



PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

County Administration Building • 14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive, 4th Floor, Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772
pgplanning.org/HPC.htm • 301-952-3680

APPROVED 01/16/2018

Summary of Actions

Prince George's County Historic Preservation Commission
Tuesday, December 19, 2017, 6:30 p.m.
4th Floor Board Room, County Administration Building

Commissioners Present: Chairman John Peter Thompson, Eddy Campbell,
Lisa Pfueller Davidson, Donna Schneider,
Yolanda Muckle, Susan Pruden, Nathania Branch-Miles

Commissioners Absent: Vice Chair Edward M. Scott, Michael Callahan,

HPC Counsel Absent: Bradley Farrar, Esq.

Staff Present: Howard Berger, Robert Krause, Jennifer Stabler,
Daniel Tana, Tom Gross, Tyler Smith

Guest: Name/Organization

Agenda Item

Attendees

Timea Gaines	C.3.
Pastor Timothy Gaines	C.3.
James and Linda Crimmins	C.5.
Scott Schroer (Durable Restoration)	C.1.
Matthew Cochran (Otery Group)	C.2.
Jeremy McGonigle (OLBM)	C.1.
Mylo Celsy (Corners Historic Restoration)	C.3.
Yvonne Johnson (M-NCPPC)	C.1.
Chris Hatcher (Lerch, Early & Brewer)	D.1.
Jude Burke	D.1.
David Bell (Bell Architects)	C.2.

A. Call to Order

Chairman Thompson called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m. Commissioner Davidson read introductory remarks about the meeting and procedures into the record. Commissioner Pruden arrived at 6:41 p.m. Commissioners Ed Scott and Michael Callahan had excused absences.

B. Approval of Meeting Summary – November 21, 2017

MOTION: Commissioner Schneider moved to approve the November 21, 2017 meeting summary. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Branch-Miles. The Motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (6-0, Commissioner Pruden had not yet arrived).

C. HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMITS

1. HAWP 2017-047 Compton Bassett

Mr. Berger presented the HAWP application noting a technical correction on page 3 of the staff report. Mr. Berger summarized the four components of the stabilization plan including interior stabilization, exterior stabilization, weather proofing of the main roof, and a scaffolding system installed around the building. Mr. Berger introduced Yvonne Johnson, Architectural Supervisor in the Department of Parks and Recreation, who provided some background on the project emphasizing its intent to stabilize the structure for at least five years while funds are raised for the building's restoration. Jeremy McGonigle with OLBM, the lead professional services contractor on the project, spoke to the four components of the stabilization plan. Mr. McGonigle noted that scaffolding will fully wrap the structure with minimum impact to the ground and structure. The scaffolding will provide moisture protection and facilitate future restoration work. Some masonry repairs will be made. The interior shoring will have minimal impact on the ornamental plaster work. The horizontal stabilization system will require some penetration of the exterior envelope of the building which will be kept to mortar joints as much as possible. Work will be completed by the end of April.

Commissioner Davidson asked what measures were being taken to avoid the ornamental plaster work. Mr. McGonigle emphasized that disturbance to plaster work will be kept to a minimum and restricted mostly to the flat plaster surfaces. Scott Shroer with Durable Restoration added that the foreman for this job has 30 years of experience and is a master plasterer, and will be able to remove, document and reinstall any disturbed plaster.

Mr. Berger presented staff's conclusion and recommendations. The applicant's submitted plans represent an extensive and invasive approach to the short-term stabilization of one of the County's most important eighteenth- and nineteenth-century houses with both significant historical associations and a unique architectural character. As outlined, this project involves a significant level of intervention with both the exterior and the interior features of the building. The project also includes weatherization of the roof and limited masonry repairs, many of which are designed to be temporary and reversible. Staff recommended that the HPC approve HAWP 2017-047 with conditions.

MOTION: Commissioner Schneider made a motion to approve HAWP 2017-047 in accordance with staff's recommendation with the addition of a fourth condition, that the applicant provide semi-annual reports as to the status of the house and stabilization. Commissioner Pruden seconded the motion. The motion passed by acclamation and without objection (6-0-1, Chairman Thompson voted present)

2. HAWP 2017-052 Melwood Park

Mr. Tana presented the HAWP application. Melwood Park is a 7-bay, 2 ½ story Flemish bond brick structure. As part of a 1672 land patent, the extant building's earliest period of construction has been dated to 1714 by dendrochronology. The subject application involves the dismantling of the two-story south wall of the building in phases, with thorough documentation; the salvaging of brick; and the re-use of salvaged brick—along with in-kind replacements, where needed, to reconstruct the wall. Mr. Tana introduced David Bell of

Bell Architects, the project architect. Mr. Bell presented details of the project. He emphasized the importance of the archeological resources highlighted by both M-NCPPC and MHT, both of which hold easements on the property. Architectural elements have been removed, documented and stored. There has been a lot of movement in the building and it has essentially rotated. The center of the front wall will be dismantled and rebuilt. The foundation of the two side walls will be underpinned. The stucco will be removed and the Flemish bond brick work examined for evidence that will be used to determine the direction of the project moving forward. The windows and doors will be reinstalled afterwards. Mr. Tana delivered staff's conclusion and recommendation that the HPC approve HAWP 2017-052. Chairman Thompson asked whether staff had come to a formal or informal understanding about continued updates about the house.

MOTION: Commissioner Schneider moved to approve HAWP 2017-052 in accordance with staff's recommendations with a fourth condition that the applicant provide semi-annual reports as to the rehabilitation and stabilization of the house. Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (6-0-1 Chairman Thompson voted present).

3. HAWP 2017-051 Mount Rainier United Methodist Church

Mr. Gross presented the HAWP application. Built in 1924 and expanded in 1955, Mount Rainier United Methodist Church is a 2½, L-shaped masonry building executed in the Classical Revival style. The applicant proposes to restore 84 windows throughout the church building. Mr. Gross noted that the property is subject to an exterior easement held by M-NCPPC. Chairman Thompson asked whether the application would be reviewed by the easement holder first. Mr. Gross clarified that the Easement Change/Alteration Request application and HAWP application could be processed in tandem. Chairman Thompson noted that this should be the topic of further discussion. Commissioner Davidson asked whether the property had received a Historic Property grant. Mr. Gross confirmed that it had. Mr. Gross presented staff's recommendations to approve HAWP 2017-051. Milo Celsy, owner of Corners Restoration, expanded on the scope of work and the treatment of the windows, describing the process Corners Restorations will use to restore the historic windows in its Baltimore workshop.

MOTION: Commissioner Schneider made a motion to approve HAWP 2017-051 in accordance with staff's recommendations. Commissioner Pruden seconded the motion. Commissioner Davidson commended the applicants for doing this sort of window restoration. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (6-0-1 Chairman Thompson voted present).

4. HAWP 2017-056 Bostwick

Mr. Tana presented the HAWP application. Bostwick is a 5-bay, 2 ½-story Flemish bond brick structure which faces west, with a slightly flared gable roof penetrated by three dormers, and two brick exterior end chimneys. Bostwick was built in 1746 for Christopher Lowndes, a prominent citizen in colonial Bladensburg. The application involves the first phase of a two-phase process to stabilize the large brick buttress on the south end of the house. The first phase entails the deconstruction and documentation of the buttress. Shoring will be used to support the side of the structure after the top portion of the buttress is removed. Mr. Tana concluded that while temporarily altering the appearance of the structure, the work proposed will provide new information about the construction of a character-defining feature of the structure and will inform the later reconstruction of the feature, ultimately restoring its appearance. Staff recommended approval of HAWP 2017-056. Chairman Thompson asked whether there was an agreement with the applicant regarding updates on the project, and suggested it be added to the conditions.

MOTION: Commissioner Schneider moved to approve HAWP 2017-056 according to staff's recommendations with the addition of a condition requiring the applicant to provide an update on the property

status on a semi-annual basis. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Campbell. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (6-0-1 Chairman Thompson voted present).

5. HAWP 2017-030 Horsehead Tavern

Mr. Gross presented the HAWP application, noting a technical correction on page 1. Built in the early nineteenth century and enlarged in the 1870s, Horsehead Tavern is a 2 ½ story, cross-gabled frame building that may incorporate an earlier structure dating to the eighteenth century. The application proposed to replace 29 windows in the house with wood-sash, single-hung windows, with grille patterns to match the existing windows. Mr. Gross concluded that the applicant had provided sufficient materials to conduct a conceptual approval of the proposed work and recommended that the HPC approve *in concept* HAWP 2017-030 with the condition that the applicant provide detailed specifications for the windows selected, that meet criteria provided by staff. Jim Crimmins, owner and applicant, introduced himself and stated that he was a certified property manager who bought the property 22 years ago and is very attached to the property. Mr. Crimmins stated his intention to replace the windows with Pella wood windows of sizes and glazing patterns to match the existing windows. Commissioner Davidson asked about true vs. simulated divided lights. Mr. Crimmins stated that he would like the most energy efficient option, which would be simulated divided light windows with tinted panes. Mr. Gross clarified that staff's preference would be for true divided light but noted that staff is willing to entertain a simulated divided light option if it meets the criteria provided by staff. Commissioner Muckle asked about new siding. Mr. Crimmins and Mr. Gross explained the original application did include siding replacement and that they determined it would be most productive to deal with the windows first. Chairman Thompson invited Mr. Crimmins to comment on the siding. Mr. Crimmins noted that he would like to use a composite material because of its low-maintenance qualities. He pointed out that many other HPCs allow the use of composite materials. He is resistant to using wood because of termites, and maintenance. Commissioner Campbell asked for clarification about whether staff and the applicant agreed about the windows. Mr. Gross clarified that staff's recommendation was for a concept approval pending submission of acceptable window specifications. Commissioner Pruden asked what the concept approval was for. Mr. Gross clarified that staff wanted to provide the applicant with some guidance in choosing appropriate windows and wanted to provide direction on what the HPC and staff would find acceptable. Chairman Thompson clarified that if the HAWP application is approved it could become a Staff Sign-Off when suitable window specifications were submitted. Mr. Gross agreed and clarified that if the application was combined with siding replacement it would come back to the HPC.

MOTION: Commissioner Schneider made a motion to approve HAWP 2017-030 *in concept* according to staff's recommendations. Commissioner Pruden seconded the motion. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (6-0-1 Chairman Thompson voted present).

D. REFERRALS

1. A-10039, Bowie Whitemarsh (adjacent to Sacred Heart Church and Cemetery, 71A-019)

Dr. Stabler presented the referral application; summarizing that the application proposed to re-zone the property from the R-E (Residential-Estate: permits large-lot subdivisions containing lots approximately one acre or larger) and R-A (Residential-Agriculture: provides for large-lot, 2-acre, residential uses while encouraging the retention of agriculture as a primary land use) Zones to the R-S (Residential Suburban) Zone. The subject property contains approximately 154.6 acres. The development surrounds the Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Church and Cemetery Historic Site (71A-019) on three sides. Originally built in 1741, altered and rebuilt in 1855 and 1876, Sacred Heart is a gable-roof stone church with Gothic-arch windows and decorative quoin patterns at the corners; at one end is the eighteenth-century sanctuary with semi-octagonal sacristy, and at the other is a Victorian frame bell tower. The subject property is part of a tract of land known

as Carrollsburg, patented to James Carroll on April 7, 1722 for 1,981 acres. In 1798, at the time of the first Federal Direct Tax, the resident priest at Carrollsburg was John Ashton, and it was in his name that the income-producing farm lands were assessed. A letter written by the resident priest in 1832 describes the site, by then known as "White Marsh," in some detail. The White Marsh Plantation was also involved in the 1838 sale of 272 enslaved men, women and children to Louisiana businessmen Henry Johnson and Jesse Batey by Thomas Mulledy, the president of Georgetown College. A Phase I archeological survey was conducted on the subject property between June 2016 and September 2017 and four archeological sites were identified and recorded. Dr. Stabler concluded that the Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Church and Cemetery should be shown and labeled as a historic site on the applicants' plans moving forward and that based on the site's location, a Type "E" buffer should be shown on all subsequent development plans, and that the Specific Design Plan will be reviewed by the HPC. Staff also recommended that if potentially significant archeological resources exist in the project area identified by the Phase I archeological report, the applicant shall provide a plan for evaluating the resource at the Phase II level or preserving the resource in place. If further archeological evaluation or mitigation is necessary, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and/or Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in a proper manner. Staff's final recommendation was that, based on the significance of findings, the applicant may be required to provide interpretive measures that shall be reviewed by the Planning Department's staff archeologist.

Commissioner Davidson asked if the HPC weighs in on the zoning change. Dr. Stabler clarified that the HPC can weigh in on how the zoning change will affect the historic site. Commissioner Davidson replied that up-zoning would have a drastic effect. Chairman Thompson asked how it would affect it. Commissioner Davidson replied that going from approximately 170 to 400 housing units would dramatically increase the density of the development. Chairman Thompson asked how big the current environmental setting is. Dr. Stabler clarified that the environmental setting will remain the same. The church is not part of the application but is adjacent. Chairman Thompson asked about the distance from the new development to the church. Chris Hatcher, the land use attorney representing the applicant, introduced Jude Burke with Elm Street Development (the contract purchaser) from the applicant's office and Dr. Hill, an archeologist, and added that the Community Planning section recommended the zoning change in the Master Plan which has been to the Planning Board. Mr. Hatcher acknowledged the importance of the historic site and a desire to provide adequate buffers that will exceed what is required by the landscape manual. Commissioner Davidson asked if the City of Bowie has weighed in on the project and whether the church has weighed in on it. Neither party had, although notice had been provided. Mr. Dan Lynch, legal representative for the Archdiocese of Washington, stated that he was present at the meeting to monitor the proceedings. Chairman Thompson noted that it was too early to tell whether the finished development would be visible from the high ground of the church. Mr. Berger stated that in the review of previous applications adjacent to Historic Sites, the HPC has asked for sightline studies to answer similar questions. Commissioner Campbell stated that the HPC had addressed similar situations on a smaller scale with more information and asked if staff agreed that usually the HPC is given more information. Mr. Berger pointed out that the historic site is surrounded by, but not included in, the application so that its effects are indirect. Mr. Berger suggested that the HPC could ask the applicant for additional information based on whatever concepts are available to them. Mr. Hatcher indicated that there is some context for buffer and the applicant has had conversations with the Archdiocese. Mr. Burke explained that the applicant has been working with the Archdiocese and local parish for several years and that the applicant will be back before the HPC with the preliminary plan. He pointed out that the distance from the historic church to the developing property is 300 to 800 feet and that the width of additional buffers that will be proposed are well beyond the requirement in the Landscape Manual.

Commissioner Pruden asked what the HPC is doing with the referral. Mr. Berger clarified that generally the Commission would make a recommendation to the Planning Board on the zoning application. Mr. Hatcher further clarified that the zoning change application was the first step in a multi-stage process. The recommendations of the HPC are given to the Planning Board, whose recommendations are given to the Zoning Hearing Examiner, whose recommendations are given to the District Council. The question before the

Historic Preservation Commission is what effect the zoning change will have on the existing asset. When the archeology report is submitted for the preliminary plan a lot more information will be available, but the effect on the existing and adjacent historic site would be largely determined by buffer and viewshed regulations in the Master Plan. Mr. Berger added that the preliminary plan will include a proposed lotting pattern for the Historic Preservation Commission's review. Commissioner Muckle stated that the current zoning would allow for 115 houses, while the proposed zoning would allow for 440, which would result in much smaller lots. Mr. Hatcher responded that it is a legitimate concern perhaps best addressed when reviewing a site development plan. Commissioner Pruden summarized that in concept the Commissioners are voting on whether to approve up-zoning. If the rezoning is not approved as the applicant submitted, the applicants could submit a revised plan, or a development plan under the current zoning and the project will come before the HPC again. Mr. Berger pointed out that the HPC does not have to have an opinion one way or another but can simply use the referral memo as a vehicle for the HPC's concerns should the application go forward. Commissioner Schneider asked about traffic around the historic site.

MOTION: Commissioner Davidson made a motion to submit to the Planning Board that the HPC is not taking a position on the zoning change but would like to submit its concerns regarding any future development of the property as outlined in the staff report. Commissioner Pruden seconded the Motion. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (6-0-1 Chairman Thompson voted present).

E. HISTORIC SITE EVALUATION

1. Walker-Mowatt Site (Historic Resource 68-002)

Mr. Gross presented the Historic Site Evaluation. Walker-Mowatt Mill Site is the location of a grist mill that operated from the late eighteenth century until circa 1900 on what is now the Northeast Branch of the Anacostia River. The site is located in northern Prince George's County, within the limits of the Town of Riverdale Park. The property on which it sits was part of the 522-acre Yarrow Farm and Yarrow Swamp patented in 1768 to James Edmonston. Samuel Philips purchased the mill property from John Hellen Beall in September 1807. Thomas Ferral acquired the mill site between 1829 and 1838. Ferral's heirs sold the property in September 1844 to Henry L. Carleton, who is more often associated with a mill he owned southwest of Bladensburg. The mill and its race appear on the 1878 Hopkins atlas, with the attached residence in the name of N.C. Stevens [sic]. According to a historical narrative written by area resident T. Raymond Burch in 1965, the mill was operated during the 1880s by Scottish immigrant John Mowatt. In 1891, Benjamin Stephen conveyed the property to real estate investor David M. Nesbit, the deed for which sale describes the 14-acre parcel as "Stephen's Mill property." The 14-acre mill property was sold by David M. Nesbit's son Fred in 1902 and changed hands several times before its purchase in 1905 by Edwin G. Paul. As the result of a condemnation case, the mill property was transferred from James and Angelina Koutsos to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission in 1962. Walker-Mowatt Mill Site is significant as the location of a grist mill that was operated in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries by the Beall family and later under the ownership of Samuel Philips, Henry Walker and Nicholas Stephen (who owned Bostwick). However, Walker-Mowatt Mill Site does not retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance as no above-ground structures associated with the mill were extant when the property was initially documented in 1973 or subsequent surveys. Staff recommended that due to the irretrievable loss of the associated structures it should be deleted from the Inventory of Historic Resources.

Commissioner Pruden asked if the historic resource was removed from the inventory, what control the HPC would have over the property. Mr. Gross pointed out that the property was owned by M-NCPPC and that M-NCPPC archeologists would review any proposed impacts to any archeological resources remaining on the site. Chairman Thompson reiterated that the historic resource can be elevated to historic site, deleted from the inventory, or remain a historic resource.

MOTION: Commissioner Davidson moved to delete the historic resource from the inventory in accordance with staff's recommendations. Commissioner Schneider seconded the motion. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (6-0-1 Chairman Thompson voted present).

2. Powder Mill Site (Historic Resource 65-001)

Mr. Gross presented the Historic Site Evaluation. Powder Mill Site was the site of a powder mill that operated from roughly 1818 until the late 1820s, as well as a woolen mill and blanket factory that operated from 1812 until the 1860s. Powder Mill Site is located in northern Prince George's County in an unincorporated section of Hyattsville. The mill structures, no longer extant, were situated on the west bank of Paint Branch immediately north of Powder Mill Road. Powder Mill Site is located on property that was patented to Stephen Lanham as "Mizpah" in 1764 and which comprised the northern section of the 500-acre "William and Elizabeth" patent granted to William Beall in 1722. In 1806 Scholfield and Thomas Edmonston, Jr. sold 32 acres of the William and Elizabeth tract to Daniel Renner and John R. Bussard, both of Georgetown. John Bussard sold his half-interest in the property to Elkanah Cobb in 1814, the deed for which sale mentions "Paint Mills." The history of powder production at the Powder Mill site appears to begin shortly after Daniel Bussard acquired his interest in the Paint Branch acreage. The mill on Paint Branch was intended to produce powder to repay a loan that had been made by the federal government to Bussard's former business partners, the firm of Stull and Williams. Bussard put his new powder mill into operation quickly, but available evidence suggests the venture was unsuccessful in supplying the amount required to repay the loan. Owen Carroll, an Irish immigrant, purchased the property from government trustee Thomas Mustin in November 1832. Carroll died in May 1875 at age 90. In September 1869, Carroll conveyed all his real estate, including the roughly 68 acres containing the mill property and approximately 76 additional acres he had acquired. In 1892 Mary Gallant sold 41.02 acres of land south of Paint Branch and north of what is now Powder Mill Road to William W. Rapley, retaining 92.5 acres to the north on which her residence was located (Gallant House, Historic Site 61-013). The roughly 41-acre property purchased by Rapley remained intact through several changes of ownership until 1925, when the easternmost 5.18 acres was sold by Percival and Ida Fuller to James and Elanor Durrett. The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission bought the property in 1962. Powder Mill Site is significant as the location of a powder mill that operated from roughly 1818 until the late 1830s, as well as a woolen mill and blanket factory that operated from 1812 until the 1860s. However, Powder Mill Site does not retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance as an example of the nineteenth-century commercial heritage of Prince George's County.

Commissioner Schneider asked why the site was a resource in our inventory even though no structure was present since at least the 1930s. Mr. Gross replied that it was a site deemed worthy of evaluation when properties were identified as part of the survey work of the 1970s that was used in the in 1981 Historic Sites and Districts Plan, and that a number of such sites were included as resources in the plan at that time. Chairman Thompson added that mill sites are an important part of county history, but because in this case no structures remain to protect, and the property is publicly owned, it does not warrant HPC designation.

MOTION: Commissioner Davidson moved to delete the property from the inventory based on staff's recommendations. Commissioner Pruden seconded the motion. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (6-0-1 Chairman Thompson voted present).

F. COMMISSION STAFF ITEMS

1. HAWP Staff Sign-Offs

There were no questions.

2. Referrals Report

There were no questions.

3. Correspondence Report

There was no correspondence report.

4. New Business/Staff Updates

Commissioner Schneider announced that she is now President of the Prince George's County Historical Society.

Commissioner Pruden shared that she enjoyed the trip to Prince Frederick and the joint training with Calvert County Historic Preservation Commissioners and staff. Chairman Thompson suggested that Laurel and Howard County could be future opportunities to explore.

MOTION: Commissioner Pruden made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Commissioner Schneider seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation and without objection (7-0). The meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

The next HPC meeting will be held on January 16, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

Tyler Anthony Smith
Principal Planning Technician
Historic Preservation Section