

**DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND  
OFFICE OF ZONING HEARING EXAMINER**

**APPEAL OF DECISION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION RE:  
CLASSIFICATION OF MARCHÉ FLORISTS BUILDING (HISTORIC RESOURCE 68-  
041-03) AND ITS ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AS A HISTORIC SITE**

Appellant: Barbara Johnson t/a White Anjelica, LLC  
Opposition: None  
Hearing Date: April 15, 2014  
Hearing Examiner: Joyce B. Nichols  
Recommendation: Approval of Classification with Conditions

**NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS**

- (1) The instant action involves the appeal of the Decision of the Historic Preservation Commission (“the HPC”) to amend the Prince George’s County Historic Sites and Districts Plan by designating the Marché Florists Building (Historic Resource 68-041-03) and its Environmental Setting as a Historic Site in the Plan’s Inventory of Historic Sites. (2010 Historic Sites and Districts Plan, p. 144)
- (2) On October 17, 2013 the Applicant applied for a building permit (37181-2013-CU-00) for interior demolition and window replacement for the subject property, being approximately 37,814 sq. ft. of land in the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone and identified as 4800 Rhode Island Avenue, Hyattsville, Maryland. (Exhibit 2) The Applicant purchased the subject property in March, 2013.
- (3) This building permit application triggered a Historic Resource evaluation and public hearing before the Historic Preservation Commission. At the request of HPC Staff, on November 10, 2013 the Applicant submitted a Request for Historic Site Evaluation for the subject property. (Exhibit 5) §29-118
- (4) On December 17, 2013, the HPC conducted a public hearing on the Applicant’s Request for Historic Site Evaluation for Historic Resource 68-041-03. At the conclusion of the public hearing the HPC voted 8-0-1 to designate the Marché Florists Building as a Historic Site. (Exhibit 16)
- (5) The HPC’s written Decision (Exhibit 16) was issued December 23, 2013 and the Appellant noted her appeal of this Decision on January 7, 2014 to the Office of the Zoning Hearing Examiner. (Exhibit 18)

## **FINDING OF FACTS**

### **Background**

(1) The Marché Florists Building (Historic Resource 68-041-03), was surveyed and documented by EHT Tracerics, Inc., in 2009 (Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties form 68-041-03, October 2009). Based on that documentation, the property was included as a proposed Historic Resource in the September 2009 Staff Draft of the Historic Sites and Districts Plan Amendment and in the December 2009 Preliminary Historic Sites and Districts Plan. The Prince George's County Planning Board and Prince George's County District Council held a Joint Public Hearing on the Historic Sites and Districts Plan on January 19, 2010. All affected property owners and municipalities, among other groups, received written notice of the Joint Public Hearing. No written or oral testimony was received from the then-owners of the Marché Florists Building, the City of Hyattsville, or any interested parties as part of the record of the Joint Public Hearing regarding the designation for the Marché Florists Building as an historic resource. The District Council did not receive written or oral testimony from the property owners, the City of Hyattsville or any other interested party about the property before its adoption of the Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan on June 8, 2010. The property has been included as a Historic Resource in the Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan since June 8, 2010.

(2) The Marché House was identified as a contributing property within the Hyattsville National Register Historic District in 1982 and was designated as a Prince George's County Historic Site with the 2010 Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan. In 2004, because it was by then more than 50 years old (53) and could be evaluated for contributing status, the Marché Florists Building was evaluated and identified as a contributing property within the Hyattsville National Register Historic District as amended and expanded. The 2004 amendment to the Hyattsville National Register Historic District, which included commercial structures along the U.S. Route 1 Corridor, was funded and administered by the City of Hyattsville. The revised nomination was recommended for listing by both the Historic Preservation Commission and the County Executive in compliance with Certified Local Government (CLG) regulations.

### **Description**

(3) The Marché Florists Building is a one-and-two- story commercial building of masonry construction built in 1951 and enlarged with two additions completed by 1957. The primary historical focus of the structure is the one-story storefront with large plate glass display windows. Attached to the south end of the storefront is a masonry, metal, and glass greenhouse, accessible from the shop that was part of the first phase of construction. The original storefront (1951), which includes a central entry, is a slightly chamfered projection; the addition to the north (1957) extends the storefront and is slightly recessed from the original block. In addition to elongating the building's presence on the street, the storefront addition to the north provides additional retail space and a secondary single-door entry from the adjacent parking area. The westernmost

additions to the building include the two-story office section which begins at the brick chimney on the south side of the original building.

(4) The primary architectural focus of the composition is the storefront/greenhouse element of the building, which is designed for product display and to be readily visible to automobile traffic. The storefront itself is a one-story horizontal composition of large plate glass windows with simple metal frames flanking an all-glass centered double-door entry facing Rhode Island Avenue. The detailing of the original storefront is extended across the addition to the north; this detailing wraps around the northeast corner and extends the storefront and greenhouse as a visual focus of the building. The large plate-glass storefront windows are surmounted by retractable canvas awnings. The storefront portions of the building are sheathed with a random-ashlar cut stone veneer that frames the large display windows; the entire storefront cornice is sheathed a single color of red-brown brick, which originally served as the background for applied aluminum signage (since removed) facing Rhode Island Avenue. The brick sign panel/cornice and stone storefront below are separated by a simple horizontal metal band cornice which also wraps around the northeast corner of the building. The masonry base of the attached greenhouse is sheathed with the same brick as the storefront; the corners of the greenhouse are sheathed with the same random-ashlar stone used as quoining on the most visible corners of the greenhouse. The greenhouse includes outside entrances; one in a small front-gable projection facing Rhode Island Avenue, the other faces south to Crittenden Street. Both entries have small canted hoods with decorative scroll supports.

(5) The secondary elements of the overall composition include the portions of the storefront further away from Rhode Island Avenue. These areas are executed in painted concrete block and are considerably less detailed than the storefront/greenhouse. Like the more formal portions of the building, the secondary areas also have flat or shallow roofs concealed by simple parapets. The secondary elements of the north elevation include two large windows. Smaller than the storefront plate glass windows, the windows of the north elevation are large enough to provide views of the shop interior, although here the fenestration is separated to include combinations of small panes at the outside edges and larger ones at the center, all fixed, in a balanced arrangement. The two-story office addition that is the westernmost element of the building includes a large multi-light metal window at the first story on the south and smaller multi-light metal windows at the second story in several locations. The eastern “storefront” portion of the building has a flat roof drained with external scuppers and downspouts; the two-story office wing to the west is covered with a shallow west-sloping shed roof concealed on the north, east and south by an undecorated parapet.

## **Setting**

(6) The Marché Florists Building is located within a 0.868-acre parcel on the west side of Rhode Island Avenue at its intersection with Crittenden Street and 42<sup>nd</sup> Place. The building is located south and east of the Marché House (Historic Site 68-010-62), located at 4200 Crittenden Street. As originally configured, the Marché House and Florists Building were part of the same 3.10-acre parcel used by the Marché family as both a residence and business location. By the late 1930's, the property included the 1932 Marché dwelling, a large greenhouse adjacent to it,

and by the late 1930s, a small shop at the Rhode Island Avenue corner. The original small shop was replaced by the current Marché Florists Building in 1951. In 1959 a 0.6204-acre portion of the larger parcel including the florists building was subdivided by Augusta Marché and deeded to her children. This lot was subsequently enlarged to include all commercially zoned property associated with the business and now includes 0.868 acres. The Florists Building is fronted by a stone terrace/podium with low retaining stone walls that lead to the main entrance; the front of the property includes both lawn and plantings that frame the approach to the building. The stone used for the entry features is the same as that used on the building itself, and serves to tie the landscaped front yard to the structure.

### **History and Significance**

(7) The Marché Florists Building is the retail component of a significant commercial enterprise in the City of Hyattsville and in Prince George's County. The Florists Building is the commercial face of the Marché family enterprise that began on this site in 1915 and lasted until the mid-1980s. Originally, the Marché's shop was located in downtown Washington, D.C. After the death of firm's founder William Marché in 1919, the company was run by the matriarch of the family, William's widow Augusta. In 1922, Augusta Marché moved retail operations to Hyattsville and it was under Augusta's leadership that both the current Marché House and the Marché Florists Building were built. The company and the buildings are an excellent example and tangible reminder of one of the county's earliest and most successful woman-owned businesses. Under Augusta Marché's leadership and vision, the business would expand and thrive to become one of the most prosperous and well-known florists in Prince George's County. Marché Florists was operated by the Marché siblings until the death of Louise Marché in 1986. T.p. 34

### **Marché Property**

(8) Although the property's greenhouse near Decatur Street no longer stands, the Marché family dwelling and its associated mid-century retail structure remain intact and essentially unaltered. Both buildings are significant as the work of an important local architect. The two buildings should be understood for their relationship to one another, and as a reflection of evolving artistic and architectural tastes from the 1930s to the 1950s. The differences between the Marché House and the Marché Florists Building should be read as conscious aesthetic decisions made by client and architect. The aesthetic and artistic expressions are a reflection of their time, place and concepts of commercial viability. The high-style Colonial/Georgian Revival dwelling, completed in 1932 using Earley Studios technologies, is near the center of the Marché property. In the early years of their operations in Hyattsville, the Marché's maintained a large greenhouse adjacent to their residence. The west wing of the dwelling served as a shop, with refrigeration equipment in the basement. Fire insurance maps indicate that by the late 1930s, the property also included a small frame retail stand at the southeast corner of the property at Rhode Island Avenue.

(9) By 1950, with the success of their retail operations, the Marché's once again relied on the architectural services of family friend John Robie Kennedy to provide them with a commercial building suitable for U.S. Route 1, the bustling commercial corridor of post-World War II Hyattsville. Kennedy's design included a storefront with large display windows and an attached greenhouse; the freestanding building sited at a prominent intersection, displays the tenets of what is now known as the "Mid-century Modern" style that emphasized streamlined design, (sometimes employing various forms of metals, porcelain panels and large expanses of glass contrasted with rustic and textured materials such as stone, cast stone and brick), roadside visibility, and substantial product display opportunities to attract passing motorists. The stone elements of the Marché Florists Building exterior are used within the showroom as well to frame show windows, define the interior public spaces and blur the traditional distinction between outdoors and indoors. Kennedy's design is a skilled and successful arrangement of materials and design and the result is a notable local example of the commercial concerns and architectural expression embodied by the Mid-century Modern Style.

### **John Robie Kennedy and John Earley Studios**

(10) John Robie Kennedy (1881-1966) designed both Marché House and the Marché Florists Building. A friend of the Marché family, Kennedy had a long and varied practice both in Washington, D.C., and for a time in Raleigh, North Carolina.<sup>1</sup> After completing his education at the University of Alabama and the University of Illinois, Kennedy began his career as a draftsman (1904-1920) in the Office of the Supervising Architect (a department of the U.S. Treasury Department). Following three years in the office of Washington, D.C., architect Frederick B. Pyle, Kennedy became a principal in Wilson, Berryman & Kennedy (1923-1926) in Raleigh. From 1927-1932, Kennedy was employed by the Washington, D.C., firm of Murphy & Olmsted. From 1932-1936, Kennedy returned to the Office of the Supervising Architect, where he designed the Gold Bullion Depository at Fort Knox (completed 1936) before renewing his affiliation with Frederick Murphy (1936-1937). From 1937-1946 Kennedy was employed by the U.S. Government's War Department. Kennedy's sometime employer, Frederick V. Murphy (1879-1958) was the founder and long-time head of the Catholic University School of Architecture and frequently worked in collaboration with John Joseph Earley (1881-1945) and with his pioneering exposed-aggregate concrete technology. Kennedy's affiliation with John Joseph Earley and Earley Studios appears to have begun as early as 1927 through his work with Murphy & Olmsted and lasted until John Earley's death in 1945. Throughout his years in Washington and even while employed by the Federal government, Kennedy undertook private commissions such as his work for John Earley, Augusta Marché's and others.

(11) The work of Earley Studios can be found at significant public and private commissions across the United States. Notable applications of the structural and decorative technique can be found at the Bahai Temple, Wilmette, Illinois (designed by Jean-Baptiste Louis Bourgeois [(1856-1930) (Earley Studios involvement began in 1931)], and locally at Meridian Hill Park, a National Historic Landmark (1912-1936, George Burnap. Landscape Architect and Horace Peaslee, Architect); the apse, transept and domes of the Shrine of the Sacred Heart, Washington,

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Esther Marché McVey (1911-2004), Kennedy was a friend of the family, Oral Interview, October 1988.

D.C., (Murphy & Olmsted, 1922), the entry ceilings at the U.S. Department of Justice (M.B. Medary, Jr., completed 1935). Earley and Kennedy collaborated on a number of institutional and residential commissions in and around Washington, D.C., including the Marché House (J.R. Kennedy and Earley Studios, 1932), a group of “polychrome houses” in Silver Spring, Maryland (1934-1935, Polychrome House No. 1 was designed by Kennedy in 1934 and served as the model for the other four to be completed), and the Dr. M.S. Fealy House, Washington, D.C., (John Robie Kennedy, 1935). Although not associated with Kennedy, the other local notable work by Earley Studios is Peace Cross in Bladensburg (1919-1925).

### **Integrity and Degree of Alteration**

(12) The Marché Florists Building retains a high level of integrity of location, setting, workmanship, feeling and association by virtue of its largely intact condition. With the exception of the removal of the original aluminum signage at the storefront parapet, all original exterior architectural features and details are intact and in good condition. The removal of the original signage, likely a function of the cessation of the original use, is not considered to have a negative effect on the overall integrity of the building.

### **Frequency and Scarcity**

(13) The Marché Florists Building is a rare architect-designed, purpose-built, commercial building in Prince George’s County constructed in the mid-twentieth century. It is an early and excellent example of a thriving woman-owned business whose success, achievements and taste are manifest in the building complex Augusta Marché created in collaboration with her architect, John Robie Kennedy. Although there are a number of “Mid-century Modern” architect-designed schools and churches in Prince George’s County that reflects the county’s significant growth in the years after World War II, the Marché Florists Building is the only known architect-designed commercial building from this period.

(14) The Applicant Ms. Barbara Johnson testified that with the exception of a “bumpout” on the roof line to accommodate a Code requirement for the staircase, no other external architectural changes are planned which would be in conflict with the historic appearance of the subject property. T.p. 39-41

(15) Ms. Johnson stated that between 1,200 and 1,500 sq. ft. of the approximately 4,941 sq. ft. main floor would be occupied by a pizzeria and the remainder, including the greenhouse, would be occupied by Art Works. T.p. 58 The approximately 752 sq. ft. second floor would be utilized for offices and storage for Art Works and would be an area into which the general public would not be invited.<sup>2</sup> T.p. 62-64

---

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Howard Berger, Supervisor, Historic Planning Section, MNCP&PC, stated that the Historic Preservation Commission worked closely with applicants to meet ADA regulations while maintaining the character of historic structures. T.p. 45-47

(16) Mr. Mark McInturff, accepted as an expert witness in the field of architecture, testified on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. McInturff opined that the construction and operation of the subject business and property from approximately 1950-1985 by a woman owned business was not a sufficient example of “the cultural, economic, social, political, or historic heritage of the County.”<sup>3</sup> T.p. 79-80 §29-104(a)(1)(A)(iv) Mr. McInturff admitted that he did not know how many commercial businesses in Prince George’s County in the 1950’s were owned and operated by women.

(17) Mr. McInturff conceded that the architectural design of the subject structure embodies the “modern movement”. T.p. 80 §29-104(a)(2)(A)(1) He also admitted that the only example of this movement in the general area of the Route 1 corridor of Hyattsville is the Lustine showroom. T.p. 87

(18) Mr. McInturff opined that “a building being–having been designed by an architect is not all that unique”. T.p. 80 Upon further examination Mr. McInturff admitted that he did not know how many commercial structures constructed in Prince George’s County in the 1950’s were designed by an architect. T.p. 80-86 “I probably have no better record than Mr. Berger about how many buildings are designed by architect in Prince George’s County”. T.p. 82

(19) Mr. McInturff stated that he had not heard of the architect John Robie Kennedy prior to this project. T.p. 88 §29-104(a)(2)(A)(ii)

(20) Mr. McInturff opined that the subject structure has “a fairly clumsy composition but admitted that the National Register of Historic Districts found the structure to have retained “moderate integrity”. T.p. 89 Mr. McInturff could produce no pictorial examples of “classic styles of mid-modern” in Prince George’s County but stated that Leland Memorial Hospital was an example of mid-century modernism, as are three Edward Durrell Stone designed buildings which were constructed in the mid 1960’s as part of Prince George’s Plaza. T.p. 92-93

(21) Exhibits 33(a)-(e) are pictures of nationally recognized mid-century modern, architect designed (including one by a protégée of Frank Lloyd Wright) buildings, none of which are located in Maryland and all of which are considered noteworthy by Mr. McInturff. “I think all those architects had established a body of work in the mid-century style so that as they were building on their own kind of work – and I think that John Robie Kennedy built one of those buildings. I think it came out okay ... but there’s just a difference”. T.p. 95 §29-104(a)(2)(A)(iii) All of these structures are well in excess of the 2,000 sq. ft. size of the subject structure, and were designed by nationally recognized architects. Thus these examples are not appropriate to compare with the subject property.

(22) Prince George’s County’s root are those of a rural Farming community, parts of which morphed into a bedroom community for Washington, D.C. particularly in the years following WWII. §29-104 requires recognition of these antecedents and does not require that a structure must be of national significance in order to be maintained. Neither Frank Lloyd Wright nor any other nationally recognized architect designed structures in the County and therefore the burden

---

<sup>3</sup> This is ironic as the Applicant was quick to point out that both Art Works and Pizza Paradiso are woman owned businesses as if this status should accord them special consideration.

of proof is set far below that exposed by Mr. McInturff. If Mr. McInturff's standard is accepted then no architecture in Prince George's County is worthy of saving and the County's architectural history will be lost.

(23) Mr. McInturff is obviously a respected architect with knowledge of notable architectural throughout the United States but his particular or specialized knowledge of Prince George's County, which is the basis for his expert opinions solicited in this matter, is limited to "having practiced here and taught here and lived here." T.p. 84 He admits that he has no specialized knowledge of Prince George's County, which is required to give opinions which can be accorded a greater weight than that of a lay person.

**APPLICABLE LAW**

(1) Prior to designation of an unclassified Historic Resource as a classified Historic Site, the Historic Preservation Commission, and, upon approval, the District Council, must find that the Historic Site satisfies the criteria set forth in §29-104 of the Prince George's County Code, which provides as follows:

(a) In considering unclassified historic resources for classification as Historic Sites or Historic Districts, the following criteria are applicable:

- (1) Historical and Cultural Significance.
  - (A) The historic resource:
    - (i) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the County, State, or Nation;
    - (ii) Is the site of a significant historic event;
    - (iii) Is identified with a person or a group of persons who influenced society; or
    - (iv) Exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, political, or historic heritage of the County and its communities.

- (2) Architectural and Design Significance.
  - (A) The historic resource:
    - (i) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction;
    - (ii) Represents the work of a master craftsman, architect or builder;
    - (iii) Possesses high artistic values;
    - (iv) Represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
    - (v) Represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or County, due to its singular physical characteristics or landscape.

(b) If the historic resource meets any of the criteria noted above, it may be classified as a Historic Site or Historic District.

(2) Any person of record not satisfied with the decision of the Historic Preservation Commission may appeal pursuant to §29-119 of the County code which provides, in pertinent part:

The hearing before the Zoning Hearing Examiner shall be a de novo hearing and shall be held in accordance with Section 27-129. After the close of the hearing record, the Zoning Hearing Examiner shall file a written recommendation with the District Council. All persons of record shall be given at least ten (10) days written notice by the Clerk of the Council of the date and time of the District Council's consideration of the matter. Any person of record may appeal the recommendation of the Zoning Hearing Examiner within



fifteen (15) days of the filing of the Zoning Hearing Examiner's recommendation with the District Council. If appealed, all persons of record may testify before the District Council. Persons arguing shall adhere to the District Council's Rules of Procedure, and argument shall be limited to thirty (30) minutes for each side, and to the record of the hearing. The recommendation of the Zoning Hearing Examiner and the decision of the District Council shall be based upon Section 29-104(a), the Historic Sites and Districts criteria, as well as the record submitted by the Historic Preservation Commission and any additional evidence submitted before the Zoning Hearing Examiner. Any party wishing to submit a transcript of the testimony taken before the Historic Preservation Commission shall be required to pay the costs thereof. §29-119(e)(3)

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

- (1) As the retail outlet of an important local, family-owned and woman-owned floral business, the Marché Florists Building exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, political, or historic heritage of the County and its communities (Hyattsville). §29-104(a)(1)(A)(iv)
- (2) As a rare example of an architect-designed commercial building in the county, the design, form and decorative features of the Marché Florists Building embody the distinctive characteristics of the Modern Movement in commercial architecture of the post-World War II period. §29-104(a)(2)(A)(i)
- (3) As the work of John Robie Kennedy (1881-1966), an important Washington, D.C. architect, the Marché Florists Building represents the work of a master craftsman, architect or builder. §29-104(a)(2)(A)(ii)
- (4) Based on the faceted form of the main block and subservient massing of other elements, the expanses of plate glass anchored by the rustic stone podium, and the sheathing of elongated Roman bricks and ashlar stone veneer, which continues to the interior to meet slabs of black marble and polished travertine, the Marché Florists Building possesses high artistic value. §29-104(a)(2)(A)(iii)
- (5) Located on the west side of U.S. Route 1 (Rhode Island Avenue) in Hyattsville, one of the county's principal commercial corridors and the prominent intersection of Rhode Island Avenue, 42<sup>nd</sup> Place and Crittenden Street, the Marché Florists Building has been an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood since its completion in the 1950s. §29-104(a)(2)(A)(v)
- (6) Designation as a Historic Site does not preclude the approval by the Historic Preservation Commission of compatible new additions or modifications that enhance the utility of the property. In its review process, the HPC must invoke specific criteria for the approval of a Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) required to make alterations to a Historic Site (Subtitle 29-111). These criteria provide a reasoned basis of the review and approval of an application but do not provide specific design direction. To further frame its review of a HAWP application, the HPC has adopted the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, a set of preservation standards promulgated by the National Park Service, and widely used across the country by local

jurisdictions in the review and approval of applications affecting regulated properties. The Standards are summary statements with general application. To address a range of specific issues, the National Park Service has produced a series of technical papers designed to address common issues affecting historic properties. One such document, Preservation Brief 14, *New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns*, can be consulted for general guidance on the issue of compatibility of new additions:

There is no formula or prescription for designing a new addition that meets the Standards. A new addition to a historic building that meets the Standards can be any architectural style—traditional, contemporary or a simplified version of the historic building. However, there must be a balance between differentiation and compatibility in order to maintain the historic character and the identity of the building being enlarged. New additions that too closely resemble the historic building or are in extreme contrast to it fall short of this balance. Inherent in all of the guidance is the concept that an addition needs to be subordinate to the historic building.

A new addition must preserve significant historic materials, features and form, and it must be compatible but differentiated from the historic building. To achieve this, it is necessary to carefully consider the placement or location of the new addition, and its size, scale and massing when planning a new addition. To preserve a property's historic character, a new addition must be visually distinguishable from the historic building. This does not mean that the addition and the historic building should be glaringly different in terms of design, materials and other visual qualities. Instead, the new addition should take its design cues from, but not copy, the historic building.

(7) Preservation Brief 14 more specifically addresses the issue of rooftop additions and provides the following guidance:

The guidance provided on designing a compatible new addition to a historic building applies equally to new rooftop additions. A rooftop addition should preserve the character of a historic building by preserving historic materials, features and form; and it should be compatible but differentiated from the historic building.

However, there are several other design principles that apply specifically to rooftop additions. Generally, a rooftop addition should not be more than one story in height to minimize its visibility and its impact on the proportion and profile of the historic building. A rooftop addition should almost always be set back at least one full bay from the primary elevation of the building, as well as from the other elevations if the building is free-standing or highly visible.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to minimize the impact of adding an entire new floor to relatively low buildings, such as small-scale residential or commercial structures, even if the new addition is set back from the plane of the façade. Constructing another floor on top of a small, one, two or three-story building is seldom appropriate for buildings of this size as it would measurably alter the building's proportions and profile, and negatively impact its historic character. On the other hand, a rooftop addition on an eight-story building, for

example, in a historic district consisting primarily of tall buildings might not affect the historic character because the new construction may blend in with the surrounding buildings and be only minimally visible within the district. A rooftop addition in a densely-built urban area is more likely to be compatible on a building that is adjacent to similarly-sized or taller buildings.

A number of methods may be used to help evaluate the effect of a proposed rooftop addition on a historic building and district, including pedestrian sight lines, three-dimensional schematics and computer-generated design. However, drawings generally do not provide a true “picture” of the appearance and visibility of a proposed rooftop addition. For this reason, it is often necessary to construct a rough, temporary, full-size or skeletal mockup of a portion of the proposed addition, which can then be photographed and evaluated from critical vantage points on surrounding streets.

(8) Significant local, State, and Federal programs are in place to encourage the rehabilitation of historic properties. These incentives can be combined to provide maximum leverage for private funds to rehabilitate the building. The designation of the Marché Florists Building as a contributing structure in the Hyattsville National Register District provides eligibility for certified rehabilitation expenses through: (1) a 20% Federal income tax credit and (2) a 20% refundable (no liability required) Maryland State income tax credit. Additionally, the designation of Marché Florists as a Prince George’s County Historic Site provides eligibility for certified rehabilitation expenses through: (1) a 25% credit on Prince George’s County property taxes; and (2) up to \$100,000 in grants via the Historic Property Grant Program.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the record submitted by the HPC and addressed during the evidentiary hearing before the ZHE, and in consideration of the criteria established in §24-104(a), this Examiner recommends that the District Council approve the designation of the Marché Florists Building and its Environmental Setting as a Historic Site with the following conditions:

1. Designation as a Historic Site does not preclude the approval by the HPC of compatible new additions that enhance the utility and adaptive reuse of the property. The following additions/alternations to the Marché Florists Building, if proposed, shall be reviewed and approved by the HPC:
  - A second-story, one-level addition that is horizontal in character and is set back from the façade to the juncture of the brick/stone elevations and the cement block portion of the building.
  - A two-story, at-grade addition directly west of the greenhouse;
  - A one-story, at-grade addition on the building’s north elevation west of the existing storefront entry door.

2. Additions shall take their design cues from, but not copy, the historic building and shall not obscure its features. Additions may be contemporary or a simplified version of the historic building and shall be subordinate in massing and character to the historic building. New additions in extreme contrast to the historic building shall not be approved. All proposed building additions/alterations must comply with the HPC's requirement for Historic Area Work Permits as set forth in Section 29-107 and shall be approved under the criteria set forth in Section 29-111 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.