before ground was broken. It was a joint venture

²⁴⁵ Robert J. Lewis, "This Plan is Clean, Compact," *Washington Evening Star*, August 4, 1956, B-1 and B-6.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 62

between Bennett Construction Company and Matthews & Potter. Built on nine acres of particularly "craggy terrain" that "was passed up for years by other builders as too difficult," but with stunning and unimpeded views of the Potomac River and the Virginia hills beyond, the 19-home subdivision (plate 8) has very irregular boundaries. According to Mr. Matthews, he and Mr. Bennett bought the property after a woman realtor who lived in Glen Echo Heights asked them to do so. Potomac Overlook was comprised of four houses along MacArthur Boulevard (the easternmost of these houses, at the intersection of Mohican Road has been recently demolished and replaced by a much larger residence), and of homes facing two small cul-de-sac streets off Wiscasset Road: Rivercrest Court (seven houses) and Virginia View Court (eight houses, two of them with driveways accessed through Wiscasset Road). In Virginia View Court, Matthews & Potter built houses on the south side and Bennett those on the north side. Wooded lots ranged from 9,880 square feet to 30,075 square feet, averaging 1/3 of an acre. All had irregular shapes.

There is something quite enchanting, almost magical, about Potomac Overlook (photographs 7 and 9). Despite its loose boundaries, it is definitely a "visual community." The topography and scenic siting of each house afford privacy, but also give the impression of a semi-formal "family portrait," like a picnic gathering. The steeply sloping terrain and meandering roads allow many houses to be seen on several sides, a rather rare occurrence in subdivisions, and one can appreciate the simple elegance of their massing and fenestration. The Virginia View Court cluster is particularly intact and pleasing. The natural look is effortlessly achieved: there are no sidewalks, the curved, non intrusively, driveways of varying lengths had been "contoured so deftly that only 2,500 cubic yards of earth have to be moved from one lot to another."²⁴⁶ In the yards, patches of ivy create soft geometrical surfaces that complement the crisp architecture. Quarry stone was used to erect retaining walls and there are rustic fences. At the edge of Virginia View Court, 6541 Wiscasset is accessed by a bridge.

Potomac Overlook offered three basic models, averaging 2,200 square feet; all plans adopted an elongated rectangular footprint. Massing conveyed an impression of lightness, of not imposing on the land. Of all Bennett / KLC houses, these were the ones that departed most from tradition. Exteriors displayed a crisp and taut, Mondrian-like interplay of horizontal and vertical divisions. Slender white accents divided panels of redwood tongue and groove siding and used brick. Opened or screened porches and decks added visual interest and individualized each house; so did the flat or sloping, attached or detached, carports set parallel or perpendicular to the front facades.

The smallest model was the **Highview** (photograph 8 and plate 9), priced at \$29,700 in 1958.²⁴⁷ Six of these four-bedroom, two-bath homes were built: three along MacArthur Boulevard, one on Wiscasset Road and two on Virginia View Court. The Gaddy model for Pine Springs, with slightly larger rooms and minor variations in closet and bathroom spaces, was extended on the living/dining side by a lower patio and upper porches. The division between the brick base and the wood-clad upper story was emphasized by a band painted white that was much wider than at Pine Springs and matched the floor width on the screened porch.

The plan for the Highview model was extremely compact, with basically no corridor space. Downstairs, a porch protected a lateral entrance to a hallway that gave access to two bedrooms (one

²⁴⁶ "The Challenge in By-Passed Land," *NAHB Journal of Homebuilding* 12 (February 1958), 50

²⁴⁷ Advertisement, *Washington Post*, June 14, 1958, C 12

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number E Page 63

measuring 12'-6" by 13'; the other, rather dimly lit, 12'-6" by 8'), a bathroom, and a spacious recreation room (approximately 18' by 15'-2"). One entered the laundry-utility space (12'-10" by 9') from the recreation room. Upstairs, the rectangular living room (measuring 21'-0" by 15'-6") included the stairs and formed an unobstructed L-shaped space with the dining space (a square of 10'). The adjacent kitchen measured 10'-5" by 9'-6". On the long side of the house, the window wall of the living room opened onto a balcony, approximately four feet wide and 16 feet long. The wooden railing had wide supports that slanted outward on its length: quasi-invisible wiring was used (instead of wood at Pine Springs) for the intermediate horizontal divisions. The living room was continued by a screened porch (13 by 16 feet), the dining room by an open porch (12 by 10 feet). The "night" section, also inscribed in a rectangle, included a very spacious master bedroom (13' by 11'-7"), a smaller bedroom, and a bathroom composed of an anteroom with a sink and an outside room for the bathtub and toilet.

The intermediate model was the **Valleyview** (photographs 11 and 12). We did not find plans for this four-bedroom, three-bath house priced at \$33,400 in 1958. Six of these were built at Potomac Overlook: one on MacArthur Boulevard, two on Rivercrest Court, and three on Virginia View Court. Of the three Potomac Overlook models, the Valleyview's exterior had the lightest and most elegant appearance. Instead of being screened, the upper deck off the living room was opened and supported by just one set of very thin columns placed at approximately 2/3 of its length, leaving the corners unobstructed. The railing consisted of thin metal members that continued the vertical rhythm of the board and batten wall panels. The gable fronting this terrace formed an abstract composition: it featured a lateral glass door and a brick wall and was topped by a glazed triangular transom, from which two metal chimney stacks were detached, acting as sculptural, free-standing cylinders. On some Valleyview homes, the entrance porch was extended by a flat-roofed carport that balanced the profile of the terrace.

The **Riverview** (photograph 13 and plate 10) had five bedrooms and three bathrooms and was priced at \$35,500 in 1958. A total of seven were built at Potomac Overlook: five on Rivercrest Court, two on Virginia View Court (including the one Mr. Matthews built for himself at # 6604). On one end, there was a carport topped by a low-pitched roof, adjacent storage space and a screened porch surmounting a patio. An entry separated the L-shaped living / dining space from the bedroom section. Least satisfactory was the transverse placement of the kitchen, treated as a long and narrow rectangle tucked against the carport, with limited window space. There was only one flight of stairs, descending to the extra-spacious recreation room, running 27 feet, with windows all the way across, a utility/laundry space, two (rather poorly lit) bedrooms, and one bathroom. The living room had a cathedral ceiling encompassing one full slope and approximately one fourth of the second slope. Its side walls were covered with panels in stained wood. Its end wall, which opened onto the porch, had a glazed transom. The central fireplace wall in used brick, thin white mullions, and porch laths created crisp indoor-outdoor geometrical patterns. In the recreation room, the fireplace wall, also in used brick, contrasted with the glazed door giving access to the patio and backyard beyond.

Builder John Matthews's house (6604 River View Court, photographs 14 and 15) is a Riverview model that, according to its owner, was slightly reoriented on the site in order to preserve a large tree close to the glazed walls at the back. The carport was slightly detached from the house itself, making room for an intimate terrace-breezeway off the kitchen. Matthews recently painted the brick and the paneling in the living room to brighten up the room. The fireplace now holds a wood-burning stove. The top screened porch has been glazed, and the kitchen enlarged. The bathrooms have retained their

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 64

original fixtures.

Potomac Overlook was an immediate success. When it was first completed, people used to come in buses or groups to visit.²⁴⁸ In 1958, it received an NAHB Neighborhood Development Award, the judges commenting on the fact that "platting and housing siting is excellent, resulting in family privacy and retention of good views,"²⁴⁹ as well as an NAHB Merit Award in Design.²⁵⁰ The same year, the Riverview Model received an Honorable mention in the annual award program sponsored by the Potomac Valley chapter of the AIA.²⁵¹

Potomac Overlook has a neighborhood committee and covenants controlling land use and the appearance of fences, yards, and additions and alterations to houses. A panel of three residents must review all construction plans for houses and approve them before building commences. These covenants are in writing and are a part of each deed. Alterations (many of them entrusted to John Matthews himself) have been performed with great respect for the original fabric and have not altered proportions. A good example is the enclosure of the lower terrace on the Valleyview model at 6601 Valley View Court. The house that has changed most is 6601 River Crest Court, which is now painted gray and yellow. On this Valleyview model, the terrace has been replaced by an addition with slopes of widely differing lengths, which contradicts the impression of repose and balance conveyed by the original roofs.²⁵²

Overall there are more than 30 houses designed by Donald Lethbridge and his associates in Glen Echo Heights. In 1957, Bennett built one at 6115 Wiscasset Road (corner Onondaga); the following year, he built two other houses at 5419 and 5421 Wiscasset. In 1958-59, two Highview models were built (by either Bennett or Matthews) on adjacent lots right above Potomac Overlook (6516 and 6520 Wiscasset). In 1960-61, Mr. Matthews built seven KLC-designed homes after he bought from the owner of "The Castle" \$85,000 worth of land on the other side of Mohican Road from Potomac Overlook.²⁵³

2 C - Flint Hill , 1958-1961.

Flint Hill is not as architecturally distinctive and progressive as Potomac Overlook, but it greatly appealed to home building professionals when it opened, and helped Bennett gain fame and expand his business. In July 1958, Bennett bought 25 acres of wooded land south of River Road and west of Wilson Lane in the Bannockburn section of Bethesda. This newer neighborhood, farther west from the D.C. limits than Glen Echo Heights, hosted a fairly large proportion of modern homes. In fact, the site purchased by Mr. Bennett was located one block west of Crail Drive where, during the same years, Silver-Spring based architect Jack Cohen was designing modern custom homes for himself and enlightened clients.

A first section opened in the late fall of 1958, a second one in the spring of 1960, and construction continued until 1961. The 31 houses (plate 11) fronted three different streets: Nevis Road, a wide street

²⁴⁸ John Matthews, Interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, 24 March 2003.

²⁴⁹ *NAHB Journal of Homebuilding*, 12 (April 1958), 35

²⁵⁰ *NAHB Journal of Homebuilding*, 12 (April 1958), 34-35

²⁵¹ *Potomac Valley Architect* (June 1958), n.p.

²⁵² An original photograph of this house was published in the *Washington Post*, July 12, 1958, C11.

²⁵³ See advertisement, *Washington Post* May 4, 1960, B8 and October 7, 1961, B17.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number E Page 65

climbing sharply upwards from its point of origin at River Road (nine houses, including two which were far recessed from the road and shared a driveway); Broxburn Court, which dead ended around a grassy, elliptical, island (seventeen houses); and a stretched-out cul-de-sac at the extremity of Sle Kirk Drive (five houses, built in 1961). Contour alterations and tree cutting were kept to a minimum, but the parallel lots, straight driveways and quasi-uniform distance between house and road did not depart from suburban standards. Some period photographs (plate 12) indicate that lots were delineated by rustic-looking wooden fences; a few of these have survived. According to *House and Home*, the lender, Prudential Insurance Company, a major local savings and loan company, "influenced basic decisions like the choice of exterior materials and roof types."²⁵⁴ With brick walls and rather traditionally shaped openings, street elevations were far less progressive than at Potomac Overlook.

Designed for hillside lots, the four basic models all had two stories, four bedrooms (lateral extensions allowed owners to expand their number to five or six), three baths, a family room, and two fireplaces. The best selling model was the **Overlook** (photographs 17, 18 and 19; plates 13, 14 and 15), designed for an uphill site with a lower level entry. It offered 2,720 square feet of indoor living space and, on a half-acre lot, was initially offered at \$34,900. This was a variation on Potomac Overlook's Highview model, with the same kind of lateral recessed entrance. The most visible difference on the outside was the removal of the lateral screened porch, replaced by a terrace at the back of the house. The railing of the balcony changed, adopting a straight vertical profile on its long side (it was slanted at Potomac Overlook). The kitchen received much more outside light, through a set of floor-to-ceiling sliding doors opening on the back terrace. A major change to the plan was the inclusion of a lower level garage, continued by a perpendicular storage area. The distribution of the four bedrooms had changed: there were three on the upper floor (instead of two) and only one in the lower floor. As a result, the bathrooms were also different: that on the lower floor had been reduced in size (allowing for the addition of a coat closet in the entry); and there were two on the top floor, one of them directly connected to the master bedroom. The kitchen was considerably enlarged (from 10'-5" x 9'6" to 12'-6" x 12').

The other three models were devised for downhill sites, with a single-story elevation on the street, from which they looked like rather inconspicuous ramblers. The smaller windows of the Hillside and Woodside models had non-operable shutters, the only instance of this traditional feature in a Bennett/KLC model. With five bedrooms, three baths, 2,688 square feet (without the porch), the **Californian** (photograph 20 plate 16) had an elongated rectangular footprint. From the street, the low-lying facade exhibited a lateral, slightly projecting carport as well as a fence shielding the kitchen and dining room. More opened, the back elevation resembled that of the Riverview and Valleyview models at Potomac Overlook. Flaws in the plan were evident: the entry was at the back of the carport and directly into the living/dining space; stairs were directly connected to the living room; the kitchen was separated from the carport and entry by the dining room; and the screened porch was relatively small (14' by 9'-6").

Measuring 1,960 square feet and offered at \$36,900, the **Hillside model** (photograph 21, plates 17 and 18) had three bedrooms upstairs and one downstairs. The carport ran the entire width of the house and was continued by a front porch leading to the centrally located entrance door. The house had a formal, enclosed dining room, adjacent to both the front kitchen and projecting living room, which featured floor to ceiling glazing on its end wall and a balcony protected by an overhang. This was the

²⁵⁴ "What happens when a smart builder gets together with a team of top architects?," 157

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 66

only example of a T-shaped plan in a KLC/Bennett tract house. Additionally, the Hillside was the first Bennett/KLC model to feature two flights of steps (instead of a single one).

The **Woodside model** (plate 19) had 2,189 square feet of finished living space and cost \$37,800. It had an L-shaped plan, with the short and shallow wing ending on a front gable (another "traditionalizing" feature). A major drawback of this plan was that the front porch and carport darkened the kitchen. The lower level bathroom featured a shower stall. *House and Home* called the Woodside "the kind of house that much of today's home-buying market wants" and appraised its mix of "contemporary and traditional features":

Its old appeals: 1) a relatively high pitched roof (almost 5- in -12), 2) a front porch, 3) warm materials (cedar shingles; used brick), 4) a separate dining room, 5) a generous central entry hall. Its new appeals: 1) deep overhangs, 2) some exterior panelization, 3) window walls across the rear, 4) an open stairwell between the two levels, 5) a front kitchen, 6) indoor-outdoor living (off the lower-level recreation room and in the carport, which doubles as a porch).²⁵⁵

The back wall of the living room was paneled in grooved plywood, with the exception of the fireplace mantel, built in used brick.

Flint Hill won numerous accolades. In 1960, it received an Award of Merit in Community Planning from NAHB, with the following comments of the jury: "Seldom is such care taken to design the house to fit the lot."²⁵⁶ In 1960 as well, Flint Hill received a First Honor Award for merchant built homes over \$25,000 in the AIA's Homes for Better Living Competition; it was named Best Small Subdivision by the Suburban Maryland Builders Association, and received the "Finest for Family Living Award" from the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington in the over \$30,000 category.²⁵⁷ In 1961, Flint Hill was selected by the Montgomery County Council as the "Best Subdivision of the Year" for "lots of more than 10,000 square feet and less than one acre."²⁵⁸

The Hillside, Woodside and Overlook models all won NAHB design awards in 1959. In *House and Home*, they were commended for their "crisp and straightforward" exteriors, the "warmth" of their materials, "the good use of their lower level for extra low-cost living space."²⁵⁹ The Hillside model also won an *American Builder* Award of Merit in the \$25,000-45,000 class for combining "tremendous eye-appeal with two floors of compact living on a steep plot."²⁶⁰ The Woodside model won another Award of Merit in *American Builder's* Annual Quality Model Home Contest "in recognition of the use of quality

²⁵⁵ *House and Home* (April 1959), 160.

²⁵⁶ *NAHB Journal of Homebuilding*, 14 (April 1960), 57

²⁵⁷ Classified advertisement, *Washington Star*, June 11, 1960, B-4.

²⁵⁸ Alan Dessoiff, "Council Honors Area Builders," *Washington Post*, November 4, 1961, D1. The competition was suggested by Delegate Blair Lee III and backed by M-NCPPC "as a means of encouraging land developers to make maximum use of the trees and natural topography in their subdivisions."

²⁵⁹ "What happens when a smart builder gets together with a team of top architects? Every house is a prize winner," *House and Home* (April 1959), 157-161

²⁶⁰ *American Builder* 83 (February 1961), 100; "Bennett 'Hillside' Home wins award," *Washington Post*, November 12, 1960, B 12.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 67

materials and construction.”²⁶¹ In 1959, the Overlook model was declared Best Home for the Money by *American Home* and received the *House and Home* 1960 Quality Model House Award.²⁶² In 1960, the Overlook Model won the Lawrence A. Funt Award granted by the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce, for Best Home in the area,²⁶³ as well as an Award of Merit from the Potomac Valley Chapter of the AIA.²⁶⁴ The same year, the Californian model won in the “Contemporary over \$30,000” category in the second Annual “Finest for Family Living Contest” organized by Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington.²⁶⁵

Sloping down from Broxburn Court in the direction of River Road, houses on Nevis Road are the least altered. These are 7300, 7304 (Woodside model, carport has been enclosed), 7308 (Hillside, with enclosed carport), 7312, 7400 (Overlook model, with new balcony, photograph 19), 7404 (Overlook), 7408 (Overlook), 7412 (Woodside), 7500 (Overlook), 7502 (Overlook), and 7504 (rebuilt). Land mostly slopes down on both sides of Broxburn, which is essentially lined by downhill models with a single-story street elevation. However, 7301 Broxburn Court (photograph 17), at the corner Nevis Road, is an unaltered Overlook model that has maintained its original balcony railing. Its neighbor, 7303, has been demolished and replaced by a neo-Arts and Crafts house that looks twice as big as any of its neighbors. Number 7305 is a Woodside model, fairly radically altered, 7307 (Californian) and 7309 (Hillside, the carport of which has been filled) were built in 1960. Number 7311 Broxburn (Woodside with altered carport, made into a gabled two-car garage), 7313 (Californian, photograph 20), 7315 (Overlook, with changed garage door, photograph 18), and 7317 (Hillside, photograph 21) were erected in 1961.

On the opposite side of Broxburn are 7300 (which is not a KLC design); 7302 (Woodside, unaltered), 7304 (Californian, altered, with the addition of a pedimented porch); 7308 (Californian, altered, garage enclosed); 7310; 7312 (Hillside, altered, with two wings added); 7314 (Woodside, with altered garage and fenestration); 7316; and 7318 (Hillside model, little altered). The five houses on Selkirk Drive, which are totally separated from other Flint Hill homes, have been considerably altered. Because of their layout, the visual connection between Flint Hill's three streets is either weak or nonexistent. Flint Hill's status as “visual community” is far less evident than at Potomac Overlook; its “mainstreaming” seems to demonstrate that mildly “contemporary” architecture is more likely to be altered than frankly modern design.

2 D - Carderock Springs, 1962-66

While he was still completing Flint Hill, Mr. Bennett was able to purchase one of the last large tracts of unbuilt land in Bethesda. With 275 houses, Carderock Springs (plate 20) was the largest subdivision of contemporary homes built in the Capital Region in the first half of the 1960s, and marked a quantum leap in Mr. Bennett's production. It attracted considerable attention in the home building press

²⁶¹“Year's End Highlights 1960,” *Home Builders Monthly* (December 1960), 85

²⁶²*House and Home* (May 1960), 135 (Quality model House Award). “Early '60 Awards to Area Builders,” *Washington Post*, January 30, 1960, B-6

²⁶³“Flint Hill Project Wins 8th Award,” *Washington Star*, January 14, 1961, B-1; this award was donated by a “nationally prominent orthodontist” in Bethesda.

²⁶⁴*Potomac Valley Architect* (June 1960) 10

²⁶⁵“Winners in the 2nd Annual ‘Finest for Family Living’ Contest,” *Home Builders Monthly* 17 (June 1960), p.31

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 68

and the *Washington Post* consistently covered its construction and sales progress.²⁶⁶ In 1961, in order to test how cost-effective the use of off-site components would be at Carderock Springs, Mr. Bennett built three contiguous "applied-research houses" at 9210, 9300 and 9306 Fernwood, just north of Bradley Boulevard.

The Carderock Springs subdivision is bounded by the Capital Beltway (I-495) to the south, Persimmon Tree Lane to the southwest, the grounds of the Congressional Country Club to the northwest, Cabin John Creek Park to the northeast, and Seven Locks Road to the southeast. This perimeter also includes an operating quarry accessible from Seven Lock Road. Bennett-built houses are located from the northern end of the subdivision to the southern edge of Lilly Stone Drive (on this drive, houses beyond Edgewood Court in the direction of Seven Locks Road are not Bennett-built). The southern section of Carderock Springs, where Ms. Stone's Glenmore is located, was not purchased by Mr. Bennett. It includes the Carderock Springs Elementary School (opened for 510 children in 1966), which was designed by Burket, Tilghman, Nelson Associates, a local firm specializing in school buildings, in a style highly compatible with KLC's houses.²⁶⁷ In the late 1960s, lots at the southern end of Fenway Road and Comanche Court were acquired by two builder-developers, Charles Hilton and Jacobson Brothers. In the early 1980s, Hilton defaulted and had to resell some of his lots. The community fought to protect the land directly surrounding Glenmore from development, but it was eventually purchased by Richard Ashley. Fortunately, the old mansion was preserved. What is sometimes referred to as the "Glenmore area" includes mostly traditional houses, located along Comanche Court, Stone Trail Drive, the southern section of Hamilton Spring Road, as well as two cul-de-sacs, Edgewood and Thornley Courts. There are no material boundaries between Bennett-developed land and adjacent homes.

Bennett sold his Carderock Springs land in six sections, starting from the northern tip of his property. Altogether, he built 275 houses. The first section of 75 homes opened in June 1962. It offered six models, located in the 8600 block of Fenway Road, at the northern end of Bennett's property. A short illustrated note published in the *Washington Post* on September 8, 1962 mentioned that sales totaling \$1.5 million in three months proved that "contemporary styling" and research-tested functional features had found public acceptance in the capital region.²⁶⁸ Gordon Smith remembers that initial buyers wanted to move in, even though streets were not paved; compressors provided electricity; bathrooms were "in the woods," and everyone got cans of water.²⁶⁹ Homes erected in 1962 are found along Magruder Mill Court (named after local eighteenth century farmer Samuel Brewer Magruder), Peck Place, and Still Spring Court. Building progressively moved south toward Lilly Stone Drive. Section 2 opened in February 1963;²⁷⁰ Section 3 in October 1963 (sold out June 1964), with six new furnished model homes (starting at \$34,900), also located on Fenway, just north of Hamilton Spring Court²⁷¹; Section 4 in June 1964 (55 houses starting at \$42,500, with some lots adjoining the Cabin John Stream Valley Park

²⁶⁶ John B. Willmann, "Contemporary Homes Built to Fit 'Bethesda Family Profile'," *Washington Post*, May 26, 1962, B1.

²⁶⁷ "Carderock Springs Elementary School," *Esoterica 2* (June 1965), 1.

²⁶⁸ "Contemporary Styling Sells at Carderock Springs," *Washington Post*, September 8, 1962, D45.

²⁶⁹ Gordon Smith, Speech, Carderock Springs anniversary party, March 7, 2004.

²⁷⁰ "New Section Open [sic] at Carderock Springs," *Washington Post*, February 16, 1963, D10, with the same photograph of the Clubview model as that published on September 8, 1962.

²⁷¹ "New Section Opened at Carderock Springs," *Washington Post*, October 12, 1963, D15.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 69

exceeding half an acre);²⁷² Section 5 (21 homes) in May 1965, at a time when 225 houses had already been sold²⁷³; and Section 6 in the Summer of 1965.²⁷⁴ In early 1964, the Carderock Springs Citizens Association was formed. By March 1966, 266 homes had been sold and the average price of CS houses was \$45,000.

From June to September 1965, Bennett, who wanted to see if models with flat roofs and a different plan would attract buyers, showcased with great fanfare a new atrium model, with grounds landscaped by Thurman Donovan. He struck a deal with the high end magazine *House and Garden*, which took care of furnishing the model home and gave this "House of Color" a ten-page coverage in its September 1965 issue.²⁷⁵ The decor (by the interior design firm of Bewley and Bratton) was rather traditional and garish (Bennett did not care for it, but was nonetheless excited by the publicity the article could generate). Interiors were devised "for an imaginary couple with a twelve-year old son and a fourteen-year-old daughter." Without the plush carpet and big furniture and without references to its location in Carderock Springs, the atrium house was also published in *House and Home*.²⁷⁶ It also appeared in the annual Mid-May home issue of *Architectural Record*, which generally featured more expensive, custom-built designs.²⁷⁷

Lilly Stone Drive, at 8316, hosts a house built by Bennett. This was NAHB's Research House VI (photograph 23), which opened to the public in May 1966. It was built to test new materials and building techniques²⁷⁸ Costing in the \$60,000 bracket, with relatively conservative interiors realized by the Hecht Company, the house was not designed by KLC.²⁷⁹ It had a front gable supported by a brick wall that concealed a large carport and storage space. We visited this house, since it was on the market in January 2004. Its plan is clustered and very impractical.

Land planning and landscaping for Carderock Springs achieved a much higher degree of sophistication than at Flint Hill. Streets were curved, avoiding sharp right-angle turns that were inconvenient for buried cables. The principal streets, which meet close to Persimmon Tree Lane, are

²⁷² *Esoterica* 1 (May 1964), 1.

²⁷³ "Section Open at Carderock Springs," *Washington Post*, May 15, 1965, R 11.

²⁷⁴ "Carderock Total Sales Reach 132," *Washington Post*, June 13, 1964, E 14.

²⁷⁵ "H&G's House of Color illustrates the new swing to subtlety," *House and Garden* 128 (September 1965), 200-209.

²⁷⁶ "A hillside atrium house with a variety of outdoor-indoor living areas," *House and Home* 28 (September 1965), 64-65.

²⁷⁷ The atrium house was also published in *American Builder* (March 1966), 67 and *American Home* (March 1966), 57.

²⁷⁸ "Research House Planned in County," *Washington Post*, August 7, 1965, R 15. Display ad, *Washington Post*, May 14 and 21, 1966, D 15 and F 8. "Research House Planned in County," *Washington Post*, August 7, 1965, E 15. See also a view of the living room in *Washington Post*, May 14, 1966, D 19. "Atrium Planting," *Washington Post*, April 2, 1966, F 10. In 1957, an NAHB Research House was built on 3811 Denfield Avenue in Kensington by Clarke Daniel of Standard Properties and was visited by 15,000 persons (see *American Builder* (July 1957), 22-23. "Clarke Daniel Builds NAHB Research House in Kensington," *Home Builders Monthly* (June 1957), 17. NAHB's Experimental House of 1963 was built in Rockville by Evan Buchanan.

²⁷⁹ The sources we consulted did not mention a designer, but a plan indicates architect Herman Yo (incomplete name) of Jamaica, NY as consultant.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 70

Fenway Road, which sloped downwards towards the south and where the model homes were located, and Lilly Stone Drive. Tributaries of Fenway Road are Magruder Mill and Still Spring Court, which both end in landscaped cul-de-sacs, but are connected by Peck Place. Hamilton Spring Road links Fenway Road to Lilly Stone; it gives access to the sports club and to two loop roads, Park Overlook and Glenmore Spring. Between Fenway Road and Lilly Stone Drive, Carderock Drive is a short street serving Carderock Court. In the spring of 1964, Bennett and Matthews planted approximately 150 trees - "including maples, red dogwoods, oaks, white pines and flowering crabs" - as "a finishing touch to the community." "Carefully selected" by Donovan, the trees were arranged to provide interesting groupings as one travels the streets." *Esoterica* quoted the landscape architect: "Planting trees in a soldier-like fashion along the edge of the roadway is as old-fashioned as having houses with similar street set backs."²⁸⁰ Donovan also created rustic looking street signs in wood (plate 21) and two formal entrances: a rather simple one on Carderock Springs Drive off of River Road, and a more elaborate composition (c. 1965, photograph 22), at the intersection of Lilly Stone Drive and Persimmon Tree Lane. Because there are no sidewalks, children are bused to Carderock Springs Elementary School. Originally, there were few streetlights in order to preserve the natural character; some have since been added for security reasons.

Each model came with a landscape plan (plate 22) by Donovan, with "three alternative schemes of planting." It was offered for free to new owners and a cost of only \$10 to the builder.²⁸¹ Some home buyers approached Donovan to make personalized plans. One such plan (plate 23), for a Pineview model at 8012 Hamilton Spring Road, is in the possession of the current owners; it called for a random flagstone walk interspersed with bushes leading from the driveway to the entrance terrace. In the back, the patio, in concrete aggregate provided by the builder, was extended. To shield this back terrace from neighbors, Donovan proposed a "wood screen detail" for a 6-foot fence that had attractive open trellis work at the top and complied with specifications by Bennett and KLC. In the early years of Carderock Springs, any planned outbuildings and fences needed to be submitted for KLC's approval and it was forbidden to remove hardwood trees.

With the exception of a few parcels at the southwestern end of Lilly Stone Drive, all lots have irregular shapes. In the first section, the minimum size allowed by county ordinance was a half acre; it was subsequently amended to one third. Bennett took advantage of "minimum and average-lot size zoning" newly instituted by Montgomery County to reduce some lots to 15,000 square feet, while he donated land toward 2 ½ acres of public woodland.²⁸²

Mr. Bennett "worked with Montgomery County planners to implement new cluster groupings."²⁸³ Market studies indicated that homebuyers preferred a home in a dead-end street and Bennett sold such houses at a premium.²⁸⁴ Located off the western side of Fenway Road (where they backed onto the Congressional Country Club), on Park Overlook Drive and its namesake court, small "triad" or "quad" courts (plate 24) group three or four houses (generally of different models) which share the same access drive. For Mr. Bennett, this dead-end configuration carried many advantages:

²⁸⁰ *Esoterica* 1 (May 1964), p.4.

²⁸¹ "59 research tested ideas", 158

²⁸² "Research-tested ideas," 159

²⁸³ Brochure, first section, Carderock Springs.

²⁸⁴ "Economics and the Visual Community," 49.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 71

- 1) it avoids the monotony of rows of houses with standard setbacks
- 2) it permits screening of garages from the street with planting or fencing
- 3) it reduces the noise and danger from through traffic
- 4) it provides plenty of off-street parking
- 5) it permits the siting of houses to save more trees and natural ground cover.²⁸⁵

These so-called "knobs" were named after trees or plants -- Hickory Hill (plate 25), Holly Hill, Laurel Hill (photograph 25), and Wild Cherry. At the entrance, their names and house numbers appear on wooden signs, painted red with white characters (photograph 24). These new versions of the cul-de-sac, less dispirited than most dead ends, are maintained by surrounding homeowners, who are also responsible for landscaping their central island. Currently, some of these islands feature benches, lights, or concrete paving.

From Hamilton Spring to Fenway Roads, the northern side of Lilly Stone Drive (the last section built by Mr. Bennett) was punctuated by three larger knobs grouping five lots; these were not really cul-de-sacs, as they were devised as an extension of the street, forming a little recessed half-plaza where houses of different models sit, fan-like, creating a picturesque ensemble.

Quasi unbuildable land at the end of Hamilton Springs Court was reserved for the Swim and Tennis Club (photographs 26 and 27), steep "nature trails" (which linked the club to Still Spring Court and to Park Overlook Drive), and picnic grounds.²⁸⁶ Built by Robert Furman (as opposed to Mr. Bennett himself), the club was completed in September 1964 at a cost of \$125,000, including decks and equipment. Membership was limited to 400 families and included in the price of houses for the section being sold at the time and for subsequent ones. When the club opened, membership could also be purchased for \$700 by persons living outside Carderock Springs (certainly a "bargain" compared to prices charged by neighboring country clubs). Annual dues were modest. Edmund J. Bennett Associates turned the control of the facility over to its members in November 1967. At the time, there were 343 members, of whom all but 20 were Carderock Springs homeowners.²⁸⁷ The design for the club received an Award of Merit from the Washington Board of Trade in 1965. The very photogenic view of the club and pools taken from one of the nature trails appeared in both *House and Home* and *Professional Builder*.²⁸⁸

Protected by a wooden fence, the three pool basins are constructed of steel reinforced gunite. They include a "25-meter pool with seven competition lanes and a diving 'L' with a 1-meter and a 3-meter board, a junior pool, and wading pool. All are surrounded by 6700 square feet of concrete and 3000

²⁸⁵ "Research-test ideas," 159.

²⁸⁶ According to *Esoterica* 1 (February 1964), 5, in the nineteenth century, oxen carried the stone quarried at Carderock, "using the trail which runs through the Community Club area to the foot of the seven locks section of the canal. Hamilton Springs - which runs along the oxen trail - was used to water the oxen. This natural spring - preserved by Bennett Associates - spills ten gallons of water a minute and will be open to the residents following the completion of the recreation area."

²⁸⁷ "Members Get Carderock Club," *Washington Post*, December 16, 1967, E 6. When the club opened, non-resident family membership was offered for an annual fee of \$110.

²⁸⁸ "Swimming pools: most popular facility, and readily tailored to any type of project," *House and Home* (September 1966), 88; "The Private Club: How to make it pay off," *Professional Builder* (February 1968), 33.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 72

square feet of lawn at the east end.²⁸⁹ When it opened, the club had two all-weather tennis courts, with two more in the planning stage. There are currently five courts, as well as a basketball court and a play court. Designed with interspersed vegetation, the parking lot accommodates approximately 75 cars. Original benches have also been preserved.

The design of the clubhouse (photographs 28 and 29) conforms with that of surrounding homes. It has a concrete block base and a frame superstructure, covered with board and batten siding painted a blue-gray color (the original color has been preserved). The steep, two-slope broken roof, enlivened by a continuous clerestory window, creates a picturesque and rustic, barn-like silhouette. The lower floor features a small entrance, locker rooms for men and women, toilets, shower rooms, and a manager's office. Upstairs, the meeting room (photographs 30 and 31) forms a rectangle running the entire length of the club-house, measuring 29'-8" by 64'-3." Intended for "fireside, social, arts and craft activities" it has exposed wooden columns, wooden cathedral ceilings, a fireplace, and a seating capacity of 200.²⁹⁰ The top floor, which is at the same level as the pool, also has an office for lifeguards, a kitchen with a pass through to the meeting room, and a window to the pool, so that it can also be used as a snack bar. The clubhouse is extensively used for exercise classes, scout meetings, and social events all year round, such as an annual international potluck meal and a crab feast. It is where Carderock Springs residents celebrated their 25th anniversary with a black-tie cocktail party and sit-down dinner. Edmund Bennett, Donald Lethbridge, and David Condon were in attendance and in 2004, a (slightly delayed) 40th anniversary, organized by Brenda Bennett Bell and realtor Mary Lou Shannon, was held with Bennett, Arthur Keyes, and Gordon Smith in attendance.²⁹¹

First series of models, 1962.

Carderock Spring's first models differed from those at Potomac Overlook and Flint Hill in several significant ways. Screened porches were out; air conditioning was in. Market research, and the fact that 60% of Flint Hill residents had installed air conditioning within a year of having moved into their homes, dictated this change, which was rather typical for houses in this price range in the Washington, D.C. area.²⁹² Customer surveys also led to a "new emphasis on formalized entrances that utilize landscape screening on the outside and well-defined foyers on the inside." As a result, reception foyers were at least six feet wide. "Spacious master bedroom suites with complementary dressing room baths that create a luxurious adult retreat" were also offered.²⁹³ Instead of carports, one-car garages (measuring 10'-8" by 20'-0") were offered as an option. They were totally enclosed, as many homeowners wanted to use them for storage; covered with a low-pitched roof, the gable of which could face, or run perpendicular to, the street; and separated from the main house by a breezeway or, in the case of the Valleyview, by a covered patio, which could serve as an *alfresco* dining space off the kitchen, as was already the case at Pine Springs.

A new version of the **Overlook** (photograph 32 and plate 28), a model already present at

²⁸⁹ "New Pools Being Used at Carderock Springs," *Washington Post*, September 12, 1964, D 10

²⁹⁰ Display ad, *The Washington Post*, November 25, 1967, E 3.

²⁹¹ See Monica Wraga Soloday, "Community Seeks to Preserve Modernist Houses in Area," *Montgomery County Gazette*, March 17, 2004, A-6 and 7.

²⁹² "Screened Porch Losing Allure," *Washington Post*, May 25, 1963, C4.

²⁹³ Edmund J. Bennett, Sales Brochure, Carderock Springs, first session, 1962.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 73

Potomac Overlook and Flint Hill, was offered. This was the only model with an integral one-car garage, which some owners have transformed into an extra bedroom or den. The house had 4 bedrooms, 3 baths (one more than in previous versions), 2,540 square feet (as opposed to 2,274 at Flint Hill), and cost \$34,500 in 1963. Compared with previous versions, the facade was regularized, as the narrow porch protecting the entrance ran through the entire length of the facade instead of being just on one half. The entrance was frontal (as opposed to lateral) and therefore more conspicuous. The glass wall overlooking the balcony extended to the entire length of the living area. The balcony was also lengthened, to encompass the sliding glass doors of the adjacent bedroom, and its railing changed. The fact that the entry / stair hall combination ran the entire width of the house, and that its length was slightly expanded, accounted for most of the additional square footage. The kitchen had acquired a countertop with boomerang design. Well preserved examples are found at 8612 Fenway, which was the model home, and 8105 and 8201 Hamilton Spring Court. This first version of Carderock Springs' Overlook model received significant press exposure. *McCall's* published it in October 1963 as a model "certified" by the Congress on Better Living, which the magazine sponsored; judges gave it "among the highest" scores.²⁹⁴

With its redwood and brick siding, this house is as trim and neat as the car park at your door. The charm of its design is keyed to the shadows cast by deep eaves and balcony. They give ever-changing texture to the face of the house, cut out excessive summer sun, shelter the doors.

The plan is excellent for a side-of-a-hill split. The room and bath on the grade would make an excellent professional suite, guest room, or retreat for an older relative.

The upper level is conveniently zoned, with a complete separation of bedroom and living space and desirable access to the back terrace and garden. A big, airy living-room area, with closely associated kitchen, simplifies service of family meals and entertaining.

Overflow space on the lower level is invaluable for work or storage, and the playroom fireplace makes this a second living area (...) Quality materials and appliances have been used throughout.²⁹⁵

The **Valleyview** (plate 29) was an uphill model with 2,240 square feet of floor space. Its lateral inset entrance and extremely compact plan made it the direct descendant of the Gaddy model at Holmes Run Acres and of Potomac Overlook's Highview. The lower floor had a rectangular entry, two back-to-back bedrooms, one bathroom, a laundry/utility space with no windows, and a recreation room measuring 19'-4" by 14', with its own lateral entrance. The upper floor included the master suite with a tiny, naturally lit shower room; a smaller front bedroom; another full bath; and an L-shaped living/dining space, complemented by a kitchen placed at the back. The living room, directly connected to the stair hall, had two large sliding glass floor-to-ceiling windows, framed by a front balcony; the dining space and kitchen had the same type of windows, opening onto a patio. One flaw of this extremely compact plan was that the only interior access to the kitchen was through the dining space. Well preserved examples of the Valleyview are found at 8608 Fenway Road, the model home which was "selected by the editors of *Better Homes and Gardens* for selection in the Home Building Ideas for 1964 yearbook," and 8409 Fenway Road.²⁹⁶

²⁹⁴ "Carderock Models Win Awards," *Washington Post*, September 28, 1963, D4.

²⁹⁵ "McCall's Certified House. \$ 28,000 in Maryland," *McCall's* 91 (October 1963), p.200

²⁹⁶ *Esoterica* 1 (May 1964), 6.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 74

The **Clubview** (plate 30) was a 2,115 square-foot split-level model with a center hall foyer. At the entrance level, the living/dining/kitchen block was configured in the same way as in the Parkridge model (with the added advantage of a double exposure in the kitchen); so was the upper floor of the bedroom wing. The lower floor of the bedroom wing included an additional bedroom, bathroom, recreation room (14.7 by 14.2 ft), and small separate laundry and utility rooms. The idea of a protruding fireplace with cylindrical flues and glazed gable transom was borrowed from Potomac Overlook. A notable difference with previous Bennett/KLC models was the two-foot overhang between the first and second levels in the bedroom wing: as a result, volumes give the impression of being more articulated; the upper part of the bedroom wing reads almost as a small independent house. Surface continuity, an important element of the modernist syntax, is lost. The preponderance of small windows, as opposed to floor-to-ceiling glazing, is another rather traditional feature. A well preserved example of the Clubview model is found at 8308 Still Spring Court (photograph 33).

Designed for a site with a lateral slope, the plan for the **Hillcrest model** (plate 31, 2,240 square feet) was rather unprecedented in KLC's work. It was dictated by the presence of a central split foyer entry, located halfway between the upper floor (which included an abbreviated living/dining space with balconies on either front and back, as well as two bedrooms and two bathrooms, both placed back to back) and the lower level (which included two bedrooms, one bath, and a recreation room, placed on the street side, and lit with ribbon windows). The front facade marked a new emphasis on entry, as a glazed transom was placed above the entrance door. The contrast and balance between mass and voids is striking: the vertical entrance separates a primarily glazed section from a brick wall punctured by a rather small bedroom window. Inside, the living room "borrows" space and light from the stair hall. A slightly off-balanced silhouette was generated by the addition of a garage at the lower level. Well preserved examples of the Hillcrest model are found at 8613 Fenway Road (model home) (photograph 34), 8601 Fenway Road, and 8306 Still Spring Court (photograph 35). In 1963, the Hillcrest model was certified by the Congress on Better Living sponsored by *McCall's* and received a design award from *Practical Builder*.

The **Woodside model** (plate 32) was much larger than at Flint Hill (2,720 as opposed to 2,189 square feet, extended in both length and width and affecting the size of the kitchen). The only change to the upper floor was the transformation of the carport into an enclosed garage. Use of the lower floor was improved upon: the recreation room had larger windows; the adjacent room was planned as a "future bedroom" instead of a windowless storage space; both rooms had direct access to a new terrace called the "patio." The model had no cathedral ceiling and was discontinued. Well preserved examples of the Woodside model are found at 8617 Fenway Road (model home), 8600 Fenway Road, and 8416 Magruder Mill Court.

The **Parkridge model** (plate 33) was, to our knowledge, the only single-level house ever designed by KLC for Bennett. It measured 1,940 square feet and its facade stretched 73 feet. The house was composed of three blocks of different sizes, each almost square. The central block (preceded by a shallow front porch and jutting on the back) comprised the entry, an L-shaped living /dining space, and a front kitchen, as well as a utility room which was only accessible from the backyard. The entry also led to a three-bedroom, two-bath block; a smaller lateral block, accessible from the kitchen, the entrance porch, or the back patio, had the recreation room (which had no fireplace), a shower room, and the laundry. A patio was accessible from the recreation and living rooms. A garage could be attached to or face the smaller block, its gable enlivening the rather dull elevation. The absence of a basement and a

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 75

cumbersome circulation pattern hampered sales and the model was "scrapped."²⁹⁷ A well preserved example can be found at 8216 Fenway Road (Pine Hill Knob).

Second series of models, 1963.

New or updated models were devised for the third phase of Carderock Springs and were offered until the subdivision was completed. Although rooms were arranged in the same way, the **Overlook** and **Hillcrest** models were slightly bigger, by approximately 100 or 150 square feet, because some bedrooms had been enlarged to a "twin size" format. On the Hillcrest model (plate 34), the gable of the garage was turned sideways, to reinforce the effect of "strong horizontal line" and to keep the house "from looking too high on its site."²⁹⁸

The ground floor of the second Overlook model, on 8205 Fenway Road (plate 35), was initially used as the sales office. Since 1967, the owner Brenda Bell, Edmund Bennett's sister, has lived there; in 1977, she had the living/ dining / kitchen space extended and remodeled by David Condon. Landscaped by Thurman Donovan, the original patio/ front yard (plate 36) is still extant. Trimmed in redwood, the gridded paving is in brick donated by the American Brick Association.²⁹⁹ Other well preserved examples are at 7704 Glenmore Spring Road and 8309 Lilly Stone Drive.

The revised **Clubview** model (plate 37) was extended to 2,710 square feet, gaining nearly 600 square feet. The small laundry/ utility space was replaced by a very large, artificially lit room under the kitchen/ living wing. The kitchen was transferred to the end and had direct access to the patio. Well preserved examples are 8209 Fenway Road, which was the model home (addition by architect Doug-Soe-Lin) and 8100 Fenway Road (photograph 36).

Two new models were offered. The **Glenmore** (plate 38) had 2,750 square feet of space and looked like a stretched version of the Overlook model. The balcony spanned the entire width of the living room and stair hall (photograph 37). In late 1963, it was Carderock Springs' best seller, with six sales in three months³⁰⁰ In 1964, it received an award from *McCall's* and the Congress on Better Living. An option was to replace the garage by a bedroom and bathroom. The new **Pineview** model (plate 39) was 72 feet long and measured 2,850 square feet. A two-story block was centered on a large entry foyer; the bottom floor had, in the front, a separate dining room and a study and, in the back, the living room and kitchen. The top floor had four bedrooms, two baths, and a study alcove. A lower wing comprised a recreation room and attic storage, and could be extended by a garage. More formal and symmetrical than in previous Bennett/KLC models, the plan and the facade, in painted brick punctured by traditionally sized window, mark an aesthetic shift away from Situated Modernism. In 1963, the Pineview model received an award for the Middle Atlantic Area from *McCall's Magazine*. In 1964, it received an Award of Merit from the Potomac Valley Chapter of the AIA and was published in *Better Homes and Gardens - Home building ideas*.

/ Atrium model, 1965

²⁹⁷ "Bennett Talks of Building 'New Town,'" *Washington Post*, July 25, 1964, C1

²⁹⁸ *House and Home* (October 1964), 46

²⁹⁹ Display ad, *Washington Post*, October 12, 1963, D 5.

³⁰⁰ "Newest Marketing Trends," *House and Home* (March 1964), 96-97

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 76

Conceived as a downhill model, the 1965 atrium house (photographs 38, 39 and 40 and plate 40) had 2,265 square feet of living space. The upper floor had four sections anchored by the atrium and its wrap-around gallery-entry. These were (clockwise, from the entry) a paneled study with its own half-bath and walk-in closet; a kitchen connected to the family room by a large pass-through (photograph 41); a living/ dining space separated by a two-way fireplace in exposed brick (photographs 42 and 43), continued by a 35' balcony; and a bedroom wing, with a master suite and two extra bedrooms sharing a bath. Accessed by a single-flight stair, the lower floor included a fourth bedroom, another full bath, and a recreation room with its own door to the outside (photograph 40). The plan was conceived with entertainment in mind: "Guests can gather in the atrium-courtyard for indoor garden parties - outdoors on the terrace and grounds. Serve cocktails fireside in the living room or lower level in the recreation room while offspring entertain their friends in the family room adjoining the kitchen. And all entertainment centers are easily catered from the gourmet-size kitchen."³⁰¹

Both the atrium house and its garage, reached through a breezeway/ pergola, had a flat roof and were entirely sheathed in vertical shingles, with crisp white trim defining the top, bottom, and corners. In the front, the upper floor projects from approximately one foot and seems to float on a podium. The extra-wide recessed entrance has a double front door that can swing open. The 15-foot ceilings increase the impression of loftiness. To allow floor-to-ceiling openings, transoms adopt the width of the exposed beams that run perpendicular to the front and back facades. A transom and slit side windows frame the recessed street entrance, sidelights, and the garage door. This type of detail gives the atrium a sophisticated finish rarely found in speculative houses. The construction technique was also quite sophisticated. According to *House and Home*, "a prefabricator panelizes the post-and-beam house - exterior wall finish and all glazing is factory-installed, but the roof is pre-cut - and the builder's crew assembles it with the aid of a crane."³⁰² In fact, both builders and architects deem their atrium house some kind of an anomaly in their collaboration: Arthur Keyes considers that its plan generated "a lot of walking around" and Edmund Bennett deems its abundance of wall surfaces uneconomical and its maintenance cost-intensive. In all, seven atrium houses were built in Carderock Springs, and all have preserved their original facades. Only one has changed owners. We visited the Alan and Sue Astrove House on 7909 Overlook Drive, which is in mint condition. The Astroves have added a miniature pond in the atrium. Some owners (at # 8022 Park Overlook, for instance) have put a skylight over theirs. At least two atrium houses have been poorly maintained.

2 E - Carderock Springs South, 1967-1969.

Mr. Bennett was able to purchase land just south of the Capital Beltway from Carderock Springs, on the eastern side of Persimmon Tree Road. In the mid-1960s, this area was sparsely inhabited, with just a few houses nestled in the woods, such as the minimalist box designed in 1956 by architect James Hilleary for himself, at 8200 Osage Lane.³⁰³ The earliest printed mention of Carderock Springs South we were able to find dates back to March 1966.³⁰⁴ The subdivision's "Grand Opening" was advertised in the *Washington Post* on November 25, 1967 (plate 41), after Mr. Bennett had started selling homes at New

³⁰¹ Display ad, *Washington Post*, September 11, 1965, D 13.

³⁰² "A hillside atrium house," 64

³⁰³ This house still exists, but Mr. Hilleary added a prominent pitched roof.

³⁰⁴ "New at Carderock," *The Washington Post*, March 26, 1966, C8

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 77

Mark Commons. According to this advertisement, "homes at Carderock Springs have consistently appreciated on an average of \$ 3,000 a year. Yet, due to more flexible land planning and improved building techniques, prices at Carderock South start in the low 40's." Although purchase carried membership in the Carderock Springs Tennis and Swimming Club, Carderock Springs South had separate covenants.

Set on an irregular quadrilateral parcel of land, Carderock Springs South comprised 45 houses: nine (including three on a triad court) are accessible from Persimmon Tree Road, an old thoroughfare connecting MacArthur Boulevard to Potomac; seven are lined on the southern side of Tomlinson Avenue, which runs parallel to the Beltway; nineteen are located on Barkwater Court, a cul-de-sac subsidiary of Tomlinson Avenue; and ten are on Persimmon Court, a short cul-de-sac street off Persimmon Tree Road. The entrance at the intersection of Persimmon Tree Road and Tomlinson Avenue is marked by a wooden sign resting on a stone base, most likely designed by Thurman Donovan (photograph 44). The cul-de-sac streets feature landscaped islands.

On average, home lots were smaller than at Carderock Springs, but almost half of them backed to an internal reserve (photograph 45), commonly owned and maintained by all Carderock Springs South homeowners. An advertisement in the *Washington Post* mentioned that this was the first cluster-planned subdivision approved by Montgomery County, with a "4 ½ acre park at the heart of the community" enabling "nearly every home" to "back up to a wooded common."³⁰⁵ The park is also accessible from informal or concrete pathways by those whose houses have no direct frontage. It is this common space that provides a visual and social identity to Carderock Springs South. Sloping down toward the south, the park is a natural stretch of gently rolling grass, planted with bushes and tall trees. Most backyards have been kept open and the common space is heavily used by children. Beyond the limits of Carderock Springs South, the park seamlessly continues through other subdivisions, which were built at a subsequent date.

According to tax assessment documents, houses were built in 1968 and 1969; sales continued until 1970. The advertisements and brochures we were able to find identify only two model homes built *in situ*, the **Overlook Mark II** and the **Hillcrest** model. For the two other models, the sales brochures reproduced photographs of houses already erected at New Mark Commons. The **Overlook Mark II** (plate 42) is described as the Mark 70 - UH at New Mark Commons. The **Pineview** (plate 43) is similar to New Mark's Mark 70-TST model; a well preserved example is located at 7008 Barkwater Court. The description of the **Glenmore Mark II** (plate 44) matches that of the Mark 70-DH (downhill) at New Mark Commons; a well preserved example is located at 7009 Barkwater Court).

Carderock Spring South's Hillcrest Mark II model (downhill, with only half of the lower floor expressed in the front, priced at \$ 37,900) and Mark III (uphill, priced at \$ 43,400) (plate 45) were not among New Mark Commons' original models, however. Their plan was similar to that of the namesake model in the second series of houses at Carderock Springs, although it was slightly smaller (with 2,260 instead of 2,370 square feet of interior space). The facade was modified by the introduction of a bow window motif for the living room. Well preserved examples are located at 7004 Barkwater Court and 8300 Tomlinson Avenue.

³⁰⁵ Display ad, *The Washington Post*, November 25, 1967, E 3

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 78

Carderock Springs South's internal park is well preserved, but many houses have seen their exteriors altered, sometimes even "Georgianized." As wooden balconies have rotted, they have been replaced or entirely removed.

2 F - New Mark Commons, 1966-1971

New Mark Commons (plate 46) is located in West Rockville on a 96.4 -acre piece of land previously known as the McCohihe Tract. It is bounded by Maryland Avenue, Argyle Street, Monroe Street, Tower Oaks, and I-270. When the project opened, I-270's Maryland Avenue exit did not yet exist; the closest exit was further north, on West Montgomery Avenue.

New Mark Commons belongs to Rockville's Planning Area 3, located immediately south of the Town Center between Maryland Avenue and Jefferson Street and north of Wootton Parkway, and for the most part annexed to the city in 1949. Other sections are Monroe-Lynfield, where single-family homes, duplexes, and apartment buildings were for the most part erected between 1947 and 1960, and the Hungerford-Stoneridge subdivision, which was developed in the 1950s and 1960s and currently has over 600 single-family detached homes. The New Mark property is in the immediate vicinity of two city-owned recreation areas, Dogwood and Monument Parks, which are located on the opposite side of Monroe Street and Montgomery Avenue and encompass 25 and 8 acres, respectively.

New Mark was the fifth community planned and built under the city's Planned Residential Unit (PRU) zoning ordinance, which had been passed in 1964. Liberalizing land use patterns with regard to minimum lot sizes and setbacks, Rockville's ordinance allowed planned residential communities of less than 100 acres with a maximum density of 4.11 dwellings per acre, while Montgomery County's general ordinance imposed a minimum of about 230 acres. Bennett would have preferred a higher density of 6 dwellings per acre. His idea was to build in three or four years a "Modern Mini-Town" with 186 single-family homes and 196 townhouses, and a village center for recreational and commercial activities.³⁰⁶ The name New Mark Commons was coined by Robert C. Ledermann, Director of Land Acquisition and Planning for Edmund Bennett Associates, who had previously directed NAHB's Department of Community Facilities and Urban Renewal.³⁰⁷ Bennett also sought advice from outside consultants, such as Donald N. Michael of Washington's Institute for Policy Studies, and Robert Fralick, of the Radburn Association. While the project was in the planning stage, Ledermann, Michael, and Fralick, as well as the famous landscape architect Hideo Sasaki (who had previously acted as consultant for Eichler Homes) participated in a three-day brainstorming colloquium at the Kenwood Country Club (Keyes and Lethbridge came for the first day; Colden Florance attended all of them).³⁰⁸ Sasaki "served as consultant on landscape features of the water area and community center."³⁰⁹ Additionally, Mr. Bennett hired Carl Norcross and Larry Smith and Co. for market research. Already present at Carderock Springs,

³⁰⁶ John B. Willmann, "A Modern Mini-Town is His Goal," *Washington Post*, December 16, 1967, E1. "New Mark Commons: \$14 Million 'Village' Opens," *Washington Post*, December 31, 1966, D 1. According to Zweigenhaft, prior developments of the McConihe tract "proposed 313 standard lots in a grid plan arrangement."

³⁰⁷ See Robert Lederman, "The Common Green," *Journal of Homebuilding* (November 1961), 103-104.

³⁰⁸ In Maryland, Sasaki, Dawson, & Demay, whose main office was located in Watertown, CT., also worked on Towson's Goucher College campus.

³⁰⁹ Penny Zweigenhaft, "Hope for Ending Dreary Suburbia Looms Through New Use of Land," *Montgomery County Sentinel*, 4 November 1965 (clipping. Rose Krasnow's private collection).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 79

landscape architect Thurman Donovan and the engineering/surveying firm of Greenhorne and O'Mara, were asked to work on the project.

In 1965, Bennett filed an Exploratory Stage Application with the municipality of Rockville. With his architects, he gave a compelling slide presentation of examples of planned communities in Northern Europe and the United States and explained the many unusual and attractive features of New Mark Commons. While the preliminary design was under consideration, it was discussed in glowing terms by the local gazette, the *Sentinel*:

Connecting the lake with the focal point of the community – a village common – will be a running stream, broadened into a pond at one point, with cascades and fountains (...) The village common will be surrounded by indoor and outdoor recreational facilities and convenient shopping facilities. Enhancing this entire focal area will be sculpture and fountains, kiosks and pergolas. (...) The primary roadway through the subdivision will be similar to a parkway. Trees will be saved on both sides and no house will front on it. Privacy and safety for residents will be the key to the circulation pattern³¹⁰

The exploratory application was approved by Rockville's mayor and councilors on January 10, 1966. They required, however, "that a market analysis be conducted to determine the amount of supportable commercial space in the proposed center." On April 27, 1966, a Detailed Planning Stage Application was positively reviewed by Rockville's Planning Commission, which accepted the figure of 30,000 square feet of commercial space proposed by the market analysis (10,000 for Mr. Bennett's own offices, 2,000 for a medical-dental facility, 3,000 for other professional offices, 10,000 for a restaurant and 5,000 for retail) and the creation, as the final phase of the New Mark project, of a commercial area of three acres including parking space for 121 cars.³¹¹ The final approval was subject to some conditions, including the provision of a lighting system for the walkways.³¹²

Mr. Bennett targeted "perceptive families" who were sensing "something missing in the human/environmental equation," a "new breed" of home buyers who "won't settle for suburban sprawl, but won't live in the city either," and shunned "unnecessary housework and lawn tending."³¹³ An advertisement in the *Washington Post* carried the title "Be a one car family again."³¹⁴ In January 1967, the first model homes opened for immediate sale. Mr. Bennett knew that some buyers were purposely looking for contemporary homes. One of them was Claudia Rathbone, who purchased a house at 501 New Mark Esplanade in 1967 and whom we interviewed. Because she favored the clean look of contemporary design, she and her husband originally looked at Carderock Springs but the only homes

³¹⁰ Zweigenhaft, "Hope for Ending Dreary Suburbia." A note dated March 22, 1966 kept in Rose Krasnow's personal archives also mentions the promise of "several tot lots and small scale recreation outlets throughout the development" and a "garden area for residents to grow plants and flowers."

³¹¹ Technical Staff Report, City of Rockville Planning Department, June 15, 1973 (Rose Krasnow's personal archive)

³¹² *New Mark Commonist*, August 1971, p.8. At the time of the writing lights had not been installed yet along the pedestrian paths.

³¹³ *Washington Post*, June 24, 1967 and July 29, 1967, D4.

³¹⁴ *Washington Post*, April 22, 1967, 42.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 80

left there at the time were not on desirable lots —too close to the Beltway and not very wooded. The sales agent recommended that she visit New Mark Commons. Although Rockville seemed a long way out at that time, it worked well for her husband, who worked on River Road.

Bennett commercialized New Mark's first townhouses in December 1967. This was his first venture in a rapidly expanding market. Targeting empty nesters and young families, townhouses were popular because Washington area buyers were "tired of paying rent without getting equity" and townhouses were more affordable than single-family homes; these buyers also desired "freedom from house and yard maintenance" and yearned for "a better environment and recreation facilities."³¹⁵ Bennett restricted to townhouses the clause in Rockville's PRU ordinance that authorized that 30% of the units could be permanent rentals.³¹⁶ The mix of detached and row houses encouraged a greater diversity of age and income than had been achieved in previous Bennett-built communities. A 1971 market study indicated that "55 per cent of the purchasers of the townhouses are less than 35 years old and about 70 per cent of the buyers over 50 bought townhouses. About 70 per cent of New Mark buyers in the 35-49 age group chose single houses." Two thirds of those purchasing townhouses had no children living at home.³¹⁷ Among original townhouse owners was a substantial group of divorced women, attracted by the safety procured at New Mark, and a lone "bachelor girl," Wini Herrmann, whom we interviewed.

The swim and tennis club and its "Four Seasons" clubhouse opened in the summer of 1968, adding appeal to New Mark. However, Bennett faced a far from auspicious economic environment for a venture that was much more ambitious and risky than his previous endeavors. Loan interest rates were reaching record highs and larger down payments were required from homebuyers. Higher density was regarded as the solution to curb high real estate prices, which were in great part due to the rising land costs. From January to June 1967, starting prices for New Mark houses went from \$36,900 to the low \$40,000s. Because the market was slow, Mr. Bennett offered a "guaranteed trade-in plan" to New Mark homebuyers. He stopped selling townhouse units with all the extras; instead, he dropped their price and offered additional features (air conditioning, fireplace, central vacuum system, intercom, luminous ceiling, garbage can enclosures, and a roofed enclosure and patio screen) as options.³¹⁸

To stay financially afloat, Mr. Bennett was compelled to sell a portion of the land dedicated to single-family homes, on either side of Bentana Way and Welwyn Way and its tributary dead-end courts, to another developer, Louis A. Zuckerman. Initially platted for 79 lots and re-divided into 68 lots, the resulting development, Briarglen, opened in the spring of 1971. It offered six traditional designs but respected the overall character of the landscape.³¹⁹ Mr. Bennett introduced the lakeside villas in January 1971, the Waterside cluster (200-300 New Mark Esplanade) was completed in the early Fall, and by the end of the year, 60% of the projected 392 units had been erected. Built between 1971 and 1973, the southern section of New Mark Commons with Scandia Way as its sub-collector street features both Bennett-built homes and compatible contemporary wooden homes of lesser architectural

³¹⁵ Norcross, 7

³¹⁶ Zweigenhaft.

³¹⁷ Willmann, "Open Space Comes High," C1.

³¹⁸ Winifred Herrmann, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, January 21, 2004.

³¹⁹ Display Advertisement, *Washington Post*, April 3, 1971, D8 and April 24, 1971, D 22. Briarglen's homeowners are members of the Four Seasons Club and the New Mark Commons Home Association.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 81

interest. Homes designed by KLC become less numerous as one proceeds toward I-270. On Vallingby Court, only # 11 was built by Bennett, in 1973. At New Mark, KLC's late single-family and attached houses introduced variations from models published in sales brochures; a detailed examination of these changes goes beyond the scope of this nomination.

As mentioned in the original sales brochure: "Edmund J. Bennett Associates has established a separate non-profit corporation, known as the New Mark Commons Homes Association, Inc., solely for the purpose of operating the club and maintaining the club properties, recreational facilities, and all of the commonly owned grounds, walkways and lake. (...) During the period of construction, the developer will control the Homes Association." Until Bennett relinquished his control over the association in 1973, his dual and often incompatible roles as developer and association president alienated many New Mark residents.³²⁰ These tensions, notably concerning the deterioration of the lake and acts of vandalism in the clubhouse, have left a paper trail in the residents' "independent newsletter," the *New Mark Commonist*. Today the Homes Association is headed by a full time administrator and regulated by its 1967 covenants. Article X - section 1 reads as follows:

Except for original construction or as otherwise in these covenants provided, no building, fence, wall or other structure shall be commenced, erected, or maintained upon The Property, nor shall any exterior addition to or change (including any change in color) or alteration therein be made until the plans and specifications showing the nature, kind, shape, height, materials, color and location of the same shall have been submitted to and approved in writing as to harmony of external design, color and location in relation to surrounding structures and topography by the Board of Directors of the Association and by an architectural control committee composed of (3) three members appointed by the Board of Directors.

The Association's board and its architectural committee have 30 days to approve or reject any request for change and "additional volunteer committees oversee activities relating to landscaping, the pool, the lake, and property maintenance."³²¹

New Mark's commercial facilities were never built, due to strong resident opposition. According to Ms. Herrmann, concerns arose about additional traffic and trash. Residents did not want outsiders to compromise the peaceful character of their community.³²² According to Mr. Bennett, residents "requested the Rockville Planning Commission to reverse the prior approval of New Mark's principal artery (New Mark Esplanade) to connect to the existing adjoining primary street (Maryland Avenue) on

³²⁰ Early directors for the Association were Mr. Bennett, his sister Brenda Bell and Barry M. Fitzpatrick. According to Winifred Herrmann, in New Mark's early years, nothing could be done without Mr. Bennett's approval. She recalls one winter when a snow storm occurred when Bennett was vacationing in Florida. At that time, the city of Rockville did not service New Mark Commons and the workmen would not remove snow because Mr. Bennett was not there to authorize it.

³²¹ New Mark Commons website, [www.rocknet.org/Community/New Mark](http://www.rocknet.org/Community/New%20Mark). New Mark homeowners are allowed to pursue, along with one co-worker, a professional activity in their unit, as long as they are authorized by local codes.

³²² Winifred Herrmann, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, January 21, 2004.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 82

the south border," at a midnight meeting about which he was never notified. Officially decreed by the municipality of Rockville in 1973, the dead-ending of New Mark Esplanade, the connector street, made the village center "uneconomic." As he lost "considerable investment on the land intended for the village center," Mr. Bennett suffered "a stiff loss" on the entire community.³²³ From the beginning, economic planning for New Mark, including the cost of creating the lake and the dam, was premised on the income expected from the long term leasing of the commercial property.³²⁴ In 1973, Mr. Bennett requested "approval for deletion of commercial facilities and approval for a 25-unit townhouse cluster in the same area;" this number represented "11 single family detached units previously shown on the 'approval plan' but deleted by the developer during construction" and "14 units which represent the allowable yield of the 3 acre parcel" previously intended for commercial use.³²⁵ According to the President of the New Marks Homes Association at the time, "roughly 90 per cent of the residents opposed construction of these new residential units."³²⁶ In 1985, thirteen townhouses were built at the site of the planned commercial facilities, forming Tegner Way and Tegner Court. The builder (and one of the current residents) was Mr. Charles Burgdorf, who worked for Bennett in the early 1970s. Although bulkier and entirely built of wood, his models are well sited and stylistically compatible with neighboring units.

New Mark Commons received less media attention than Carderock Springs, although it was often mentioned in the *Washington Post*. In 1968, it received an Award of Merit from the Potomac Valley Chapter of the AIA; in 1971, the Urban Land Institute (ULI) dedicated to New Mark the very first number in a longstanding series of Project Reference Files. In 1973, ULI published Dr. Carl Norcross' *Townhouses & Condominiums: Residents' Likes and Dislikes*, a study of California and Greater Washington, D.C., "the townhouse capital of the East."³²⁷ New Mark Commons figured prominently in this study, which mentioned that the pool was used by 86% of residents. The complex was rated "very high" on the Owner's Satisfaction Scale Norcross had established, and "easy maintenance, environment and good design" were cited as "the three best features."³²⁸

Site planning and landscaping

³²³ Edmund J. Bennett, note to Isabelle Gournay, October 2003; telephone conversation with Mary Corbin Sies, January 15, 2005.

³²⁴ Bennett noted that he did not think residents understood the financial implications of eliminating the commercial property from New Mark when they pushed for the dead-ending of New Mark Esplanade, nor did members of the planning commission, which had changed personnel since Bennett had filed his initial plans four years earlier. Residents were concerned about protecting their neighborhood from thru traffic that would bring outsiders into the community. Edmund Bennett to Mary Corbin Sies, telephone conversation, January 15, 2005.

³²⁵ Technical Staff Report. Bennett was holding a \$350,000 loan from the Perpetual Building Association and was expecting the revenue from leasing the commercial property to enable him to repay the loan. Sale of the townhomes only brought in about a third of the amount and Bennett had to repay the loan from other sources. Edmund Bennett to Mary Corbin Sies, telephone conversation, January 15, 2005.

³²⁶ Letter of David B. Lamb to Frank Ecker, chair of the Planning Commission, City of Rockville, July 30, 1973 (Rose Kasnow's personal archive)

³²⁷ Nineteen examples were in Maryland, almost exclusively in Montgomery County, 15 in Northern Virginia, 15 in California.

³²⁸ Norcross, p.20.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 83

New Mark Commons (plate 47) represents the culmination of Mr. Bennett's experience as a community builder. As planned, it best illustrated his desire to curb the evolution of the Maryland suburbs. For him, New Mark avoided "both the sterile panning and visual pollution of suburbia and the growing pains of the big new towns."³²⁹ The 186 single-family homes were to be erected on 49.2 acres (achieving a density of 3.8 dwellings per acre) and the 196 townhouses on 27.2 acres (7.2 dwellings per acre). Accounting for open and recreation spaces, New Mark's overall density was 3.97 dwelling units per acre.

New Mark was promoted as "A Twentieth Century Village that's one foot in the future and a step back to a better time."³³⁰ An advertisement established a parallel between its proposed "village green" and those built in Colonial New England.³³¹ Mr. Bennett also wanted "to design all of the elements to human scale, to place recreational and commercial facilities within easy reach of the residents in the manner of the best examples of new town planning in Scandinavia."³³² Most of the streets were named after new towns in England (Welwyn Way led to Letchworth, Welwyn and Stenevage Circles; Cumbernauld and Harlow Courts), Sweden (Vallingby Circle, Farsta Court), Finland (Tapiola Court), Canada (Don Mills Court), and the United States (Radburn Court). The name Watchwater Way relates to this street's visual connection to the lake.

At the intersection of Maryland Avenue, which was widened by five feet, and New Mark Esplanade, the principal entrance to the subdivision is bisected by a landscaped island (automobile access is also secured by way of Potomac Valley Road). This island hosts a wooden pylon (photograph 46), nicknamed "the totem pole," which the *Washington Post* illustrated in March 1969 with the following caption:

This graphic symbol of the initials NMC was conceived by sculptor Leonard Rennie and designed by architect David Condon and built by Robert Furman for developer Edmund Bennett's small new town.

The 18-foot high New Mark has a concrete center shaft, 6-inch thick redwood slabs stained in gray-brown on the four outer sides. Bennett also plans a 100-foot-high New Mark for the village green.³³³

Inscribed in a tall rectangle, the contours of the totem served as a logo for New Mark Commons' brochures and advertising, which is still used by the Homes Association.

New Mark Esplanade is the collector street that feeds the townhouse clusters and the cul-de-sac streets in the single-family home sections. These streets end for the most part in landscaped

³²⁹ "Village Life in New Mark Commons Offers Values Lost in Suburban Sprawl," *Montgomery County Sentinel*, January 5, 1968, 1.

³³⁰ *Washington Post*, August 19, 1967, C 4.

³³¹ *Washington Post*, July 29, 1967.

³³² Bennett 1967, 49

³³³ *Washington Post*, March 29, 1969, D 10. A slide preserved at the University of Maryland shows a large panel on the other side of Maryland Avenue, with the inscription "Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon, Architects F.A.I.A" below the inscription indicating Mr. Bennett's firm.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 84

round-about islands, and are presently dedicated and maintained by the City of Rockville. No single-family home directly fronts on New Mark Esplanade, which ends onto a grassy pedestrian mall before reaching Monroe Street.

New Mark Commons features 17.5 acres of open common space (plates 48 and 49), including 4.7 acres for an artificial lake, made possible by the erection of a small concrete dam and the channeling of an existing stream. Mr. Bennett was adamant that the project needed a lake, just like the new towns of Reston and Columbia. As New Mark Esplanade curves, a picturesque vista of the water (photographs 47 and 48), wooden dock, trees, and townhouses begins to unfold. The lake catches first-time visitors by surprise. Its unusual shape, alternating sharp edges and more natural curvilinear contours, and its architectural and landscaping treatment make it a particularly scenic element. Bennett decided against planting trees in the immediate vicinity of the water (maybe to insure its cleanliness), which, according to Mr. Keyes, makes the lake look "too barren."³³⁴ Although the lake was also meant to have a cooling effect in the summer, its purpose is more aesthetic than practical. Advertisements mention that the water had been stocked with trout and showed "youngsters in sailboats" and a child with a fishing rod (plate 50), but the lake is too small for most water sports.³³⁵ In 1970, a jet fountain was added in its center.³³⁶ Mr. Bennett deemed Lake New Mark "not necessarily a profitable feature," as the cost of building a retaining wall amounted to \$2,250 for each lakeside townhouse site.³³⁷

In addition to one sidewalk on every street in the single-family home section and all around the townhouse parking courts, residents have at their disposal several pedestrian pathways. A centrally located and slightly meandering north-south spine (photographs 49 and 50) is paved in concrete for more durability and lit by distinctive lamp posts with glass globes. It originates at the parking lot for the sports club, goes along the pool, and bisects the townhouse section, where it is framed by tall trees and bushes. Beyond New Mark Esplanade, this pedestrian and bike path becomes a backyard alley between Bentana and Watchwater Ways, then runs parallel to Maryland Avenue, ending at the totem. It also connects with a pedestrian underpass that allows New Mark residents to access Monument Park without having to cross Maryland Avenue. This underpass was funded in half by Mr. Bennett and in half by the City of Rockville. Accessible from New Mark Esplanade by a set of stairs, which do not retain their original aspect, another concrete path crosses a small bridge and runs along the southern bank of the lake (photograph 48). Alongside are a few benches. At the edge of the property, right behind the Summit Apartments, the path becomes a large swath of lawn bordered by retaining walls made of heavy timber (photograph 51). Additionally, narrow paved alleys connect the different townhouse clusters and link them to the lake and sports club.

Vegetation (generally kept close to its pre-development condition) abounds in the subdivision, where 653 trees of at least 12 feet in diameter were initially surveyed and preserved during construction. To this day, hardwood trees cannot be removed without the approval of the Homes

³³⁴ Arthur Keyes, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, 24 March 2003.

³³⁵ Skating was possible in New Mark's early years, as the lake was shallower than it is today.

³³⁶ John B. Willmann, "Lower Loan Rates Seen as Stimulant to Housing," *Washington Post*, December 5, 1970, R 15.

³³⁷ "New Mark Commons, Rockville, Maryland." *The Urban Land Institute. Project Reference File*, vol.1, 1971, 4.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 85

Association, which also discourages planting shrubs requiring extraordinary maintenance. The tree canopy has become so thick in some places that it is hard to grow anything under it. Wood painted a dark red is used for address signs for the townhouse clusters and homes' knobs off New Mark Esplanade. Natural wood is used for low U-shaped fences hiding garbage cans in front of the town houses (photograph 52), and for custom-built benches, including one in a townhouse cluster (photograph 53) and a extremely long one, near the sports club.

With the exception of a cluster of single-family homes on Lakeside Overlook next to the Maryland Avenue entrance, the section east of New Mark Esplanade is devoted to townhouses and communal space. The back of the lakeside townhouses, located at the boundary of the property, is essentially treated as a service and parking area. The site strategy (photographs 54 and 55) adopted for all other "village" townhouses achieves a degree of sophistication rarely matched for this residential typology. Access roads have been kept to a minimum. They serve clusters of four to eight, generally staggered units. In 1968, four linear clusters with adjoining one-story garages (which have no interior connections with their units, however) and front fenced patios were built alongside New Mark Esplanade. Other "village" townhouses do not have garages. They are lined to form courts of varying width and length, accommodating two parking spaces for each unit, and connected by pathways. Two of these courts are large enough to host a landscaped island, complete with benches. Planting minimizes the presence of automobiles, as do transverse sidewalks acting as pedestrian "jetties." Front yards have low brick walls hiding air conditioning equipment and bushes providing privacy. Patios in the back are generally fenced in, but residual spaces between back yards are kept as natural as possible, and tend to become natural pathways.

Fences pre-approved by the Board of the Home Association and its architectural committee are "either horizontal rustic, unfinished split rail, or vertical split sapling." Proposals for any other type of fence require pre-approval from the association. Article X section 4 - f of the 1967 covenants stipulates that "outdoor clothes dryers or clothes lines shall be placed within a screened enclosure of any approved design of attractive rustic wood not over (8) eight feet in height."

Communal space currently centers on the pool complex (photographs 56 and 57), which has retained its original character. The 25-meter swimming pool and the wading pool are surrounded by a vertical wooden fence. At one end, stands the two-story Four Seasons Club, a simple mass of brick painted white with two-slope roofs, which Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon designed to match the scale and character of the surrounding housing stock. Like at Carderock Springs, the two-story clubhouse features locker areas for the pool (as well as a sauna) at the lower level, and a large upstairs entertainment hall that opens onto a balcony facing the pool. This multi-purpose room features walls in exposed brick and a wooden cathedral ceiling. An ingenious system of large barn-like sliding doors on its length conceals a fireplace and conversation pit, as well as a catering kitchen. New Mark residents can reserve this space (as well as the pool) for private functions. In the early days of New Mark Commons, the large room was used to show children movies on weekends. Adjacent to the pool are two all-weather tennis courts and a playground and, at a lower level, a parking lot accessed from New Mark Esplanade.³³⁸

Two additional communal structures (plates 51 and 52) designed by KLC were planned

³³⁸ Initial plans called for six tennis courts.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 86

alongside and just north of the clubhouse, but were never built. The convenience shopping center (with office suites above) and a free standing gourmet restaurant would have framed an open courtyard graced by stairs, an oval pool with stone walls, and a "120-foot-high tower," which would have served "as an identity feature, visible above the trees from Rockville and the nearby highway."³³⁹ Renderings show evidence of a particularly fine design.

- Single-family homes

The five basic models originally offered at New Mark Commons formed the Mark 70 series. This name derived from the assumption, stated in advertisements, that "many design features and appointments presage those you'll find in homes of the 1970s."³⁴⁰ The initial model homes were built on Radburn Court, in the very center of the community. As evidenced in period photographs (photograph 58 and plate 53), only every other lot was originally built upon, which allowed for more appealing photographs. Remaining lots were built in 1968 (#3 Radburn Court) and in 1971 (# 1, 5, 7, and 9).

Ranging from 2,644 to 3,648 square feet, the model homes were intended for lots averaging 11,000 square feet. Differences from houses built at Carderock Springs were notable. Panelization methods for the facades had been abandoned. On the lower floor of the downhill models, fluted concrete made of light gray aggregate had been substituted for brick. As had already been the case for the very last houses built at Carderock Springs, thicker laths in reddish wood replaced metal rods on balcony railings. Roofs continued to be covered with cedar shingles, but the type of hand split shakes found at Carderock Springs came as a more expensive option.

Inside, changes were also significant. Cathedral ceilings covered not only the living/ dining space, but also all upstairs bedrooms. Triangular transoms were used systematically in living rooms, to provide views of the surrounding trees, while preserving privacy as well as wall space for paintings and furniture. A projecting fireplace and its free-standing circular flue, profiled against the transoms, gave a dramatic visual anchor to the living/dining space. The railings for staircases were still pre-assembled (with open steps) and elegantly detailed, but they were built in wood instead of metal. Luminous ceilings were placed in kitchens and in many bathrooms, replacing skylights: composed of large translucent tiles made of Owens-Corning fiber glass supported by a grid of redwood laths, they were intended to convey "a daylight appearance even in a sunless day."³⁴¹ In kitchens, Formica-faced cabinets (in light brown with a wood grain motif) had distinctive circular handles and light gray back splashes. Bathrooms featured one-piece fiberglass tub/shower units manufactured by Universal Rundle; sinks were embedded in consoles supported by chrome legs. "Newly developed vinyl covered wall boards" were used in recreation rooms; their texture added "a casual look" and ensured "easy cleaning of children's handprints and even crayon and pencil marks." Offered as options were a central vacuum system produced by Black & Decker, electronic air filters by Honeywell, remote control for garage doors, Humidaire power humidifiers, and an intercom system. Electrical switch plates were in chrome, to "eliminate fingerprints." A built-in panel phone with a retractable cord was also installed in each unit.

The **Mark 70 - UH** or Mark 70 Uphill (same as Overlook - Mark II in Carderock Springs South)

³³⁹ Bennett, "Economics and the Visual Community," 50.

³⁴⁰ Display ad, Washington Post, January 28, 1967, E 4.

³⁴¹ *Montgomery County Sentinel*, January 5, 1968, 3

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 87

(photograph 59 and plate 54) had the same plan and was roughly the same size as the second Overlook model at Carderock Springs (2,656 square feet, a deficit of 4 square feet). The balcony was slightly reduced in length, as windows for the living room did not reach the side wall, leaving instead a lateral strip of siding. The overhang running through the entire front facade was not as deep. The interior differed significantly from that of Carderock Springs' second Overlook model. The long and narrow transverse entry stairhall splitting the lower floor in half was abandoned for a frontal stair that landed in the living room. The kitchen in the back gained space formerly used for the stairs; it acquired a breakfast alcove, separated from the living room by a double door. As a result of the new stair placement, the fenestration for the lower floor changed dramatically, as openings for the recreation room, the entry / stair hall, and the fourth bedroom formed a floor-to-ceiling window wall around the wooden entrance door, painted a bright color. A slightly awkward detail, which can be found in several models, was the visual and physical juncture between the glass plane of the facade and the stair landing. On the lower floor, the laundry room was separated from the utility room, and the back wall of the recreation room was treated as a storage space connected with the utility room. The garage had a lateral internal door that did not exist at Carderock Springs. The recreation room was smaller than at Carderock Springs, to allow space for a larger utility room in the back. The exhibition home for the Mark 70 - UH model is at # 4 Radburn Court.

The plans for the **Mark 70- MU** (mid-entry uphill) (plate 55) and **70- MD** (mid-entry downhill; there was no display model for this version) were essentially similar to that of the Mark 70 - UH, which we have just described. However, a major difference related to the mid-level placement of the stairs, which allowed the designers to eliminate the lateral entry and to return to the time-tested formula of the elongated and frontal recreation room. The interruption of the top floor overhang at the central stair hall strengthened the impression of recessed entry. The top floor was sheathed in shingles; in the late 1960s, this type of rough, earthbound surface treatment inspired by the early Colonial architecture of the Atlantic Seaboard was gaining favor among post-modern architects, such as Robert Venturi and Charles Moore. The front balcony was also protected by a shingled parapet; it was smaller than for the Overlook-Mark II at Carderock Springs South, as its length matched that of the two double floor-to-ceiling windows of the living room. This model was offered with an optional carport or enclosed garage. A well preserved example is at #10 Lakeside Overlook (photograph 60), which gently nestles into the trees; for this particular house, the fact that one must climb an exterior stair and then go down again to the downstairs room is not totally rational.

The **Mark 70-SL** or Mark 70 Split Level (plate 56) has already been described as the Clubview model in the second phase of Carderock Springs. The only difference in plan was that the family room in the back was smaller, in order to expand the adjoining "garden room." The Mark 70-SL was offered with an optional attached carport off the living room. The exhibition home for this model is at # 6 Radburn Court.

The **Mark 70-DH** (downhill) (plate 57) derived from the namesake model at Carderock Springs, but it was smaller (2,762 as opposed to 3,050 square feet). The fireplace did not project out; there was no porch preceding the garage. A small balcony was added to the master bedroom window and the balcony off the back side of the living room was shortened in length. The kitchen was placed in the front. Accessible from the living room, a narrow gallery illuminated by floor-to-ceiling windows terminated the entry foyer. The exhibition home for the Mark 70-DH is # 10 Radburn Court. A well preserved example is 501 New Mark Esplanade (photographs 61, 62 and 63). The owners, Mr. and Mrs. Rathbone, added skylights in the foyer and kitchen (which is completely remodeled, though within the original footprint).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 88

There has been no change to the living/dining room. The side patio, opening from the dining area through a sliding glass window, is original—the same aggregate concrete squares with wood dividers. The hallway still has its original luminous ceiling. The master bedroom has its original very tall closets and an attractive floor to ceiling vertical window. The second bedroom has not been altered at all, just carpeted. The original dark paneling in the stair hall has been covered with light-colored wallboard. On the lower floor, the full bath still has its original fiberglass bath/shower stall. The one-car garage and unfinished utility room remain unchanged. Like many New Mark homeowners, the Rathbones have replaced the balcony off the living room by a much larger deck and installed a patio below the deck.

The largest of New Mark's original models (3,300 square feet) was the **Mark 70-TST**, also called Mark 70 Two-Story or Mark II (plate 58). It was described in the sales brochure as "an imposing two-story design, perfectly planned for outdoor-indoor living." The main two-story block was the same as in Carderock Springs' Pineview model, but the lower block was completely changed, as the garage was placed in frontal projecting position, and the recreation room was pushed to the back. An interesting detail was the floor-to-ceiling glazed slit filling the projection between the recreation room and the narrower garage. An artificially lit basement was under the entire first floor. Increase in surface through the addition of this basement hiked the price to \$57,700. The main block was entirely covered in brick; the lower wing had horizontal siding. The display model was located on # 8 Radburn Court, with the Recreation room and garage utilized as a Community Exhibit Center. Priced at \$62,200, the **Mark 70 TSA** or Mark III Alternate included a finished recreation room on the lower level, and an optional fifth bedroom and bath.

In November 1969, Mr. Bennett offered two new models, which were built in a rectangular court off New Mark Esplanade, at # 705 and # 703 New Mark Esplanade between Potomac Valley Road and Don Mills Court (# 701, the last house on the court, was built in 1971). The major novelty was a "master bedroom - living suite(s)" with cathedral ceiling on the upper level. The **Sturbridge model** (# 705 New Mark Esplanade, plate 59 and photograph 64) was a new version of the Mark 70-MU and was offered in uphill and downhill versions (the recreation room was located in the front in the former, in the back in the latter). The overhang of the second story was shallower than for Mark 70-MU. The balcony had no depth; it was only destined to allow floor-to-ceiling sliding windows of the living-room to open. A closet was added in the entry. The Nantucket model (3,245 square feet, plate 60 and photograph 65) was a variation on the Mark 70-TST and TSA. In terms of massing, it featured the same symmetrical main section, but the projecting wing comprising the garage and the recreation room (renamed family room) was larger and higher and housed a second-floor master bedroom. This wing was clad in brick, as opposed to wood siding in the previous versions. The plan for the lower floor was radically reconfigured. Adopting a frontal position, the dining room was totally separated from the living room. The kitchen and family room were located in the back and formed, for the first time in a Bennett-KLC house, a common entity, separated only by a countertop. The family room included on the wall adjacent to the garage a laundry closet closed by accordion doors. Upstairs, the hall ended in a bow window. The Nantucket alternate model (3,615 square feet) offered a two-car garage, which was new for a Bennett house; as a result, the family room and the master bedroom upstairs gained six feet in length. From 1970 to 1973, variations on existing models were also built. For instance 16 Watchwater Way (photograph 66) features an integral garage and a larger balcony and # 17 Farsta Court (photographs 67 and 68) was built in 1972 as a Hillcrest model, which we have already described for Carderock Springs South.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 89

- Townhouses

In the townhouse clusters, architectural unity was conferred by the uniform 72-foot lot length and identical roof slopes; individuality by variations in unit width, massing (through setbacks between units and recesses in individual units), openings (projecting bow windows, arched entries in later units), and wall finishes (contrasts between brick, dark cedar shakes, and white window and door trim became increasingly complex as construction progressed).

Village houses (plates 61 and 62) were generously sized. Most were downhill models, adopting a three-story layout that superimposed a recreation room, opening onto a private backyard through large sliding glass doors, with a living room ending in a bow window or a projecting boxed balcony (photograph 69). There were three basic models, with variations related to the configuration of the entrance and its powder room and to the availability of a full or half bath on the lower floor, near the recreation room. The **Windemere** model (2,480 square feet of gross area, 2 Bedrooms and a recreation room, 3 ½ baths) was 17'4" wide. The **Windemere II** had similar characteristics, but was an end unit, selling at a premium. The **Scandia** was the largest model (2,628 square feet of gross area, 3 Bedrooms and a recreation room, 3 ½ baths). It was 21'4" wide and had a dining room in front, opening onto an enclosed patio court, and a centrally located kitchen, with a luminous ceiling. The **Scandia II** had a frontal kitchen and a half bath on the lower level. **The Lakeview** (2,470 square feet of floor area, 3 Bedrooms and a recreation room, 3 ½ baths) was always an end unit; its two-flight stair hall was placed perpendicular to the end wall and illuminated by a vertical strip window. It had a dining room in front and a centrally located kitchen. Its front facade had a deeply recessed entrance, and above it a daylight master bath. The living room bow windows or balconies were centrally located in the Windemere model, but held a lateral position in the Scandia and Lakeview models. A later, and wider, version of the Windemere was named **The Bentana**.

We visited a 1968 Windemere townhouse at 504 New Mark Esplanade, a center unit with a balcony off the living room. It is occupied by its original owner, Winifred Herrmann, who did not opt for a fireplace because it took up too much wall space. In the dining room, recessed lights replace a hanging chandelier. The family room has preserved its dark paneled wall (with an irregular pattern of verticals) and linoleum floor covering. The upstairs bathroom off the bedroom facing the backyard maintains its original fixtures in a light avocado green, including a fiberglass bath/shower unit, and a single globe light over the sink. The kitchen has its original padded linoleum "brick" floor, Formica counters and cabinets (including metal handles), Formica splash guard, and stove with a double oven in coppertone. In the kitchen, a floor to ceiling sliding glass door opens onto the front patio, which has its original redwood fence and a dogwood tree that Wini transplanted (with permission) after workers dug it up when they were recontouring the landscaping behind her house. Re-flooring the patio has involved recreating the original concrete aggregate with wood dividers. Ms. Herrmann carpeted over the steps and closed the gap between the lowest step and the floor of the landing, to protect a blind dog from missteps. She replaced the original outside door that she considered plain and too flimsy; Mr. Bennett approved a heavy custom-made oak door since it was not visible to passersbys. Ms. Hermann put in a skylight over the staircase and framed it off with oak. She also had a pulldown stair put in to give access to a small attic storage space over the bathrooms.

There are 43 "**lakeside villas**" (photograph 70). Some units are located right on the water and possess a wooden balcony, with vertical laths; others have a waterfront patio. Some master bedrooms have bow windows. Preceded by an enclosed "forecourt," all lakeside villas have the same three-level

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 90

layout; a skylight illuminates their straight, lateral stairs. The first floor had, in the front, an eat-in kitchen and a powder room, a centrally located dining room, and a living room (with an optional fireplace) in the back, facing the lake. Many units had a "stepped down" living room that made interiors feel less cavernous. The second floor offered a waterside master bedroom and, depending on the unit's width, one or two bedrooms on the other side; sandwiched in between were two bathrooms. The basement had a blind storage room on the waterside, an intermediate laundry room, and a recreation room with a window.

Advertisements assured that the lakeside townhouses were "clearly influenced by the charm of the villas on the canal of Venice." The **Lido I** (1,775 square feet, 2 Bedrooms, 2 ½ baths) was only 15 feet wide and had a small square balcony overlooking the lake, a master bedroom with a bow window, and a slightly recessed lateral window for the second bedroom. The **Lido II** (plate 63) (2,138 square feet) had the same plan, but with a width of 17'4", which allowed for a more generous entry and balcony. The **Venezia I** (2,155 square feet, 3 Bedrooms, 2 ½ baths) was 19'4" wide and had a patio on the lake. The **Venezia II** (plate 64) had the same width and a shallow balcony off the master bedroom. The **Fontana** (plate 65) (2,738 square feet, 3 Bedrooms, 2 ½ baths) was 22'4" wide; it had a 406-square foot balcony and a bow window off the master bedroom. Another version of the Fontana was the **Villa del Lago** that featured a waterside patio stepping down to the living room.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 91

G. Geographical Data

All of the Bennett/KLC subdivisions are located in the State of Maryland within the corporate limits of the towns of Bethesda and Rockville in Montgomery County.

Kenwood Park Group

This 300-acre subdivision is located in the southern section of the district comprised by River Road to the west, Wilson Lane to the north, Bradley Boulevard to the east, and Goldsboro Road to the south. Mr. Bennett developed seven lots with direct views on the golf course of the Kenwood Country Club at the southern end of the subdivision: five on the 5800 block of Marbury Road (5458, 5852, 5844, 5840, and 5836), and two on an adjacent dead-end street, Pemberton Street (6708 and 6704).

Potomac Overlook

Potomac Overlook is just upriver from Glen Echo Heights and is located between MacArthur Boulevard to the west and Massachusetts Avenue to the east, only a mile north of the District Line. The subdivision is tucked between Bent Branch Rd (part of the Tulip Hill subdivision) to the north and Dahlonga (part of Mohican Hills) to the south. Mr. Bennett developed four houses on adjacent lots on Wiscassett Road (6220, 6216, 6212, and 6210), four houses along MacArthur Boulevard (the easternmost of which has been torn down and replaced), and homes facing two small cul-de-sac streets off Wiscassett Road: Rivercrest Court (seven houses) and Virginia View Court (eight houses, two of them with driveways accessed through Wiscassett Road).

Flint Hill

The Flint Hill subdivision lies on 25 acres of wooded land south of River Road and west of Wilson Lane in the Bannockburn section of Bethesda, and located one block west of Crail Drive. The 31 houses (plate 11) fronted three different streets: Nevis Road, which runs perpendicular to River Road (nine houses, including two that were far recessed from the road and shared a driveway); Broxburn Court, a cul-de-sac that runs north from Nevis Road (seventeen houses); and a stretched-out cul-de-sac at the extremity of Selkirk Drive (five houses, built in 1961), which lies northwest of Nevis and Broxburn, is accessed from Helmsdale Road to the west, and is discontinuous with the other two streets, though the terminuses of the two cul-de-sacs, Broxburn and Selkirk, are adjacent to one another.

Carderock Springs

The Carderock Springs subdivision is bound by the Capital Beltway (I-495) to the south,

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 92

Persimmon Tree Lane to the southwest, the grounds of the Congressional Country Club to the northwest, Cabin John Regional Park to the northeast and Seven Locks Road to the southeast. Bennett-built houses are located from the northern end of the subdivision to the southern edge of Lilly Stone Drive (on this drive, houses beyond Edgewood Court in the direction of Seven Locks Road are not Bennett-built). The principal streets, which meet close to Persimmon Tree Lane, are Fenway Road, which originates on River Road and slopes downwards towards the south and where the model homes were located, and Lilly Stone Drive, which runs between Persimmon Tree Lane and Seven Locks. Tributaries of Fenway Road, from west to east, are Magruder Mill and Still Spring Court, which both end in landscaped cul-de-sacs, but are connected by Peck Place. Hamilton Spring Road links Fenway Road to Lilly Stone; it gives access to the sports club and to two loop roads, Park Overlook and Glenmore Spring. Between Fenway Road and Lilly Stone Drive, Carderock Drive is a short street serving Carderock Court.

Carderock Springs South

Carderock Springs South begins on a small parcel of land tucked just south of the Capital Beltway from Carderock Springs and east of Persimmon Tree Road, which passes over and perpendicular to the Beltway. The subdivision, which is clustered around a common greenspace, is set on an irregular quadrilateral parcel of land and contains 45 houses: nine (including three on a triad court) are accessible from Persimmon Tree Road, an old thoroughfare connecting MacArthur Boulevard to Potomac; seven are lined on the southern side of Tomlinson Avenue, which runs roughly parallel to the Beltway; nineteen are located on Barkwater Court, a cul-de-sac subsidiary of Tomlinson Avenue; and ten on Persimmon Court, a short cul-de-sac street off of Persimmon Tree Road.

New Mark Commons

New Mark Commons (plate 46) is located in West Rockville on a 96.4 - acre piece of land previously known as the McCohihe Tract. It is bounded by Maryland Avenue to the northwest, Argyle Street to the north, Monroe Street to the east, Tower Oaks to the south, and I-270 to the west. New Mark Commons belongs to Rockville's Planning Area 3, located immediately south of the Town Center between Maryland Avenue and Jefferson Street and north of Wootton Parkway. The main entrance to New Mark Commons is along New Mark Esplanade, the collector street that feeds the townhouse clusters and the cul-de-sac streets in the single-family home sections. The Bennett development includes houses along Lakeside Overlook, New Mark Esplanade, Watchwater Way and Watchwater Court, Radburn Court, Potomac Valley Road, and Don Mills Court. Scandia Way and the courts adjoining it—Farsta, Tapiola, and Vallingby—contain a mix of Bennett homes and dwellings by other builders. Houses along Bentana Way and the courts off the feeder street of Welwyn Way were developed by Louis A. Zuckerman, and are not included in this nomination. Houses along Tegner Way and Tegner Court—the original location of the intended commercial center—are also excluded from this nomination.

Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

This multiple property listing is based on detailed field surveys and interviews conducted in 2003-2004 by Dr. Isabelle Gournay and Dr. Mary Corbin Sies as part of a three year project funded by the Maryland Historical Trust to survey modern architecture in the State of Maryland. To prepare for and supplement field visits, we undertook systematic library and archival research. Important primary sources

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 93

included articles in professional and trade journals, magazines relating to the home industry, and daily newspapers. We performed archival research in the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress, the Marylandia collection at the University of Maryland, and the personal collections of architect Arthur Keyes and sales manager Brenda Bennett Bell. We also perused the relevant secondary sources on suburban development in greater Washington, D.C., as well as on modern houses and residential planning nationally and internationally. Human informants were a significant part of our research as well; we maintained phone and email correspondence with a broad range of architectural historians, preservationists, realtors, and local historians across the state and beyond. We obtained interviews with several of the principal subjects of the study: Edmund Bennett, Arthur Keyes, Brenda Bennett Bell, John Matthews, and several residents of Bennett-built homes and subdivisions. To manage information, we maintained vertical files, chronological collections of print sources on Bennett/KLC subdivisions or houses, and bio-bibliographies chronicling the professional output and involvement of architects, landscape architects, planners, interior designers, developers, home builders, and clients. These recorded biographical information, a chronological list of associated resources with their locations and dates, and relevant bibliographic and archival references. Finally, we visited each Bennett subdivision on foot multiple times, walking the streets, examining each model type, observing the planning and landscaping features, photographing, and taking detailed field notes. We were invited to inspect the interiors and speak with the residents of several Bennett/KLC houses and we acquired additional primary source materials from residents.

To frame the documentation of individual sites, we have written a multi-disciplinary context essay, a factual and intellectual exploration that grounds the resources listed in the bio-bibliographies in their historical and architectural contexts. The essay focuses on the question, "who sponsored modernism in the State of Maryland," and discusses the social, political, economic, and cultural circumstances that shaped the everyday lives of Marylanders and framed the development of modern architecture in the Free State. Proceeding roughly chronologically, it covers policies, leading public and private institutions and personalities, promotional tools and building programs, and the role of the architectural and real estate professions in the state. By exploring how state and national architectural history intersect, the essay evaluates the universal and local characteristics of Modern Movement resources in Maryland. Research for the context essay combined with intensive primary and onsite research turned out to be an indispensable combination for enabling us to identify the appropriate contexts for understanding the significance of Bennett/KLC subdivisions. These five contexts—1) The Bethesda District and City of Rockville: physical and social change, 1860-1975; 2) Collaboration between home builders and modernist architects in the United States and the Capital Region, 1945-1975; 3) Collaboration between Edmund Bennett and Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon, 1953-1973; 4) Planned residential subdivisions in the United States and in the D.C. suburbs, 1945-1975; and 5) Modern residential architecture in the suburbs of Washington, D.C., 1945-1975—represent the local, regional, and national circumstances exerting the strongest influence on post World War II tract subdivision development in the mid-Atlantic and on the Bennett/KLC collaboration in particular.

Having determined through our systematic primary and secondary research that the Bennett/KLC tract subdivisions gained national recognition in their time and have national significance, we made the decision to include all the subdivisions created by the Bennett team in Montgomery County in order to showcase the evolution of their planning and design. Thus we included all tracts of a half dozen or more houses: the Kenwood Group, Potomac Overlook, Flint Hill, Carderock Springs, Carderock Springs South, and New Mark Commons. For each subdivision, we determined the key site

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 94

planning, landscaping, and communal features, and the range of house models offered. Their significance is evaluated in terms of the five contexts listed above.

The integrity of each subdivision is evaluated according to its adherence to or deviation from the original Bennett/KLC site planning and the current state of maintenance of the communal features. Homes are assessed according to their adherence to or deviation from the applicable standard model. It is important to note that we have evaluated the integrity of each subdivision in a general way only. We have not assessed each individual property (though we assess several in each subdivision), nor have we determined the registration requirements for each model type. Our assessments derive from documentation and field research in each subdivision. From the perspective of property owners, designation is a sensitive issue. Determining registration requirements will have to be undertaken through some mechanism such as town meetings in each location. This is likely to be a politicized process in certain subdivisions and will need to be handled carefully if MHT decides to proceed with nomination. Entering into these negotiations is beyond the scope of the work we contracted to do with MHT.

Major Bibliographical References

- Adamson, Paul, and Arbunich, Marty. *Eichler: Modernism Rebuilds the American Dream*. Gibbs Smith, 2002.
- Burns, John, ed., *Hollin Hills, Community of Vision: A SemiCentennial History 1949-1999*. Alexandria, VA: Civic Association of Hollin Hills, 2000.
- Callcott, George H. *Maryland & America, 1940 to 1980*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Goldhagen, Sarah Williams and Legault, Réjean. *Anxious modernisms: Experimentation in Postwar*

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 95

Architectural Culture Montréal: Canadian Centre for Architecture and Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.

Hiebert, Ray Eldon and MacMaster, Richard L. *A Grateful Remembrance. The Story of Montgomery County, Maryland*, Rockville: Maryland Historical Society, 1976.

Martin, Christopher T., *Tract-House Modern: A Study of Housing Design and Consumption in the Washington Suburbs, 1946-60*, Ph.D. Dissertation, George Washington University, 2000.

"AIA-NAHB cites architect-builder team," *House and Home* (April 1961), 184.

Writings on Edmund Bennett

"This is Builder Ed Bennett. He tells ... How you can make modern management ideas pay off - even at 14 houses a year," *House and Home* (April 1959), 152-156.

Mason, Joseph, "Ed Bennett: Nature can help you sell problem sites," *American Builder* (June 1964), cover page and 60-65.

Writings by Edmund Bennett

Bennett, Edmund J. "Let's Re-examine Program Plans and Assumptions," *Home Builders Monthly* 16 (February 1959), 45-47.

Bennett, Edmund J. "Economics and the Visual Community," *Building Research* 4 (September-October 1967), 47-50

Holmes Run Acres

"Builder-Architect Teamwork Pays Off: Step From Colonial to Contemporary Takes Lurias of Washington Into a Faster Market," *Architectural Forum* (August 1951), 166-169, 238-239.

"Two-story house gives flexibility for big families" *House and Home* (October 1955), 169.

Award of Merit, *House and Home* (June 1957), p.445?

"The big change in builder's houses," *House and Home* (June 1954), 92.

"How these Washington builders worked out their idea of a foolproof house" *American Builder* (August 1955), 110-115.

"Two-story houses give flexibility to big families," *House and Home* (October 1955), 169.

"Award of Merit" (Homes for Better Living Awards, sponsored by the AIA in cooperation with *House and Home*, *Better Homes and Gardens* and NBC) *House and Home* (June 1957), 145.

Sarah Booth Conroy, "After a 25-Year Run, Holmes Run Still Ahead," *Washington Post*, September 12, 1976, M1 and M3.

Pine Spring

"Lesson for builders: to sell houses, get a fine site plan, fresh designs; [Lesson for] architects: one design job for builders can lead to others," *House and Home* (November 1952), 140-147.

"Local Builders Team with Architects," *Home Builders Monthly* (December 1952), 16-17.

"A Transition from Conventional to Contemporary," *Washington Post*, March 22, 1953, R 8.

"Area's Best Buildings of 1951-52," *Washington Post*, May 17, 1953, R 5.

Mary Roche, "A house for the family with \$ 7,000 a year," *House Beautiful* (June 1953), 137-139

"Two Virginia Developments Rate Honor at Housing Exhibit," *Washington Post*, August 23, 1953, R 7.

"Houses at Pine Spring, Washington, DC," *The Architect's Journal* (February 18, 1954), 223-226.

"Architectural Design under the FHA Program," *Insured Mortgage Portfolio* (Spring 1954), 4.

[NAHB Award of Merit in Design], *NAHB Correlator* (June 1954), 198-199.

"How to make a small house look bigger," *House and Home* (September 1954), 130-131.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 96

Kate Ellen Rogers, *The Modern House U.S.A.*, New York: Harper & Row, 1962, 8-9, 98

Kenwood Park

"Dramatic Construction [photograph and caption], *Washington Post*, May 20, 1956, G 9.

Robert J. Lewis, "Award Winner. Center Hall is Hub Of 4-Level Plan," *The [Washington] Evening Star* (Real Estate Section), June 30, 1956, B-1 and B-4.

Robert J. Lewis, "Three Homes in Area Chosen For Exhibit" *The [Washington] Evening Star* (Real Estate Section), October 6, 1956, B-1 and B-4.

"Good design makes this a handsome split from any angle," *House and Home* (October 1956), 120-123.

6210 Wiscassett Glen Echo Heights

Robert J. Lewis, "This Plan is Clean, Compact," *Washington Evening Star*, August 4, 1956, B-1 and B-6.

Potomac Overlook

"Potomac Overlook Homes Win National Awards," *Washington Post*, February 1, 1958, B6.

"The Challenge in By-Passed Land," *NAHB Journal of Homebuilding* 12 (February 1958), 50-52.

NAHB Journal of Homebuilding, 12 (April 1958), 34-35.

Potomac Valley Architect (June 1958), no page.

Flint Hill

"What happens when a smart builder gets together with a team of top architects? Every house is a prize winner," *House and Home* (April 1959), 157-161.

"Government analyst becomes top builder," *American Builder* (March 1960), 86-91.

NAHB Journal of Homebuilding, 14 (April 1960), cover page and 56-57.

House and Home (May 1960), 135 (Quality model House Award).

"Winners in the 2nd Annual 'Finest for Family Living' Contest," *Home Builders Monthly* 17 (June 1960), 31.

"It looks like a one-story - but a daylight basement doubles its area," *House and Home* 18 (November 1960), 119.

Robert J. Lewis, "Design Award Winners," *Washington Star*, June 11, 1960, B-1.

"Bennett 'Hillside' Home Wins Award," *Washington Post*, November 12, 1960, B-12.

American Builder 83 (February 1961), 100.

"Flint Hill Project Wins 8th Award," *Washington Star*, January 14, 1961, B-1.

Carderock Springs

John B. Willmann, "Contemporary Homes Built to Fit 'Bethesda Family Profile'," *Washington Post*, May 26, 1962, B1.

"59 research-tested ideas," *House and Home* 22 (July 1962), 146-159.

"Contemporary Styling Sells at Carderock Springs," *Washington Post*, September 8, 1962, D45.

"These houses were designed by good architects for leading builders - and they sold very well," *House and Home* (August 1963), 113 (Overlook model).

"McCall's Certified House. \$ 28,000 in Maryland," *McCall's*, 91 (October 1963), 200

"Carderock Models Win Awards," *Washington Post*, September 28, 1963, D4 (Overlook model).

"Nakashima Furniture Seen Here," *Washington Post*, November 16, 1963, E 2 (Valleyview model).

"Newest Marketing Trends," *House and Home* (March 1964), 96-97 (Glenmore model).

Joseph P. Mason, "Problem sites," *American Builder* (June 1964), 60-65.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 97

- "A hillside atrium house with a variety of outdoor-indoor living areas," *House and Home* (September 1965), 64-65.
- "H&G's House of Color illustrates the new swing to subtlety" *House and Garden* 128 (September 1965), 200-209.
- "A hillside atrium house with a variety of outdoor-indoor living areas," *House and Home* 28 (September 1965), 64-65.
- "Development House, Bethesda, Maryland," *Architectural Record* (Mid-May 1966), 50-51.
- "Good land, made better by skilled planning, helps this development sell itself," *House and Home* (May 1967), 88-91.
- Blanchard, Jayne M. "Carderock Springs is lushly green," *Washington Times*, Friday Home Guide, May 29, 1992, H 11.
- Mary Lou Shannon, *A Look Back in Time*, typewritten document in author's possession, 1999.

New Mark Commons

- McGuckian, Eileen. *Rockville: Portrait of a City*. Franklin, Tennessee: Hillsboro Press, 2001, 169.
- "Bennett Talks of Building 'New Town,'" *Washington Post*, July 25, 1964, C1.
- "New Mark Commons. \$ 14 Million 'Village' Opens," *Washington Post*, December 31, 1966, D1.
- John B. Willmann, "A Modern Mini-Town is His Goal," *Washington Post*, December 16, 1967, E1 and E3.
- John B. Willmann, "This Builder Buys a Village Concept," *Washington Post*, May 18, 1968, E1.
- "With secluded foot paths, you sell Village Houses," *Professional Builder* 34 (June 1969), 90-91.
- Special supplement to the *Montgomery County Sentinel*, January 5, 1968.
- Special supplement to the *Montgomery County Sentinel*, January 15, 1970.
- "Large townhouses for a broad suburban market" *House and Home* (April 1970), 86-87.
- John B. Willmann, "Open Space Comes High; Another Step Into Systems," *Washington Post*, October 16, 1971, C1.
- "New Mark Commons. Rockville, Maryland." *The Urban Land Institute. Project Reference File*, vol.1, 1971.
- Norcross, Carl. *Townhouses and Condominiums: Resident's Likes and Dislikes*, Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute, 1973.
- Washington Post*, Real Estate Section, June 24, 1989 (clipping).
- Washington Post*, May 13, 2000 (clipping).
- Washington Post*, Cityscapes, June 6, 1992 (clipping).

Interviews

- Andy Balderson. Interview with Liz Creveling, June 25, 2003.
- Brenda Bennett Bell, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, April 11, 2003.
- Edmund Bennett, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, April 11, 2003
- Winifred Herrmann, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, January 21, 2004
- Arthur Keyes, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, March 24, 2003.
- John Matthews, interview with Isabelle Gournay and Mary Corbin Sies, March 24, 2003.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 98

Property Address	Owner	Built	Model	C/NC
1 BASILDON CIRCLE	BURNS/GOLDBLATT	1970		NC
2 BASILDON CIRCLE	CHAO	1970		NC
3 BASILDON CIRCLE	GRANDIN	1970		NC
4 BASILDON CIRCLE	YARKONY	1970		NC
5 BENTANA COURT	KASSMAN	1970		NC
6 BENTANA COURT	ZOLGHADR/FRANCHI	1970		NC
7 BENTANA COURT	BLOOM	1970		NC
8 BENTANA COURT	HART	1970		NC
9 BENTANA COURT	KUKELHAUS	1970		NC
1 BENTANA WAY	MCVITTIE/RINAUDO	1970		NC
2 BENTANA WAY	TURESSON	1970		NC
3 BENTANA WAY	ROTHMAN	1970		NC
4 BENTANA WAY	DAGER	1970		NC
10 BENTANA WAY	JOSE	1970		NC
11 BENTANA WAY	FREW	1970		NC
12 BENTANA WAY	SUSSMAN/ECKSTEIN	1970		NC
13 BENTANA WAY	CHAPMAN	1972		NC
14 BENTANA WAY	WILLIAMSON	1970		NC
15 BENTANA WAY	CORIO	1970		NC
16 BENTANA WAY	SADLER	1970		NC
17 BENTANA WAY	BILLINGS	1970		NC
18 BENTANA WAY	JAYNES	1970		NC
19 BENTANA WAY	REED/REED	1970		NC
1 BRACKNELL CIRCLE	STAFFORD	1971		NC
2 BRACKNELL CIRCLE	CASSIDY/MASSAR	1971		NC
3 BRACKNELL CIRCLE	YU	1971		NC
4 BRACKNELL CIRCLE	BUCHANAN	1971		NC
5 BRACKNELL CIRCLE	MILLER	1971		NC
1 CUMBERNAULD COURT	KIESLER	1971		NC
2 CUMBERNAULD COURT	SCHIERLING	1970		NC
3 CUMBERNAULD COURT	MOLINA/CIESIELEZYK	1971		NC
4 CUMBERNAULD COURT	GORAYA	1971		NC
5 CUMBERNAULD COURT	GUPTA	1971		NC

6 CUMBERNAULD COURT	MEYER	1971		NC
7 CUMBERNAULD COURT	STEIN	1971		NC
8 CUMBERNAULD COURT	GERVASIO	1971		NC
9 CUMBERNAULD COURT	PICKAR	1971		NC
1 DON MILLS COURT	BROWN	1969	Sturbridge UH	C
2 DON MILLS COURT	WETTERHAHN	1969	Nantucket	C
3 DON MILLS COURT	OLLISON	1969	Nantucket	C
4 DON MILLS COURT	FINKOV	1969	Sturbridge UH	C
5 DON MILLS COURT	KRASNOW	1969	Sturbridge UH	C
6 DON MILLS COURT	REHBEHN/REMINGTON	1969	Sturbridge DH	C
7 DON MILLS COURT	ZIEBARTH	1969	Nantucket	C
8 DON MILLS COURT	JOHNSON	1969	Nantucket	C
9 DON MILLS COURT	REISS	1969	Sturbridge DH	C
1 FARSTA COURT	BURKHARD	1970	Sturbridge DH	C
2 FARSTA COURT	COWL	1970	Sturbridge DH	C
3 FARSTA COURT	GRASSER/KOMO	1970	Sturbridge DH	C
4 FARSTA COURT	SMITH/BELITSKY	1970	Sturbridge DH	C
5 FARSTA COURT	MANGAN	1970	Nantucket	C
6 FARSTA COURT	KARIMIAN/REZAIE	1970	Nantucket	C
7 FARSTA COURT	MIZUUCHI	1970	Nantucket	C
8 FARSTA COURT	CHAMBERS	1970	Nantucket	C
9 FARSTA COURT	CHEPURIN/BARANOVA	1970	Sturbridge UH	C
10 FARSTA COURT	MURPHY	1970	Sturbridge UH	C
11 FARSTA COURT	RIVERA/DEAN	1970	Sturbridge UH	C
13 FARSTA COURT	SCHRACK/WILSON	1972	Sturbridge UH	C
14 FARSTA COURT	KENYON/SCHMIDT	1972	Sturbridge DH	C
15 FARSTA COURT	GOKHVAT	1972	Hillcrest DH	C
16 FARSTA COURT	HADIDIACOS	1972	Sturbridge DH	C
17 FARSTA COURT	ROONEY/ADAM	1972	Hillcrest DH	C
18 FARSTA COURT	GAMAGE	1972	Hillcrest DH	C
19 FARSTA COURT	GARLOW/SMITH	1972	Sturbridge DH	C
20 FARSTA COURT	CALVO/BOCCA	1972	Sturbridge DH	C
21 FARSTA COURT	DURSO	1972	Sturbridge DH	C
1 HARLOW COURT	BARRESI	1970		NC

2 HARLOW COURT	SUCHINSKY	1970		NC
3 HARLOW COURT	CLARENCE	1970		NC
4 HARLOW COURT	FREED	1972		NC
5 HARLOW COURT	FRANCIS/CLARENCE	1971		NC
6 HARLOW COURT	CHEMNAMSETTI	1970		NC
7 HARLOW COURT	ROBINSON	1970		NC
1 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	WALTERS	1968	Mark 70 - DH	C
2 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	LIZAK/KOMLOSH	1968	Mark 70 - MD	C
3 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	PARLATO	1968	Mark 70 - TST	C
4 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	WILLIAMS	1968	Mark 70 - TST	C
5 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	PERMUTTER/ZAGOSKIN	1967	Mark 70 - DH	C
6 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	CRAMPTON	1968	Mark 70 - SL	C
7 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	OZAN	1968	Mark 70 - UH	C
8 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	FISHBEIN	1968	Mark 70 - UH	C
9 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	LEONOV/ANISIMOVA	1967	Mark 70 - DH	C
10 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	JAFFE	1967	Mark 70 - MU	C
11 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	KIMELMAN	1967	Mark 70 - DH	C
12 LAKESIDE OVERLOOK	CANO	1968	Mark 70 - TST	C
1 LETCHWORTH CIRCLE	MISNER	1971		NC
2 LETCHWORTH CIRCLE	BERTHIAUME	1971		NC
3 LETCHWORTH CIRCLE	NORTHUP	1972		NC
4 LETCHWORTH CIRCLE	GOMES	1972		NC
5 LETCHWORTH CIRCLE	SOO	1972		NC
6 LETCHWORTH CIRCLE	WONG	1971		NC
1 RADBURN COURT	SCHOOLS	1971	Sturbridge UH	C
2 RADBURN COURT	GORA	1967	Mark 70 - MU	C
3 RADBURN COURT	CHERNOMORDIK/RAKHOVSKAYA	1968	Hillcrest DH	C
4 RADBURN COURT	BARBER	1967	Mark 70 - UH	C
5 RADBURN COURT	POSNER	1971	Hillcrest DH	C
6 RADBURN COURT	HANSMAN/HIRONS	1967	Mark 70 - SL	C
7 RADBURN COURT	COLIN	1971	Sturbridge DH	C
8 RADBURN COURT	CHEN/WANG	1967	Mark 70 - TST	C
9 RADBURN COURT	ABRAMMOVICH/KAPLAN	1971	Sturbridge DH	C
10 RADBURN COURT	HOLDSWORTH	1967	Mark 70 - DH	C

3 SCANDIA WAY	BEKLIK	1972	Sturbridge DH	C
8 SCANDIA WAY	VAUGHAN	1973		NC
9 SCANDIA WAY	RABKIN	1973		NC
10 SCANDIA WAY	RITTER	1973		NC
11 SCANDIA WAY	GALL	1973		NC
12 SCANDIA WAY	DYER	1973		NC
13 SCANDIA WAY	MATTA	1973		NC
1 STEVENAGE CIRCLE	KLISE	1971		NC
2 STEVENAGE CIRCLE	KATZ/OSDOBY	1972		NC
3 STEVENAGE CIRCLE	METZGER/SLOAN	1972		NC
4 STEVENAGE CIRCLE	DUBOV	1972		NC
5 STEVENAGE CIRCLE	FETSCH	1971		NC
1 TAPIOLA COURT	WORTHING	1972		NC
2 TAPIOLA COURT	CHANG	1972		NC
3 TAPIOLA COURT	BAKER	1972		NC
4 TAPIOLA COURT	BALL	1972		NC
5 TAPIOLA COURT	PENN	1973		NC
6 TAPIOLA COURT	NESTORIAK	1973		NC
7 TAPIOLA COURT	DITTMANN	1973		NC
8 TAPIOLA COURT	TSAI	1973		NC
9 TAPIOLA COURT	BERNSTEIN	1973		NC
10 TAPIOLA COURT	CHEN	1973		NC
11 TAPIOLA COURT	REIN	1972		NC
12 TAPIOLA COURT	RAISCH	1972	Sturbridge UH	C
13 TAPIOLA COURT	SAMID/PERILLANS	1972		NC
14 TAPIOLA COURT	KOLKER	1972	Sturbridge DH	C
15 TAPIOLA COURT	CRANE	1972		NC
16 TAPIOLA COURT	PHILLIPS	1972	Sturbridge DH	C
17 TAPIOLA COURT	YSERN	1972		NC
1 TEGNER COURT	GERSON/CLARK	1985		NC
2 TEGNER COURT	BURGDORF	1985		NC
3 TEGNER COURT	ZIOMEK/WORTH	1985		NC
5 TEGNER COURT	SCHNEIDER	1985		NC
6 TEGNER COURT	DAROFF	1985		NC

7 TEGNER COURT	GOBIEN	1985		NC
600 TEGNER WAY	GREENLEE/MERRILL	1985		NC
601 TEGNER WAY	CORTELLESSA	1984		NC
602 TEGNER WAY	NEIL	1985		NC
603 TEGNER WAY	WHALEN	1984		NC
604 TEGNER WAY	MORGAN	1985		NC
605 TEGNER WAY	TURNER	1984		NC
606 TEGNER WAY	DUNMYER	1985		NC
607 TEGNER WAY			Clubhouse	C
1 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	MARTELLA	1973		NC
2 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	MAUST	1973		NC
3 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	BECKER	1973		NC
4 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	BAILEY	1973		NC
5 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	BOKMAN	1973		NC
6 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	POLLACK/ROBERTS	1973		NC
7 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	WALL/ZAHAVI	1973		NC
8 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	SIMHON	1973		NC
9 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	CHAREST	1973		NC
10 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	DWYER	1973		NC
11 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	MILLER	1973	Sturbridge DH	C
12 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	RHODEN	1973		NC
13 VALLINGBY CIRCLE	HEIDLER	1973		NC
3 WATCHWATER COURT	DHEENAN/SHETTY	1968	Mark 70 - DH	C
4 WATCHWATER COURT	GURESITZ/ROEMER	1968	Mark 70 - DH	C
5 WATCHWATER COURT	MATULKA/NICELY	1968	Hillcrest DH	C
6 WATCHWATER COURT	RODRIGUEZ	1968	Hillcrest DH	C
7 WATCHWATER COURT	BOYCE	1968	Mark 70 - DH	C
8 WATCHWATER COURT	LIPSON	1968	Hillcrest DH	C
1 WATCHWATER WAY	HADDAD/HESELMEYER	1968	Mark 70 - TST	C
2 WATCHWATER WAY	STEMPEL	1968	Mark 70 - MD	C
9 WATCHWATER WAY	KLEIN	1968	Mark 70 - TST	C
10 WATCHWATER WAY	KASSIDAY	1968	Mark 70 - SL	C
11 WATCHWATER WAY	SANTORO	1968	Hillcrest DH	C
12 WATCHWATER WAY	BERSOFSKY	1968	Mark 70 - TST	C

13 WATCHWATER WAY	GROSSMAN	1968	Mark 70 - TST	C
14 WATCHWATER WAY	SPEIS	1968	Hillcrest DH	C
15 WATCHWATER WAY	LUBELL	1968	Hillcrest UH	C
16 WATCHWATER WAY	WILLIAMS/KERNS	1969	Mark 70 - UH	C
17 WATCHWATER WAY	TSCHAKERT	1968	Hillcrest UH	C
18 WATCHWATER WAY	CORREDERA/METZMAN	1968	Hillcrest UH	C
19 WATCHWATER WAY	STIMLER	1969	Mark 70 - UH	C
20 WATCHWATER WAY	GOLDSTEIN	1968	Mark 70 - UH	C
21 WATCHWATER WAY	KAUFMAN/DUNNING	1968	Mark 70 - UH	C
22 WATCHWATER WAY	CRUCE/STUESSE	1968	Mark 70 - DH	C
23 WATCHWATER WAY	HARGER	1968	Mark 70 - UH	C
9 WELWYN WAY	LOPEZ	1972		NC
10 WELWYN WAY	BREYCHAK	1972		NC
11 WELWYN WAY	NOURI	1972		NC
12 WELWYN WAY	CHAO	1971		NC
13 WELWYN WAY	CURRY	1971		NC
14 WELWYN WAY	PERRY	1971		NC
15 WELWYN WAY	CHENG	1971		NC
16 WELWYN WAY	HEFFERON/MACAYA	1971		NC
17 WELWYN WAY	ASTROVE	1971		NC
18 WELWYN WAY	MORAN	1971		NC
23 WELWYN WAY	O'NEAL	1972		NC
24 WELWYN WAY	PETER/RAKESH	1971		NC
25 WELWYN WAY	TALLEY	1971		NC
100 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GUARDIA	1970	Lakeside Villa	C
102 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GOROKHOV	1970	Lakeside Villa	C
104 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	LEONARD	1970	Lakeside Villa	C
106 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	PICKEL/BARNSTEAD	1970	Lakeside Villa	C
108 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	ROSHAN	1970	Lakeside Villa	C
110 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	JOHNSON	1970	Lakeside Villa	C
112 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	MILLER	1970	Lakeside Villa	C
114 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	ARNOLD	1970	Lakeside Villa	C
116 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	HAUENSTEIN	1971	Lakeside Villa	C
118 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	PROBST	1971	Lakeside Villa	C

120 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	LAZEBNIKOV	1971	Lakeside Villa	C
122 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	ALARID/LAW	1971	Lakeside Villa	C
124 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	HISA	1971	Lakeside Villa	C
126 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	KERNAN	1971	Lakeside Villa	C
128 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GONG	1971	Lakeside Villa	C
130 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	WONG	1971	Lakeside Villa	C
134 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	LEONARD	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
136 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GRANADA/LENIS/LENIS	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
138 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	BACKBAUER/LYNCH	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
140 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	LEVEE	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
142 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SILVERS	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
144 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	WOOD	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
146 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SANDIN	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
148 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GUZIK	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
150 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GOOVAERTS	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
152 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GRUNBERG	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
154 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	ZHANG	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
156 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SCHOFIELD	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
158 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	TOBIASON	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
160 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	LOVE	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
162 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	NICKELS	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
164 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	DEFREYRE/BAKER	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
166 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	EOYANG	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
168 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	LAUFFER	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
170 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	MESMER/OLSEN	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
172 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	BERMAN	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
174 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SILBERFARB	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
176 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SPAK	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
178 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	CHARLES	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
180 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	ROSENBAUM	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
182 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	BROWN	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
184 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	BRUBAKER	1972	Lakeside Villa	C
200 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	ROSHAL/VILENSKIY	1970	Village House - Cluster 1	C
202 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	NANAN	1970	Village House - Cluster 1	C

204 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	ROSENTHAL	1970	Village House - Cluster 1	C
206 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	TETERINA	1970	Village House - Cluster 1	C
208 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	HUNG/HO	1970	Village House - Cluster 1	C
210 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	HARRELL	1970	Village House - Cluster 1	C
212 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	FRANCO/GULICK	1970	Village House - Cluster 1	C
214 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	CABAL	1970	Village House - Cluster 1	C
216 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	LYONS	1970	Village House - Cluster 1	C
218 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	MOLYNEAUX/TIPTON	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
220 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SMITH	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
222 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	AZAMI	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
224 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	HARPER/WOZNY	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
226 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	LUU/BECK	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
228 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	FLYNN	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
230 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	DHEENAN	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
232 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	HEINEMAN/DOBROVOLSKAIA	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
234 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	MENG	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
236 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	KRIMER	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
238 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	CHAITIN	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
240 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	DEPUE/MASSA	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
242 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	HAMPTON/KOCHAN	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
244 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	KING-SHAW	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
246 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	HUNTINGTON	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
248 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	CHI	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
250 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	KOLCHINS	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
252 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	MASON	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
254 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	TANNER/BANG	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
256 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SCHWARTZMAN	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
258 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	MILLER	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
260 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SILVERSMITH/GIESKE	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
262 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	NADJIMOVA	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
264 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	RAVIV	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
266 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	HANGER	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
268 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	CORBETT	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
270 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GALLAWAY	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C

272 NEW MARK ESPLANE	LYUBOVITSKY	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
274 NEW MARK ESPLANE	KORB	1971	Village House - Cluster 1	C
276 NEW MARK ESPLANE	NEWMAN	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
278 NEW MARK ESPLANE	BERNHEIMER	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
280 NEW MARK ESPLANE	FEDLAM	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
282 NEW MARK ESPLANE	LEVINE/BRODSKY	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
284 NEW MARK ESPLANE	YUEN	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
286 NEW MARK ESPLANE	QUINN	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
288 NEW MARK ESPLANE	POURLAFOLLAHI	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
290 NEW MARK ESPLANE	GOLDSTEIN	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
292 NEW MARK ESPLANE	SWAIN/SLOANE	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
294 NEW MARK ESPLANE	COLEMAN	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
296 NEW MARK ESPLANE	CALDERONE	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
297 NEW MARK ESPLANE	BAKU	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
298 NEW MARK ESPLANE	BOUNDS	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
299 NEW MARK ESPLANE	IRIAS-CASTILLO	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
300 NEW MARK ESPLANE	THALMAYER	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
302 NEW MARK ESPLANE	WOOD	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
304 NEW MARK ESPLANE	MILLER	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
306 NEW MARK ESPLANE	FAN	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
308 NEW MARK ESPLANE	ABREAU	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
310 NEW MARK ESPLANE	JONES	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
312 NEW MARK ESPLANE	RUBIN	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
314 NEW MARK ESPLANE	REYNOLDS	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
315 NEW MARK ESPLANE	HEARNE	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
316 NEW MARK ESPLANE	SIDHWANI	1972	Village House - Cluster 1	C
318 NEW MARK ESPLANE	BERKOWITZ/SCOTT	1968	Village House - Cluster 1	C
320 NEW MARK ESPLANE	LEVI	1968	Village House - Cluster 1	C
322 NEW MARK ESPLANE	CULMAN/HOFFMAN	1968	Village House - Cluster 1	C
324 NEW MARK ESPLANE	COKER	1968	Village House - Cluster 1	C
326 NEW MARK ESPLANE	KOLINA/NAZROV	1968	Village House - Cluster 1	C
328 NEW MARK ESPLANE	JORDAN	1969	Village House - Cluster 1	C
330 NEW MARK ESPLANE	JUNG	1969	Village House - Cluster 1	C
332 NEW MARK ESPLANE	KRONENBERG	1969	Village House - Cluster 1	C

334 NEW MARK ESPLANE	MANOLATOS	1969	Village House - Cluster 1	C
336 NEW MARK ESPLANE	WHAUN	1969	Village House - Cluster 1	C
338 NEW MARK ESPLANE	FROST/ROSEN	1969	Village House w/Garage	C
340 NEW MARK ESPLANE	JURVIS	1969	Village House w/Garage	C
342 NEW MARK ESPLANE	HALL	1969	Village House w/Garage	C
400 NEW MARK ESPLANE	GORDON/ALTARAC	1969	Village House w/Garage	C
402 NEW MARK ESPLANE	O'NEAL	1969	Village House w/Garage	C
404 NEW MARK ESPLANE	SEEMANN	1969	Village House w/Garage	C
406 NEW MARK ESPLANE	FISHER	1969	Village House w/Garage	C
500 NEW MARK ESPLANE	RUNDELL/RUNDELL	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
501 NEW MARK ESPLANE	SIROTKIN/RATHBONE	1967	Mark 70 - DH	C
502 NEW MARK ESPLANE	ROGIN	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
503 NEW MARK ESPLANE	COBB	1967	Mark 70 - UH	C
504 NEW MARK ESPLANE	HERRMANN	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
505 NEW MARK ESPLANE	POLSTER	1967	Mark 70 - DH	C
506 NEW MARK ESPLANE	DENTON	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
507 NEW MARK ESPLANE	KOHUT	1968	Mark 70 - MD	C
508 NEW MARK ESPLANE	GIGUERE	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
510 NEW MARK ESPLANE	LEE	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
512 NEW MARK ESPLANE	JACOBS	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
514 NEW MARK ESPLANE	DENNY	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
516 NEW MARK ESPLANE	GOLDMAN/YERICK	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
518 NEW MARK ESPLANE	NELSON/LESTER	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
520 NEW MARK ESPLANE	HIEBERT/TOWNSEND	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
522 NEW MARK ESPLANE	GARLAND/ZULUETA	1968	Village House w/Garage	C
701 NEW MARK ESPLANE	GRANDIN	1971	Mark 70 - MU	C
703 NEW MARK ESPLANE	ZUBER	1969	Mark 70 - MD	C
705 NEW MARK ESPLANE	BELIDA/REBER	1969	Nantucket	C
800 NEW MARK ESPLANE	COHEN	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
802 NEW MARK ESPLANE	RESESDIZ	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
804 NEW MARK ESPLANE	PABST	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
806 NEW MARK ESPLANE	PHILLIPS	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
808 NEW MARK ESPLANE	O'SULLIVAN/SUSLOV	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
810 NEW MARK ESPLANE	KAVSADZE/GORGILADZE	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C

812 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	BRENNER/BROWN	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
814 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	QUARTARARO	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
816 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	BRENNER	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
818 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	CHIAPPA	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
820 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	BROWN/MACHUGA	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
822 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	ZIONS	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
824 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	AMIR	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
826 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GOLDSTEIN/MAIA-NETO	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
828 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	TRAN/PHAM	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
830 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	RUDOLPH/RUDOLPH	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
832 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	KELLEY	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
834 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	WEBER	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
836 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	ADAMS	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
838 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	CROSSLEY	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
840 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	WALLACE	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
842 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GIGAX	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
844 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SCHAMS	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
846 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	TONAT	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
848 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	LAZAROUS	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
850 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	YOUNG	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
852 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	DUNDAS	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
854 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	WEINSTEIN	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
856 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	FELDMAN	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
858 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	CHURCH	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
860 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	KELLER/BOLDEN	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
862 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	BLOOM	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
864 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	LEVENTHAL	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
866 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	DUFOUR	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
868 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	KUSTERER	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
870 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	VAN LOON/MELYNK	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
872 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	ASADOLLAHI/RASHIDAN	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
874 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	OLASKY	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
876 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	BENADI/CHEBLI	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
878 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	MORADI	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C

880 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	PARLATO	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
882 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	EPSTEIN	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
884 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SULLIVAN	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
886 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	KANYENDA	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
888 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	BLISS	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
890 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	COLEMAN	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
892 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	PLOTKIN	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
894 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SHAPES/ZANER	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
896 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	GRAHAM	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
898 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	DAI/ZHANG	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
900 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	CHEN/MA	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C
902 NEW MARK ESPLANADE	SIGMOND	1973	Village House - Cluster 2	C



M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Evans & Coakley

Apr. 27, 2004

Montgomery SUPD

Entrance from New Mark Esplanade

#1 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0001. TIF

M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Evans & Coakley

Apr. 3, 2004

Montgomery SUPD

Entrance from New Mark Esplanade and Right-of-way

#2 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0002. TIF



M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2004

Maryland SHPO

Pedestrian Underpass to Monument Park

#3 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 00075.711



M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County

Emily Connors

March 31, 2004

Maryland SHPO

Pedestrian Path

#4 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 00075.711



M2640

607 Tegner Way, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

Apr 3, 2014

Montgomery SPO

607 Tegner Way, Clushouse

#5 of 16

MD - Montgomery County, New Mark Commons - U. 0006.71F



M-2640

607 Tegner Way, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

Apr 3, 2014

Montgomery SPO

607 Tegner Way, Clushouse and Pool

#6 of 16

MD - Montgomery County, New Mark Commons - U. 0006.71F



M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

Tennis Courts

#7 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons #D-0007, TIF

M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

Playground

#2 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons #D-0007, TIF



New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Conroy

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

Basketball Court

#9 of 46

MD- Montgomery County, NewMark Commons, HD 0009, TIF

M: 20-410

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Conroy

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

Watchtower Way

#10 of 46

MD- Montgomery County, NewMark Commons HD 0009, TIF



M:26-40

New Mark Connors

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Mayland SHFD

Lakeside Overlook

#11 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Connors HD - 0011.tif

M:26-40

New Mark Connors

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Mayland SHFD

Lakeside Overlook

#11 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Connors HD - 0012.tif



M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 28, 2014

Montland SHPO

Farsta Court

#13 of 46

MD-1000

M:26-40

4 Radburn Court, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

Apr 28, 2014

Montland SHPO

41 Radburn Court, New Mark Commons

#14 of 46

MD-1000 Montgomery County, New Mark Commons #0, 0014, 14



M26-00

10 Radburn Court, New Mark Commons
Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Mayland SHPO

10 Radburn Court, Mark 70-04

#15 of 46

MD - Montgomery County, New Mark Commons SHL 0015-11F

M 26-00

10 Lakewood Overlook, New Mark Commons
Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Mayland SHPO

10 Lakewood Overlook, Mark 70-04

#15 of 46

MD - Montgomery County, New Mark Commons SHL 0015-11F



M:26-10

2 Lakeside Court, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Mayland SHPO

2 Lakeside Court, Mark 70-MD

#17 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD. 0017. TIF

M:26-10

6 Radburn Court, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Mayland SHPO

6 Radburn Court, Mark 70-SL

#18 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD. 0018. TIF



M121-40

8 Radburn Court, New Mark Commons
Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

8 Radburn Court, Mark Commons

#19 of 46

MD - Montgomery County NewMark Commons SHPO_0019.TIF

M121-41

11 Farsta Court, New Mark Commons
Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

11 Farsta Court, NewMark Commons

#20 of 46

MD - Montgomery County NewMark Commons SHPO_0020.TIF



M:26-40

2 Farsta Court, New Mark Commons
Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

2 Farsta Court, Starbridge Dr

#21 of 216

MD - Montgomery County - NewMark Commons HD_0021.TIF

M:26-40

705 New Mark Esplanade, New Mark Commons
Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

705 New Mark Esplanade, Nantucket

#22 of 416

MD - Montgomery County - NewMark Commons HD_0022.TIF



M:26-40

3 Radburn Court, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPD

3 Radburn Court, Hillcrest Dr

#23 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0023.tif

M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

March 27, 2014

Maryland SHPD

Steps to Lake New Mark between 122 and 126 New
Mark Esplanade

#24 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0024.tif



H:25-45

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

March 27, 2014

Maryland SHPO

View of Lake New Mark and Lakeside Villas from Steps

#25 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - NewMark Commons HD - 0025.tif

H:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

March 27, 2014

Maryland SHPO

View of Lake New Mark and Lakeside Villas from Steps

#26 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - NewMark Commons HD - 0026.tif



M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Common

March 27, 2014

Maryland SHPO

View of Lake New Mark and Lakeside Villas from Steps

#27 of 46

MD: Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0027.tif

M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Common

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

Pedestrian Bridge over Lake New Mark

#28 of 46

MD: Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0028.tif



M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Commons

March 27, 2014

Maryland SHPO

View of Lake New Mark and Lakeside Villas from
Pedestrian Bridge

#29 of 46

MD-Montgomery County-New Mark Commons HD-0029.tif

M:26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Commons

March 27, 2014

Maryland SHPO

View of Lake New Mark and Lakeside Villas from New
Mark Esplanade

#30 of 46

MD-Montgomery County-New Mark Commons HD-0030.tif



M-26-40

New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emilio Commons

April 13, 2011

Maryland SHPO

View of Lake New Mark and Lakeside Villas from New
Mark Esplanade

#31 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HL-0031, TIF

M-26-40

171 New Mark Esplanade, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emilio Commons

April 13, 2011

Maryland SHPO

170-171 New Mark Esplanade, Lakeside Villas

#32 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HL-0032, TIF



M:26-40

520-522 New Mark Esplanade, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Commons

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

520-522 New Mark Esplanade, Village Houses with Garages

#33 of 40

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0033.TIF

M:26-41

400-400 New Mark Esplanade, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Commons

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

400-400 New Mark Esplanade, Village Houses with Garages

#31 of 40

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0034.TIF



M126-40

300-314 New Mark Esplanade, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connor

March 27, 2004

Maryland SPO

300-314 New Mark Esplanade, Village Houses - Cluster 1

#35 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0030, ITF

M126-40

200-210 New Mark Esplanade, New Mark

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connor

April 3, 2004

Maryland SPO

200-210 New Mark Esplanade, Village Houses - Cluster 1

#36 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0030, ITF



1526-40

228-246 New Mark Esplanade, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connor

April 3, 2014

Maryland SHPO

228-246 New Mark Esplanade, Village Houses - Cluster 1

#37 & 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0031, TIF

1526-40

812-820 New Mark Esplanade, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connor

March 27, 2014

Maryland SHPO

812-820 New Mark Esplanade, Village Houses - Cluster 1

#38 & 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0038, TIF



M:26-40

824-836 New Mark Esplanade, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connor

April 3, 2019

Maryland SHPO

824-836 New Mark Esplanade, Village Houses - Cluster 2

#39 of 46

Mt. Montgomery County, New Mark Commons SHD. 0839.11F

M:26-43

878-902 New Mark Esplanade, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connor

March 27, 2019

Maryland SHPO

878-902 New Mark Esplanade, Village Houses - Cluster 2

#40 of 46

Mt. Montgomery County, New Mark Commons SHD. 0840.11F



M126-40

Tapia Court, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 28, 2014

Maryland SHPO

8-10 Tapia Court, Non-contributing

#41 of 46

HD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0041.TIF

M126-40

12 Vallyngby Circle, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 28, 2014

Maryland SHPO

12 Vallyngby Circle, non-contributing

#12 of 16

HD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0042.TIF



H:20-40

Tegner Court, New Mark Commons
Montgomery County, Maryland.

Emily Carnas

April 28, 2014

Maryland SPO

1-B Tegner Court, Non-contributing

#43 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - CC13, TIF

H:26-01

607 Tegner Way, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Carnas

April 28, 2014

Maryland SPO

606 Tegner Way, Non-contributing

#41 of 46

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - CC13, TIF



M:26-40

Harlow Court, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 28, 2014

Maryland SPO

Harlow Court, non-contributing

#15 of 416

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0015.TIF - 5

M:26-40

7 Cumberland Court, New Mark Commons

Montgomery County, Maryland

Emily Connors

April 28, 2014

Maryland SPO

7 Cumberland Court, non-contributing

#416 of 416

MD - Montgomery County - New Mark Commons HD - 0016.TIF