

**From:** [todd.scribner](#)  
**To:** [MCP-Chair](#)  
**Subject:** Written Testimony - Woodside Locational Atlas District (M:36-4): Removal of the District and Addition of Six Individual Locational Atlas Site  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 26, 2026 11:58:30 AM  
**Attachments:** [Montgomery County Planning Board Testimony, Scribner.docx](#)

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Good morning,

My name is Todd Scribner and I live at [REDACTED]. I am submitting written testimony for the upcoming Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, May 28th. This is in respect to the meeting item: Woodside Locational Atlas District (M:36-4): Removal of the District and Addition of Six Individual Locational Atlas Site. Thank you for providing the opportunity to do so. The testimony is attached.

Todd Scribner

**From:** [todd scribner](#)  
**To:** [MCP-Chair](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Automatic reply: Written Testimony - Woodside Locational Atlas District (M:36-4): Removal of the District and Addition of Six Individual Locational Atlas Site  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 26, 2026 12:02:38 PM

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

I want to make sure that you have my complete address. I didn't include the zip code.

Todd Scribner  
Nicole Pascua

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] 20910

On Tuesday, May 26, 2026 at 11:58:33 AM EDT, MCP-Chair <mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org> wrote:

Thank you for contacting the Planning Board Chair's Office. This confirms receipt of your message for distribution to appropriate staff to review. If you have submitted an inquiry, we will respond in a timely manner. You may also leave a voice message at (301) 495-4605 and a staff member will return your call.

**IMPORTANT:** If you have submitted written testimony for a Planning Board item, please be sure to include your mailing address to satisfy proper noticing requirements. If this was not already included, please reply to this email with that information. Written testimony submitted before the deadline of 12pm, two business days before the scheduled Planning Board meeting, will be distributed to the Board and staff and included in the public record. Written testimony received after the deadline will only be distributed to staff to review.

For more information about the Chair's Office, please visit: <https://montgomeryplanningboard.org/>

Montgomery County Planning Board  
2425 Reedy Dr, 14th Floor  
Wheaton, MD 20902

To the Montgomery County Planning Board:

My wife, Nicole Pascua, and I are the owners of [REDACTED] in Woodside, one of the properties currently recommended for retention on the Locational Atlas for potential future historic designation. I apologize for not attending this hearing in person, but work obligations prohibit me from doing so today.

At the outset, I want to state clearly that I support the recommendation to remove the Woodside district from the Locational Atlas. I believe that decision appropriately reflects the broader planning direction the County has adopted for this area and acknowledges the significant changes the neighborhood has undergone over the past fifty years.

For that reason, however, I struggle to understand the planning rationale for simultaneously retaining a small number of isolated individual properties for possible future designation after concluding that the district itself no longer warrants preservation as a coherent historic environment.

To me, this raises a fundamental question of planning consistency.

If the larger district no longer meets the threshold for preservation, then the standard for retaining individual houses should become substantially higher and more clearly justified. Otherwise, the County risks creating a fragmented preservation framework untethered from the broader rationale that justified removing the district in the first place.

This tension is particularly notable given the County's broader planning direction for the corridor and surrounding neighborhoods. Montgomery County has made clear that increasing housing supply, encouraging greater density near transit, and expanding long-term housing flexibility are central policy goals moving forward. I do not oppose those objectives and, in many respects, support them. But in that context, the selective retention of a handful of isolated homes for possible future historic designation becomes more difficult to reconcile with the larger planning framework the County itself is advancing.

Our home has been described as a strong example of a Craftsman bungalow, and I do not dispute that characterization. However, it is also part of a broader architectural pattern that extends beyond the narrow boundary of the former Woodside district itself. Similar homes exist immediately beyond that boundary in adjacent neighborhoods with comparable development patterns and housing stock.

Even if our house may be considered among the stronger examples within the administrative boundary of Woodside itself, that fact alone does not necessarily establish that it stands apart in a

sufficiently exceptional way to warrant future individual designation, particularly after the decision has been made to remove the district as a whole.

I also recognize that some homeowners may welcome historic designation, and I respect that position entirely. My argument is not that historic designation is never appropriate, nor that no homeowner should seek it. Rather, my concern is that where owner-occupied homes are being considered for individual designation outside the context of a preserved district, homeowner preference should carry substantial weight unless the property in question possesses unusually clear and compelling significance.

Historic designation carries meaningful long-term implications for how a property may be maintained, altered, and adapted over time. Those consequences fall directly on the homeowner. In cases where the district context is being removed, where the surrounding neighborhood is entering a period of substantial transition and evolution, and where the property is not associated with a historically significant person or event, I would respectfully urge caution before moving forward with isolated individual retention.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Planning Board not to retain our property on the Locational Atlas for further consideration.

Sincerely,

Todd Scribner  
Nicole Pascua



Maryland