The following column of news and personal opinion will be a regular feature of PVA.

AREA ACTIVITY

by NEIL R. GREENE, A.I.A.

An urban renewal program, Northwest One, which will eliminate one of Washington's worst slums, has gone before the National Capital Planning Commission for approval. This 89 acre section west of Union Station will be the first city urban renewal project aimed primarily at providing housing for families of low and middle incomes in high rise apartments, walkups and town houses.

Maryland road planners envision a scenic, historical and limited access highway that would run the length of the Chesapeake Bay and would hopefully rival Virginia's Skyline Drive as a tourist attraction. The "Tidewater Drive" would begin around Annapolis and run south along the Bay Shore over the 100 foot cliffs in Calvert County, crossing the Patuxent River at St. Marys and across the Potomac River Bridge to Route 301.

The U.S. Park Service is considering another shoreline parkway along the east side of the Potomac. The long planned "Palisades Parkway" would connect the "Three Sisters Bridge" with the District's Potomac River shoreline. This could eventually be extended past the Woodrow Wilson Bridge toward Fort Washington and beyond.

As the National Capital Region begins to explore the implications and the far reaching effects of the "Year 2000 Plan," two Washington planning groups take on greater significance. The National Capital Regional Planning Council and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments have decided to work together to develop a master plan for the region. Starting this year, the plan will coordinate the planning of the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Northern Virginia Planning Commission and The National Capital Planning Commission (District). It would later be turned over to the council of governments and become a sounding board to test local reaction on various proposals. Montgomery County has been criticized by Frank J. Lastner, chairman of the Prince George's Commissioners for the Montgomery County Council's withdrawal from the Council of Governments. If the council does not reconsider their move it can be detrimental to Washington and the "Year 2000 Plan." It should also be noted that Montgomery County has not supported the National Capital Transportation Agency's plan in whole or part as has N.C.P.C., RLA, Prince George's County, National AIA and the Potomac Valley Chapter AIA to mention a few.

It is ironical that Montgomery County, which privately acknowledges the source of the wealth it accumulates (primarily from the District) further reduces its obligation to the region with negative planning action and responsibility. In a county already beset by exploding suburban sprawl and a lack of planning accomplishments and opportunities recent action should give Montgomery County citizens some second thoughts. It must be realized by Regional Planning groups that Washington's governmental complex is the main reason for this area's growth and its being here. Through the combined efforts of the planning agencies representing governmental and private interests will come recognition of the relative merits of highways, rapid transit, government employment, shopping, recreation, educational centers combined with the aesthetic and social amenities the region demands. The major redevelopment work around the world is being done by architects and planners, and not by the popular recommendations in our counties of highway engineers and sewer consultants.

APRIL MEETING
12 Noon, April 3
Sirloin Inn
Wheaton Plaza Shopping Center
EVENTS and EXHIBITIONS

AIA OCTAGON
Opening April 1
Twelve Churches

NATIONAL HOUSING CENTER
Through March 24
New Techniques in Community Development
Opening March 30
Ikebana — Japanese Flower Arrangement

CORCORAN GALLERY OF ART
Through March 24
Jacob Kainen
Opening March 14
Stephen Greene

WASHINGTON GALLERY OF MODERN ART
Through April 14
Arshile Gorky — A Retrospective Exhibition

PHILLIPS COLLECTION
Through April
Contemporary Abstractions

TEXTILE MUSEUM
Caucasian Carpets
Textiles Found in Egypt
Ancient Peruvian Textiles

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
Through March 21
Intaglio Prints by Cyril
Through March 28
Contemporary German Books
Opening March 19
Photographs by Bert Stern

PAN AMERICAN UNION
Opening March 19
Paintings by Arturo Kubotta

CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS INSTITUTE
March 19, 8:00 p.m., National Housing Center
Hazards and Liabilities of Professional Practice

AIA FELLOWSHIP FOR PAUL H. KEA

The Jury of Fellows has advanced Paul Henton Kea to Fellowship in the Institute. The fellowship has been awarded for Public Service and Service to the Institute. Paul's friends and associates know how truly he deserves this honor as recognition of his long and full career.

Paul was born 77 years ago in Surrey County, Virginia. Beginning in 1937 with the Maryland Society of Architects, he joined with others in the organization of the Washington-Metropolitan Section of the Society and became its president in 1939. In 1944 when the AIA agreed to absorb the membership of the Society, Paul was assigned as a corporate member of the Baltimore Chapter of the AIA. In 1947 he helped with the formation of a branch of the District of Columbia Chapter to be located in Maryland. After years of success in various committees with the Maryland Section of the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter, he was instrumental in founding the Potomac Valley Chapter of Maryland, chartered by the AIA in August 1955. While serving on the first Board of Directors, Paul was appointed chairman of the Registration and Legislation Committee. This assignment was close to his heart and he gave freely of his time in this work throughout the life of the Maryland Society and the Maryland Section of the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter and now with the Potomac Valley Chapter. No man ever worked harder than Paul to enforce the State Registration Law and to prevent passage of legislation weakening it.

Paul Kea was appointed in 1955 to the National Committee for the Preservation of Historic Buildings and is currently serving his third term. In addition to helping stimulate building owners to a greater appreciation of the historic value of their property, he planned and supervised the restoration of the Market Masters House in Bladensburg, Maryland. There are countless other instances in which he has vitally influenced the saving of worthy structures.

Paul has served his community in numerous ways; as a member of the Exchange Club of Prince Georges County, as a member of the Hyattsville Lions Club and in 1939 serving as President of the Prince Georges County Chamber of Commerce. He was appointed in 1937 to the Board of Examiners and Registration of Architects of Maryland.

During World War II Paul served as chairman of the Fuel Oil Panel of the Price and Rationing Board, contributing nearly 3500 hours of his time. During this period he was appointed as Director of Public Works under the Council of Defense of Prince Georges County, again serving the citizens of his community in time of need.

Paul has always been a steadying influence on our young Chapter. We have leaned on him for guidance throughout our existence and he always came forth with sound advice. Almost 40 years ago, I remember gazing fondly at the new "V-16" Marmon auto that my next door neighbor Paul had just driven home; this was a big, beautiful monster that commanded my reverent attention and respect for the man driving it. Today, quite a few years later, I still stand like that little boy looking up to this man who has gained respect of his fellow professionals... TRC Jr.
The following article originated as a radio address on the BBC. While it says nothing new to a professional audience, its lack of jargon and its simple return to, and restatement of the basic problems of the urban traffic situation make it refreshing reading. It is, I think, an ideal introduction to the subject for any concerned layman. Mr. Buchanan is a well known English planner and the author of Mixed Blessings: The Motor in Britain.

Cities in the Motor Age

by COLIN BUCHANAN

No one would question that the use of motor vehicles in towns and cities is presenting many difficulties at the present time. There are the common complaints of congestion and parking difficulties, and there is the less widely recognized effect that traffic is having on life in cities: the accidents, the noise, the fumes, the obscuring of the architecture, and the general sense of confusion and untidiness. Reduced to absolute essentials the 'traffic problem', as it is commonly called, seems to combine two irreconcilable elements—the desire of everyone to go everywhere and do everything by motor vehicle, and the desire to have reasonably safe and stimulating surroundings. What is the secret? How can we have large numbers of vehicles and good surroundings? And make no mistake that the possible total of vehicles is very large indeed, probably at least three times the present number, and this is likely to come about before the end of the century.

One slant on the secret is obtained by seeing what happens when designers get to work on a clear site and start designing for motor traffic from the start. In Stevenage New Town in Hertfordshire, for instance, there are no vehicles at all in the main shopping centre for 80,000 people. There is a pleasant square, and narrow pedestrian shopping ways lead off it. All the parking, good access, and bus stops are to the rear or flanks. The concept of the ordinary shopping street has been abandoned.

If you look at some of the residential areas in the New Towns you feel at first that they are inside out in some curious way, and then you realize that conventional streets with houses each with individual access have given way to layouts which offer far more effective protection to the residents (particularly children) from the danger and nuisance of motor traffic.

Again, if you examine some of the more recent work on New Towns, especially the town centre plans for Cumbernauld New Town in Scotland and the now abandoned project for a new town at Hook in Hampshire, you will find even less resemblance to the conventional town centre: the only thing at ground level is the traffic; the pedestrian circulation and all the shops are placed above the traffic, an effective arrangement for getting the vehicles close to the buildings without interfering with pedestrian access.

These studies of new towns demonstrate the rather startling fact that when one sets out to design deliberately for motor traffic one gets something entirely different from anything we have had before. A new art is being worked out here, the art of arranging buildings for accessibility by vehicles and for good environment and pedestrian freedom. A convenient name for this is 'traffic architecture', and it is a vitally important subject for the future. The truth does seem to be that the motor vehicle is demanding completely novel arrangements of buildings and access ways. It is this which makes the whole subject of traffic in existing towns so difficult; there are no simple remedies such as building urban motor-ways or providing car parks. What is really demanded if we would cope with motor traffic properly is a clean sweep and a fresh start, which is about the one thing we cannot have. There lies our dilemma.

However, there is no reason why we should not make plans for adapting existing towns to motor traffic as far as reasonably possible, the plans to be implemented as resources are available. To understand the kind of plans required it is necessary to understand one or two fundamental things about traffic in towns.

First, apart from through-traffic which goes right across a town and goes that way because there is no other route, all the vehicles in towns are there because of the activities that go on, and for no other reason. Secondly, since all these activities take place in buildings (granted a broad definition of that term to include places like goods yards and depots), it follows that the movements of vehicles must be closely
related to the way the buildings are laid out. A simple village street will produce fairly simple movements, but when you get a city with docks in one part, two or three wholesale markets elsewhere, busy warehouses in several concentrations, railway goods yards from which all the distribution is by road, shops and departmental stores into which large quantities of goods have to be delivered and later taken away, banks to which money is brought in bulk, pubs to which barrels and crates have to be delivered, offices requiring fuel oil and paper and typewriters and supplies for the canteen — when you have all this and much more besides, with the buildings packed close together and mixed up and even piled on top of one another, then the movements become very complex indeed. A criss-cross maze of movement is introduced which is most difficult to discipline. My third point arises directly out of this: motor traffic does not consist of the private motor or 'tin overcoat'; there is in addition a great weight of commercial, industrial, and business traffic — including admittedly the use of many cars — which is now essential to keep towns and cities functioning. Fourthly, I want to emphasize the importance of walking as a means of getting about. It is an indispensable part of the transport system and it is plain common sense that it should take place in reasonable comfort and safety.

How can all these complex movements be sorted out so that access is still possible to the buildings and a good environment is secured as well? The plan must be related to the two kinds of movement that the vehicles make: the longer movements from locality to locality, and the more individual movements when contact is made with buildings. To deal with the latter movements a network of distributory roads is required on to which the movements are channelled. The purpose of this is not only to ease the movement, but also to prevent the traffic charging through the habitable parts of the city. I do not think it is possible to lay down a set pattern for these roads, such as the ring roads so beloved of planners in the immediate post-war period: it depends entirely on the disposition of the buildings and the movements they generate.

The other kind of movement — the contacts with the buildings — must obviously take place within the areas enclosed by the network because that is where the buildings are. This is a different kind of problem. It is traffic architecture par excellence, it is a matter of intricate design so as to ensure that the vehicles can contact the buildings and also that there is a good environment. Within these areas I visualize the traffic being subordinated to the surroundings.

The principle involved here is exactly the same as the design of a large building with corridors and lifts serving the rooms. Every room has its own internal traffic problem but no designer would normally make a room serve as part of the main corridor system as well. But this is exactly what is happening in many parts of towns where shopping streets, for example, also serve as important traffic routes. Oxford Street tries to discharge the two irreconcilable functions of being one of the most popular shopping streets in Europe as well as being a major traffic distributor for London; and at Piccadilly Circus the traffic pours across a space which also tries to serve as a meeting place for multitudes of pedestrians.

There is an important question of capacity involved here. The living-room of a house can hold an extraordinary number of people on some special occasion such as a cocktail party, but for ordinary comfortable use there will be a strict limit. The same applies to the whole house, and the designer ensures that passages and staircases are sensibly related to the capacity of the rooms. Exactly the same applies to designing a town for traffic. There must be a proper relationship between the traffic capacity of the main distributory system and the capacity of the intervening areas (which for convenience I call the 'environmental areas'). It would be unwise, for instance, to redevelop the centre with huge offices and enormous car parks if there were no roads adequate to deal with the cars; and equally unwise to lead in big roads from the suburbs and beyond if there were no place for the traffic to go on arrival.

This leads to the question of the actual capacity. How much traffic ought we to be designing for? My own studies lead me to the conclusion that it may not be a question of how much we ought to design for, but how much we can design for. Consider one of these so-called environmental areas: if it were possible to rebuild it completely, using every technique we know about multi-level circulation, and provided we were ready to accept the new look involved, then it would be possible to have a fine environment and plenty of traffic. Even so it is doubtful whether the full potential demands for traffic in a big city, intensively developed, could be met. An acre of land, for instance, might have 400 people working on it and another 200 visiting it, and if they all wanted to come by car it would require three floors of parking over the whole acre. Add to this the space needed for commercial traffic and for general circulation, and it is obvious that it is more than we are likely to be able to provide. But suppose we could not rebuild the area completely: suppose it had Georgian squares, terraces, character and atmosphere we were not prepared to change, then, if the decencies of environment were to be secured, the amount of traffic would be much less and considerably below the full potential.

Somewhat similar considerations apply to the distributory network. A network of the kind I envisage can only be fashioned by adapting existing roads or carving out new ones, and it would be misleading to suggest that either course is easy or indeed anything but very difficult and extremely expensive. The intersections of such roads are particularly difficult because they absorb a great deal of land. It is not only a matter of expense; it is the fact that buildings and houses
have to disappear for such roads, and their replacement elsewhere is far from easy. So problems of the network may also impose their limitations on traffic. To give an example: if only half the present total number of people who come into central London every day to work declared their intention to travel by private car it is doubtful whether we could contrive a network to enable them to do so: the space requirements would be prohibitive.

The conclusion one reaches is that questions of space and design, and indirectly of cost, seem likely to put a ceiling to the amount of traffic we can have in densely developed areas. If I am right that there are indeed limitations, then obviously something has to give. It cannot be the vital commercial and industrial traffic which keeps the place alive, so I am driven to the conclusion that it is the ‘optional’ traffic that must give; that is to say the traffic for which there is another form of transport available, and which is particularly exemplified in the car-commuters who have the alternative of public transport. I am not seeking to lay down the law about cars in cities; all I am saying is that to attempt to go the whole way for cars, to try to provide for the whole gamut of future increase, and to allow public transport to run down in the process, could produce cities which are no longer cities, but disintegrated sequences of parking lots, highways, and clumps of buildings.

It is in the areas I have described as environmental that the process of urban renewal will provide many opportunities. The capacity of these areas for traffic will depend largely upon our readiness to accept new forms and new looks; while I hope we shall pay all the respect that is due to the good buildings inherited from the past, I also hope we are not going to be frightened of new forms, especially of these ideas of segregating pedestrians from vehicles by different levels. It would be wrong to think of this particular item merely in terms of ‘elevated pedestrian ways,’ or terrifying catwalks, or steep stairs impossible for elderly people or mothers with prams, or bleak windswep ted platforms. If you can let your imagination rove, and provided you are prepared to accept a certain amount of mechanical equipment in the form mainly of escalators, you find this kind of planning presents fascinating possibilities. At the extreme, for instance, if you decked an area above the local traffic, you could build on the deck in forms free from the dictates of the traffic below. You could in fact re-create perfectly many of the things that give us so much pleasure in older towns — narrow ways, contrasting squares, and casual open spaces.

But I do not think continuous decking will often be possible or even wholly desirable. I visualize it much more as a kind of lacework of pavements and squares, generally on a close and intimate scale, with frequent views down to the traffic, because I am sure that most people rather enjoy traffic so long as they are not mixed up with it. The levels, moreover, can be varied a great deal. Sometimes the pedestrians will be up, sometimes down, and where there are older buildings, or groups of buildings, which we want to keep, then normal ground level usage will prevail and small precincts in the proper sense of that term can be introduced. All this, which I call traffic architecture, involves skill in design of a high order. It is designing for movement and circulation with a deliberateness we have seldom attempted before. Yet there is nothing fantastic about it, because designs of this kind are on the drawing boards already — in the Barbican area of the City of London for instance, and in another big scheme at Hammersmith Broadway, and in other places. But this sort of thing cannot be done without comprehensive redevelopment, in the absence of which we are likely to find ourselves restricted in the usage of that machine which has endeared itself to us — the motor vehicle.
Remarks to the Washington Chapter, American Institute of Architects, at a luncheon meeting, February 12, 1963, the Mayflower Hotel, by Knox Banner, Executive Director, DOWNTOWN PROGRESS.

DOWNTOWN PROGRESS

its plans and prospects

DOWNTOWN PROGRESS, as many of you know, is a non-profit corporation formed and financed by Washington businessmen, which has been working in close cooperation with public agencies and with many private organizations since April 1960 to develop and to help carry out a plan for the revitalization of Downtown.

The basic guide for this program of revitalization is the Action Plan for Downtown, which was published in January 1962, and which was prepared by our professional staff of urban renewal administrators, city planners, engineers, and architects, assisted by consultants in market and real estate, economics, opinion research, urban renewal, law, and design, and with the advice and participation of numerous groups and agencies.

I place emphasis on the fact that we are an organization of professionals, and that the Action Plan represents a blending of economic, functional, and design thinking, from the very first day that we started work. The first assignment to our planning designer, Paul Spreiregen, was to study the L'Enfant Plan and the development of Washington, in order to be able to provide a sound basis of historic design continuity for the Downtown plan. We did not wish to be guilty of using the name of L'Enfant in vain. One of the fruits of this research, incidentally was the article on the L'Enfant Plan in the special issue of the A.I.A. Journal on the Nation's Capital which was published in January 1963.

The Action Plan is a sound one based on design, function, and economics.

We are convinced, and this includes the businessmen who are our officers and who make up our executive committee, that the Action Plan is economically sound. This judgment is based on thorough market studies carried out by our consultants and staff and it is being substantiated by the recently increased interest in Downtown being demonstrated by real estate firms, land assemblers, and developers. We feel, therefore, that given the assistance of the urban renewal process, the development goal of $500 million worth of new construction in Downtown will be easily met, and probably exceeded, by 1980 or perhaps by 1975.

We are convinced that the Action Plan is functionally sound. The key factor here is the transportation system that serves people coming to and going from Downtown, by subways, rapid transit buses, and automobiles; and that helps people get around within Downtown. In this respect, a small but important beginning has already been made with the minibus which is now operating on a test basis on F Street.

The Action Plan published in January 1962, described a number of public improvements which could be started, or completed, during 1962-63. Among these are:

- Adoption of the Traffic Plan
- Revision of bus routes
- Development of a demonstration block
- Improvement of pedestrian circulation
- Installation of an internal circulation system
- A construction policy

A public hearing on a Traffic Plan for the central area of Washington, including Downtown, was held by the District Commissioners, on June 18, 1962. The public, in general, endorsed the plan, although the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, by resolution, asked the Commissioners to withhold adoption of the plan. A subsequent hearing on the first stage of this plan — making I and L Streets into a one-way pair — was given strong public backing, and had the support of the District Police and Fire Departments. Actual carrying out of this first stage is still being delayed at the request of the House District Committee.

In conjunction with the proposed staging of the Traffic Plan, the D. C. Transit System has developed new bus routes which will take advantage of improved traffic flow to provide better bus service to Downtown. Carrying out of these new routes and schedules will take place as soon as implementation of the Traffic Plan is begun.

Proposals for two demonstration blocks have been completed. Plans and specifications for physical changes on F Street should be completed this year, with the installation to take place in 1964 as the initial major public improvement under the urban renewal plan. The results of this demonstration will set the stage for additional planned improvements to pedestrian circulation throughout Downtown.

Plans for the first stage of the internal circulation system — a demonstration on F and 7th Streets — have been worked out. A preliminary test began on February 1, with a full system to be in operation this summer. The cost of the demonstration will be shared by D. C. Transit System and the Housing and Home Finance Agency, with the contributions of staff time
by the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, and DOWNTOWN PROGRESS.

A guide for construction in public rights-of-way has been drafted. The District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic has also prepared such a guide. These two plans will be combined into a policy for the overall benefit of the general public, public agencies, construction companies, utility companies, and business.

In addition, the past year was the most active year for new private development and for development interest in Downtown in this century. Announcements already made this year say 1963 will be even more active — all this in an area of relative inactivity for the past two decades.

Insofar as we are concerned, all this is not enough. Far more can and must be done.

We alone among the ten major cities of our country lack the tool of urban renewal to use to assist the revitalization of Downtown. Appropriate clarifying legislation has been introduced in both the House and the Senate. We work and hope for its early passage. Without this legislation, the task of Downtown revitalization will be extremely difficult and frustrating. Without urban renewal, the task is impossible.

Now, what are we doing to achieve good urban design, and good building design in Downtown?

First, the Downtown Streets and Places study, prepared for us by the Washington office of Doxiadis Associates, provides a framework for the achievement of some of the elements of urban design:

1. to provide an identity for Downtown and its streets and places so that you know where and what Downtown is when you approach it and when you get there.
2. to provide means of orientation within Downtown so that you will know how to get to where you want to go after you get there, and
3. to provide urban and urbane spaces to be formed by public action and by private construction in Downtown.

To a degree, appropriate identities, means of orientation and spatial experiences can be achieved through public action in the public rights-of-way, as set forth in the Downtown Streets and Places report, by the provision of new streets, sidewalks, street lights and other street elements.

The complete realization of the objectives of urban design, however, can be achieved only by the provision of buildings, to be built one at a time, and to be designed by individual architects, that will contribute to the delineation of the spaces that make up Downtown.

However, in our work at DOWNTOWN PROGRESS — and our experience in this respect is not unique — we have come upon two problems:

1. Given a specific, we have been unable to find agreement on what good design is, and
2. We can't get much help even on how to get good design by setting up ground rules that would provide a basis for assuring the production of good design.

The Action Plan and its supplement, the Downtown Streets and Places report, delineate a number of special places in Downtown, new squares that can be formed primarily as a result of functional traffic improvements. Here are at least six opportunities to create new urban spaces, to blend the design of the public open space with the buildings that will enclose it. Under an urban renewal plan, guides can be adopted to help achieve good design in these special places. Should architects be selected to design the places? Should they be done by design competitions? Should they be done by development competitions?

Secondly, in the Downtown core, how should we go about encouraging the design of buildings, shops and signs, to complement the proposals for the treatment of the public ways as shown in the Downtown Streets and Places report? I am confident that rigid controls lead to mediocrity.

And let me add a third question here. How should the elements of the transportation system — subways, freeways, underpasses, parking garages — be designed to contribute to the kind of Downtown environment that we seek?

This last question is a particularly sensitive one for us at DOWNTOWN PROGRESS. Our outstanding staff and a number of consultants and advisory committee members have worked long and hard to arrive at a transportation system that will meet the needs of Downtown in the future. We have limited ourselves, for the present, to the use of things that we know will work: freeways to bypass around Downtown much of the through traffic that now congests the surface streets; underpasses to separate the remaining through traffic from heavily travelled pedestrian ways; parking garages properly related to designated streets for those vehicles that must be brought Downtown; and subways and buses to meet the increasing peak hour travel demands of Downtown employees.

Despite all of our thoughts, and the wishes of some, the automobile will not disappear. We can bypass some of the cars, and hide others below the surface or behind facades, but eliminate them you cannot, because some of you and a few others just must drive Downtown. Of course, there are many people who don't have to drive, or who can't drive, who will ride the transit system . . . and this may amount to 60 per cent, or even an optimistic 75 per cent of all those who would come Downtown in the course of a day, provided that we get the best kind of a transit system possible, but you and I and a few others are going to drive, and when you add us all up, it means freeways, and underpasses, and parking garages, and someone has to design them.

I conclude these remarks, therefore, not with a revelation, but with a challenge, to you who work in the field of design. We will welcome your suggestions on how to build into the Downtown renewal plan procedures to encourage good design . . . and we will look forward to the efforts of those of you who will be designing the 140 buildings or more that will be built in Downtown by 1980, to contribute to the total effect by outstanding individual design.
F Street: Before \ After

F Street, primarily for pedestrians, would be at the same level from building line to building line, with provisions for proper surface drainage. The roadway for the mini-buses and for necessary service vehicles would be four lanes wide, a reduction from the existing six lane pavement, and the two lanes thus removed from vehicular use would be added to the pedestrian area on the north side of F Street. Concrete planting boxes and bollards would protect the pedestrian walkways.

To begin the revitalization of the Downtown Core, a full scale demonstration of the proposed treatment is recommended for the two block section of F Street between 12th and 14th Streets. This area contains a wide variety of establishments, it has high volumes of pedestrian traffic, and it would be large enough to create an identifiable environment.

In the accomplishment of this demonstration, the north sidewalk would be doubled in width while the south sidewalk would remain at its present width. Pedestrian crossings are proposed between 13th and 14th Streets, to increase interaction between the stores on both sides of the street, with consequent increases in business activity. The widened sidewalk area on the north side also provides for pullout bays for delivery trucks and service vehicles for the establishments between F and G Streets which have limited rear loading access, or no rear access at all. Most of the establishments on the south side of the street can be served through rear alleys so that curbside deliveries would be reduced to a minimum.

Small clusters of canopies would be placed on each side of the street to shelter people waiting for the minibuses; and there would be kiosks, benches, location maps, trash bins, mail boxes and other street elements for the pedestrians' convenience. Large red or willow oak trees would be planted on the north side of the street where the pedestrian way is widest, and the smaller littleleaf linden, honeylocust, or Japanese Pagodatrees on the south side of the street.

The intersection of F and 13th Streets and the pedestrian crosswalks would be paved differently from the rest of the area, with red brick laid in varied patterns. A lightweight canopy is proposed over the intersection to provide shelter as well as a strong visual accent to identify this special part of Downtown.

This illustration shows, in more detail, the change in treatment proposed for the demonstration blocks. The new pavement of hexagonal blocks is set in a large grid of pebble textured concrete strips. Bands of pavement, 4 feet wide, along the building line, provide a transition between the regular pattern of the pavement and the irregular pattern of the store fronts and entrances. The design of these strips could be varied by the stores individually.
Street Elements
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T. M. Woodall, Inc.
Plastering and Acoustical Treatment
6492 Sligo Mill Rd., Takoma Park 12, Md. 580-8811

CONCRETE PRODUCTS
Atlantic Perifile Co.
Lightweight Concrete Roof Decks
1819 Kanawha Ave., N.E., Wash., D.C. 5-3000

Tecfab, Inc.
Precast Structural Insulating Panels and Window Wall Systems
Plylone Mosaic and Tile Felings
Beltsville, Md. GR 6-6211

The Upco Co.
Al Pack
Non-Fading Hydrant for Color Concrete
14000 Maydale Ct., Silver Spring, Md. EY 6-2474

FURNISHINGS & EQUIPMENT
Klaw O. Row, Inc.
Bathroom and Wall Toilet Partitions
Floor City Ornamental Iron Co.
1420 Telegraph Ave., N.W., Wash., D. C. F 5-4410

Milo Products Corp.
Milo Cabinets—Wall Covers and Fronts
Milo Bi-Fold Doors, Metalic Warp-Proof Sliding Doors, Accord-Fold and W rvorvo Doors
1010 Vermont Ave., N.W., Wash., D.C. ST 5-9647

GENERAL CONTRACTORS AND BUILDERS
Altmont Bros., Inc.
4949 Bethesda Ave., Bethesda 16, Md. GL 2-1700

Briggs Construction Co., Inc.
4906 Cordell Ave., Bethesda, Md. OL 6-4545

2010 15th St., N.W., Wash., D.C. 1908 Sunander Pl., N.W., Wash., D.C.

C. M. Hale Co., Inc.
Specializing in Churches, Commercial and Public Works
2706 Perry Ave., Kensington, Md. 940-2414

EXECUTIVE INTERIORS
Wholesale to the Trade Only
Consultants for Professional Space Planning & Design
Herman Miller—Robert John—Monarch
Imperial-Aims—All Steel—Accessories
1015 112th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. Men. Thu. Fri. 9 to 5 or by Appt. 367-4921

MT. VERNON CLAY PRODUCTS CO.
800 Hamlin Street, N.E.
Washington 17, D.C.
832-8400

Hill and Kimmel, Inc.
General Contractors
1103 Wynko Ave., Silver Spring, Md. JU 5-3911

Morrison & Brady, Inc.
Contractors & Builders
4206 35th Ave., Bladensburg, Md. Post Office Box 85. UN 4-3220-30

N. S. Stavrou, Inc.
General Contractors
605 Silver Spring Ave.
Silver Spring, Md. JU 7-2902

Roy Thornton, Company
General Contractors
6482 Sligo Mill Rd., Takoma Park 12, Md.

Warthen & Ward
General Contractors
16410 Montgomery Ave., Kensington, Md. 694-0424

HARDWARE
Builders Hardware Corp.
Architectural Hardware Consultants Builders, Finishing Hardware
4908 St. Elmo Ave., Bethesda, Md. OL 6-8000

Fries, Beall & Sharp Co.
Architectural Hardware Consultants Representatives of Sargent & Co. and Schlage

HEATING FUELS
Griffith-Consumers Co.
Distributors of All Types of Commercial and Residential Fuels and Heating Equipment
1413 New York Ave., N.W., Wash, 6, D.C. NE 8-6440

MASONRY AND MASONRY
A. Myron Cowell, Inc.
Quality Masonry Contractors
Brick — Glazed Tile, Clinder Block
2400 Marcus Blvd., N.W., Wash. 7, D.C. F 5-4410

Mel Products Corp.
Milo Cabinets—Wall Covers and Fronts
Milo Bi-Fold Doors, Metalic Warp-Proof Sliding Doors, Accord-Fold and Wrvorvo Doors
1010 Vermont Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. ST 5-9647

GENERAL CONTRACTORS AND BUILDERS
Altmont Bros., Inc.
4949 Bethesda Ave., Bethesda 16, Md. OL 2-1700

Briggs Construction Co., Inc.
4906 Cordell Ave., Bethesda, Md. OL 6-4545

2010 15th St., N.W., Wash., D.C. 1908 Sunander Pl., N.W., Wash., D.C.

C. M. Hale Co., Inc.
Specializing in Churches, Commercial and Public Works
2706 Perry Ave., Kensington, Md. 940-2414

FURNISHINGS & EQUIPMENT
Klaw O. Row, Inc.
Bathroom and Wall Toilet Partitions
Floor City Ornamental Iron Co.
1420 Telegraph Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. F 5-4410

Milo Products Corp.
Milo Cabinets—Wall Covers and Fronts
Milo Bi-Fold Doors, Metalic Warp-Proof Sliding Doors, Accord-Fold and Wrvorvo Doors
1010 Vermont Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. ST 5-9647

GENERAL CONTRACTORS AND BUILDERS
Altmont Bros., Inc.
4949 Bethesda Ave., Bethesda 16, Md. OL 2-1700

Briggs Construction Co., Inc.
4906 Cordell Ave., Bethesda, Md. OL 6-4545

2010 15th St., N.W., Wash., D.C. 1908 Sunander Pl., N.W., Wash., D.C.

C. M. Hale Co., Inc.
Specializing in Churches, Commercial and Public Works
2706 Perry Ave., Kensington, Md. 940-2414

United Clay Products Co.
— Headquarters for —
Georgetown Colonial Brick
Carrier Air Conditioning
1541 Elm St., N.W., Wash., D.C. 20036

Permanent Products Co.
CHARLES R. WOODHAMS, Mgr.
Gracoo—Corroura—Ofice
Medlar Curvata Walls, Windows, Aluminum and Steel Systems
Ledcor Sun Control Louvers
7714 Red Roof Road, Bethesda
Washington 14, D.C. — OL 2-7473

PAINT & GLASS
Cunningham Paint Company
Distributors: P.V.A. Muralsite; Muralsite
Coating Finishers for All Interiors and Exterior Walls
2020 14th St., N.W., Wash., D.C. CS 5-2081

Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.
Private Architects: Call Al Laman
Government: Call Sheldon Reynolds
LA 6-4800

W. R. Winslow Co.
Distributors for Benjamin Moore, Samuel Cabot and National Gypsum
Winslow Products
923 New York Ave., N.W., Wash., D.C. NA 8-0610

PORCELAIN
Calcote Porcelain Co., Inc.
Subsidiary of Calcote Company
Architectural Porcelain — Curtain Wall Panels
Shirley St., Harvard, Va. 912 Thayer Ave., Silver Spring, Md. JU 7-7000

PLUMBING, HEATING & ELECTRICAL
American Radiator and Standard Sanitary Corp.
Specifications for Plumbing and Heating
8641 Colvin Rd., Silver Spring, Md.

Jack T. Irwin, Inc.
"Dealers in Natural Stone"—Flagstone,
Building Stone, Jackson Stone Products
1450 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Md. 424-5444

National Brick & Supply Company
High Pressure Cured Block and Brick
Doak Plank Floor and Roof System
Terr Catta, Wash., D.C. LA 9-6800

Washington Brick Co.
Masonry Manufacturers & Distributors
6th and Crescent Sts., N.E., Wash., D.C. LA 9-7000

West Bros. Brick Co.
Tunnel Kiln Face Brick, Various Colors
6600 Sheriff Rd., N.E., Wash. 27, D.C.

Windows, Folding Doors
Folding Partitions
Sliding Glass Doors
Exteriors
Pella Products of Wash., D.C. 3250 K St., N.W. Phone 553-3560
Floyd E. Koons

REPRODUCTIONS & SUPPLIES
Cooper-Trent
Your Authorized K & E Distributor Complete Reproduction Services
4820 Cordell Ave., Bethesda, Md.

Lluck-Melbrook, Inc.
Blueprints, Architectural Photos, Drafting Supplies
900 Sligo Ave., Silver Spring, Md.

Rockville—306 Commerce Lane

Geo. F. Muth Co., Inc.
Architects', Engineers', Drafting and Artists' Supplies, SM-Adhesives
Office Equipment and House Parts
1522 New York Ave., N.W., Wash., D.C.

SPECIAL SERVICES
Mickelson's
Prints and Paintings
Fine Prints, Framing
709 G St., N.W., Wash., D.C. NA 8-1790

Patrick Sign Studio
Sign Design & Manufacture, Neon & Plastic, Billboards
642 Sligo Ave., Silver Spring, Md.

Lachner Typing Service
Architect's, Engineer's Specifications
Mimeograph — Multilith — Oosil
Long Experience — Best References
JE 4-6655

SWIMMING POOLS
Lewis Swimming Pool Construction Co., Inc.
Swimming Pools
115 Mary St., Falls Church, Va. JU 7-2353

TILE
The Mosaic Tile Co. of Virginia
Tile Manufacturers
Warehouse and Showroom
607 B.Ball St., Arlington, Va.

DT 4-5553

Standard Art, Marble & Tile Co.
Scagliola, Marble, Mosaic, Terrazzo, Tile, Ceramic, Slate
117 D St., N.W., Wash., D.C. NA 8-7418

WINDOWS
Hope's Windows, Inc.
The Finest in Aluminum and Steel Windows
1820 N. Nash St., Arlington, Va.
JA 5-8018

JAMES H. CARR, INC.
Structural Timber Specialists
Glam Arches and Bevelling Trusses
Prefabricated Trussed Rafter
2138 P St., N.W., Washington 7, D.C.
Amanda 4-7797
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THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

 cites with merit

POTOMAC VALLEY ARCHITECT

Published by The Potomac Valley Chapter of Maryland, AIA

In the opinion of the Award Jury, Potomac Valley Architect displays generally excellent covers, effectively modest design of editorial pages, and a wide variety of intelligently edited material within a limited amount of space, thereby rendering an outstanding service to its readers.

PUBLICATIONS AWARD JURY:  Obie Helms, FAS A  Thomas Creghton, FAS  Ralph Paterson

MARCH, 1963  Vol. 7  No. 7