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Foreword

The Prince George’s County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission is pleased to make available the Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan.

Policy guidance for this plan came from the 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan and the 1992 Historic Sites and Districts Plan. The goals, concepts, and guidelines document that outlined many of the major issues addressed in the plan and provided structure for the planning process was presented to the Planning Board and District Council in November 2008.

An extensive planning effort engaged historic property owners, citizens, residents, and other stakeholders in public participation activities and resulted in valuable contributions to the plan. In response to a request by county nonprofit organizations and citizens at large, a draft of the plan prepared by staff was distributed for public comment in September 2009 in order to provide the opportunity for stakeholders to review the proposed policies and strategies.

The plan represents an effort to chart the direction of future historic preservation policy in Prince George’s County. We are continuing this countywide effort through an Envision Prince George’s initiative to engage a broad cross section of stakeholders in developing a shared vision for the county’s future direction and growth. We invite you to visit the Envision Prince George’s web site at www.mncppc.org/Envision to learn more about how to participate in this exciting initiative.

The approved plan includes changes to historic sites and resources, goals, policies, and strategies to guide future preservation planning efforts and an initial set of implementation priorities. Appendices provide updated county and community histories; a summary of historic themes; and lists of cemeteries, organizations, and sources of additional information.

On January 19, 2010, the Planning Board and the District Council held a joint public hearing on the preliminary plan. The Planning Board adopted the plan with modifications per the Planning Board’s Resolution No. 10-42(c) on June 7, 2010. The District Council approved the plan with additional modifications per CR-51-2010 on June 8, 2010.

The Planning Board appreciates the contributions of the community and stakeholders throughout the plan development phase and at the public hearing. We look forward to seeing this plan preserve, protect, and enhance the county’s historic resources and, in doing so, improve the quality of life for Prince George’s County residents and visitors for years to come.

Sincerely,

Samuel J. Parker, Jr., AICP
Chairman
Prince George’s County Planning Board
Plan Highlights

**Purpose**
The Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan for Prince George’s County (HSDP) sets countywide preservation policy and provides citizens, nonprofit organizations, the private sector, and government agencies with guidance on historic preservation. It provides information about the county’s historic resources, presents an overview of preservation tools and techniques, and serves as a blueprint to assist in implementing effective historic preservation policies and strategies.

**Plan Highlights**
The Plan is divided into four parts.

*Part One* includes the Introduction and Heritage Themes. The introduction describes the plan’s public participation process, the general planning framework in which the HSDP functions, the certified local government process, and the implementation of highlights from the 1992 HSDP. Part One also addresses the themes that represent important aspects of the county’s history, culture, and heritage and provide an analytical framework for evaluating the significance of properties. The list of themes and associated properties will expand as further research and investigation broadens our knowledge of Prince George’s County’s heritage.

*Part Two* contains chapters 3–15, all of the chapters that respond directly to the 12 plan goals established by the District Council.

**Chapter 3: Evaluation and Designation**—explains the processes of historic site and historic district evaluation, the listing of properties in the National Register of Historic Places, and the survey initiatives that formed the recommendations for historic site or historic resource designation. Among other policies and strategies, Chapter 3 begins a discussion of the development of an honorific, nonregulatory program to recognize and highlight places of cultural significance that may not meet designation criteria or benefit from regulatory oversight.

**Chapter 4: Preservation Planning**—identifies ways that preservation planning can be more effectively addressed in the county’s development review process. It recognizes that M-NCPPC must lead by example in its stewardship of historic resources. It identifies the need for a strategic plan to be implemented to select priorities, benchmarks of progress, and the responsibilities of plan stakeholders.

**Chapter 5: Historic Preservation Regulations**—posits that the historic preservation ordinance (Subtitle 29 of the Prince George’s County Code) should be updated to reflect nationally recognized best practices. It also emphasizes the importance of working closely with the real estate community, as well as historic property owners, to ensure that all are aware of the preservation regulations affecting private property.

**Chapter 6: Environmental Settings**—explains the process of determining environmental settings and identifies some of the problems in maintaining them. It outlines policies and strategies to better protect the settings and to produce more compatible new development.

**Chapter 7: Protection of Cemeteries**—describes measures to better protect historic cemeteries, including legislative initiatives, a cemetery preservation manual, workshops, and a grant program.

**Chapter 8: Planning for Archeology**—explains the archeological review process and identifies current archeological issues. It suggests measures to further protect archeological resources and ways to promote public understanding of their significance.

**Chapter 9: Cultural Landscape Preservation**—includes a discussion of the characteristics of cultural landscapes, why they need protection, and strategies for their protection.

**Chapter 10: Historic Preservation Incentives**—summarizes existing incentives and outlines policies and strategies to promote and use existing and proposed incentives.

**Chapter 11: Neighborhood and Commercial Revitalization**—outlines planning and implementation tools for neighborhood conservation and commercial revitalization, and outlines policies and strategies to improve the county’s focus on this work.
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Chapter 12: Heritage Tourism—begins to describe ways the county can better support this effort to authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present while preserving and protecting resources.

Chapter 13: Partnerships—calls upon preservation stakeholders to form new partnerships with a broader constituency to advance the goals of historic preservation. Selected strategies include using emerging technologies to improve communication and seeking partnerships with schools to promote historic preservation.

Chapter 14: Heritage Education—focuses on policies and strategies to increase understanding and support for the protection of the county’s cultural heritage.

Chapter 15: Implementation—asserts that a strategic plan of implementation be developed to establish the priorities, benchmarks of progress, and commitment of partners in carrying out the plan’s recommendations. An initial action plan on the four principles of protection, stewardship, incentives, and education are proposed.

Part Three includes all the properties covered by the historic preservation ordinance as part of the Inventory of Historic Resources.

Chapter 16: Historic Sites—provides a brief description of the 411 designated historic sites.

Chapter 17: County-Designated Historic Districts—contains descriptions and maps of the two designated Historic Districts, Broad Creek and Old Town College Park.

Chapter 18: Inventory of Historic Resources—is a listing of all 411 designated sites and 136 designated historic resources in the Inventory of Historic Resources.

Part Four contains the Appendices—a history of the county, a statement of prehistoric archeological context, a summary of 58 documented historic communities, an inventory of historic cemeteries, a list of preservation organizations, and a glossary of important preservation terms. Appendix B identifies and describes historic communities that have been documented to date. For a more detailed explanation of the historic district documentation and designation process, see Chapter 3: Evaluation and Designation.

The HSDP presents goals, policies, and strategies that will be realized through the development of a strategic plan for implementation. Potential implementation methods include legislative changes to applicable ordinances, capital improvement program commitments, operating budget initiatives, and the inclusion of policy guidance in master plans and sector plans.

The strategic plan for implementation is intended to establish the priorities, identify the commitment of various stakeholders, provide a timeline, and set benchmarks. Successful implementation will take time and require the efforts of all stakeholders—government, the private sector, nonprofit organizations, and historic property owners. The plan also suggests that a biennial summit be convened to review progress on implementation until the next HSDP amendment process.

Inventory Additions

New Historic Sites
This plan classifies and/or adds 98 properties as historic sites in the plan inventory.

62-023-17 Thomas Matthews House
62-023-21 Queen’s Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery
64-007 Holst Cabin
65-010 D C Boundary Marker NE 3
65-011 D C Boundary Marker NE 4
65-015 Rizzo House
66-014 Lakeland Community High School
66-015 Buck-Singleton House
66-035-06 Morrill Hall
66-035-07 Calvert Hall
67-006 Beaverdam Creek Bridge
67-008 Civilian Conservation Corps Lodge
67-022-01 Kleindienst-Haker House
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67-022-14</td>
<td>McNitt-Gohr House</td>
<td>72-001</td>
<td>Wilson Station Railroad Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-022-23</td>
<td>Graves-Keleher House</td>
<td>72-009-15</td>
<td>D.C. Boundary Marker NE 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-004-03</td>
<td>Calvert Family Cemetery</td>
<td>72-009-18</td>
<td>William Sidney Pittman House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-010-62</td>
<td>Marché House</td>
<td>72-009-29</td>
<td>Fairmount Heights World War II Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-010-80</td>
<td>Wilson-Ferrier-Windsor House</td>
<td>72-009-30</td>
<td>Isaac Brown House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-013-08</td>
<td>Charles M. Lightbown Building</td>
<td>72-014</td>
<td>D.C. Boundary Marker NE 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-013-36</td>
<td>Mount Rainier United Methodist Church</td>
<td>72-064</td>
<td>Fairmont Heights High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-019</td>
<td>D.C. Boundary marker NE 7</td>
<td>73-009</td>
<td>Rose Mount Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-022</td>
<td>ERCO</td>
<td>75A-006</td>
<td>Epiphany Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-041-01</td>
<td>Professional Building</td>
<td>75A-008</td>
<td>Forestville Methodist Episcopal Church Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-061-07</td>
<td>A.A. Randall House</td>
<td>76B-016</td>
<td>Mount Hope African Methodist Episcopal Church Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-061-19</td>
<td>Garland-Palmer House</td>
<td>77-012</td>
<td>Saint Luke’s Methodist Episcopal Church Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-061-20</td>
<td>Sandy P. Baker House</td>
<td>79-019-22</td>
<td>Dr. William &amp; Sarah Beanes Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-061-22</td>
<td>Quander-Dock House</td>
<td>79-019-23</td>
<td>Magruder’s Law Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-079-01</td>
<td>Poppleton-Roberts House</td>
<td>79-019-23</td>
<td>Magruder’s Law Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-096-20</td>
<td>Rural Cottage at the Highlands</td>
<td>79-019-51</td>
<td>Old Marlboro Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-005-16</td>
<td>Peace Cross</td>
<td>79-019-52</td>
<td>Old Marlboro High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-021</td>
<td>Cherry Hill Cemetery</td>
<td>79-019-54</td>
<td>Bunnell-Anderson House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-023-17</td>
<td>William Stanton Wormley House</td>
<td>79-019-64</td>
<td>Crain Highway Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-023-27</td>
<td>Thomas Hunster House</td>
<td>79-046</td>
<td>Union Methodist Episcopal Chapel Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-024-26</td>
<td>Cheverly United Methodist Church</td>
<td>79-063-12</td>
<td>Gregor Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-028</td>
<td>Publick Playhouse</td>
<td>79-063-14</td>
<td>John Henry Quander House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-004</td>
<td>Franklin Pierce House</td>
<td>80-015</td>
<td>Warburton Manor Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-091</td>
<td>Western Star Lodge Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71B-019</td>
<td>Colbert Family Farm Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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80-050  Addison Family Cemetery
81A-008  James Gardiner House
81A-027  Christ Episcopal Church & Cemetery
81B-003  Thrift Schoolhouse
81B-011  Providence Methodist Episcopal Church & Cemetery
82A-008  James Christmas House
82A-019  Boys' Village of Maryland Cemetery
82A-027  Duvall Tobacco Barns
82B-000-013  Brookfield United Methodist Church & Cemetery
82B-006  Sansbury-Griffith House
82B-035-16  Nottingham Schoolhouse
82B-038  Site of Columbia Air Center
83-006  Strawberry Hill
83-009  Dr. William G. Hardy House (Kuehn House/Ellerbrook Farm)
85A-032-10  William Berry Early House
85A-032-11  William H. Early Store
85B-007  Cedarville Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) Cottages
85B-008  Cedarville Charcoal Kiln
86A-012  Saint Simon’s Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery
86A-013  Saint Mary’s Methodist Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery (Myers Cemetery)
86A-027-45  Tayman Tobacco Barn
86B-001  Gibbons Methodist Episcopal Church Site, Education Building & Cemetery
86B-008  Waring Tenant House
86B-018  Immanuel United Methodist Church & Cemetery
86B-037  Wilmer’s Park
86B-038  Sasscer Tobacco Barn
87A-009  Connick’s Folly & Cemetery
87A-012  Poplar Hill School
87A-018  Black Swamp Farm
87A-057  Black Swamp School
87B-033  John Wesley Methodist Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery
87B-036-12  Saint Phillip’s Episcopal Chapel Site & Cemetery
87B-036-17  James A. Cochrane Store
87B-036-35  Keech House

New Historic Resources
This plan adds 32 properties as Historic Resources to the plan Inventory.

62-023-20  Muirkirk School
67-022-03  Willard-Ryan House #1
68-013-01  Star/Potts Hall
68-041-03  Marché Florist
68-061-02  Orr House
68-061-03  William H. Thomas House
68-061-05  Owings House #1
68-061-08  Edith Mason House
68-061-13  Foursquare #1
68-061-15  Foursquare #2
70-037  Burke-Jackson House
70-053-11  Thomas Seabrook House
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70-087  Good Luck School
70-089  Spalding-Rigoli House
71A-006  Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railway Bridge
72-009-25  Fairmount Heights (Grace) Methodist Church
72-009-26  Trammell-Taylor House
72-009-27  Towles-Brooks House
72-009-28  Louis Brown House
72-009-31  William B. Coles House
72-009-32  John S. Johnson House
72-009-33  Henry Pinckney House
72-009-35  Cornelius Fonville House
72-009-36  Doswell Brooks House
72-009-39  Robert S. Nichols House
72-009-43  Prince Albert Washington House
72-045  Harmony Memorial Park
74B-030  Duvall-Hopkins Store at Hall Road
75A-055  Heinemann-Payton House
80-018-05  Lancaster House
85A-018  Union Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church & Cemetery
87A-058  Woodborough Boundary Stone

Other Inventory Changes

Deletions by the Historic Preservation Commission

Since the approval of the 1992 plan, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) determined that a number of historic resources no longer merited inclusion in the plan inventory. These properties were evaluated by the HPC either at the request of the owner or as a result of a development application referral. As a result of HPC decisions, the following properties are no longer included in the plan inventory:

65-009  John Miller House
68-010-29  Site of Pinkney Memorial Church
70-043  Robert Cook House
71A-011  Site of Bowie Family Cemetery¹
71A-014  Site of Bowie-Arnold House
74A-005  Townshend House
74A-013  Site of Hill Tenant House
74B-005  Samuel Hamilton House
76A-003  Souder House
78-004  Berry’s Grove/Barger Barn
78-007  Westphalia Schoolhouse
78-019  Latimer-Evans House
79-019-44  St. Mary’s of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church
80-014  Lyles Family Cemetery¹
81A-003  Marshall-Walters House
81A-009  Francis Goddard House
82A-030  Croom Station
82B-011  Tobacco Barn
82B-029  Cooksey House
84-017  Sharpersville School

¹ Four family graveyards have been legally moved to new locations: Bowie Family Cemetery (71A-011) was moved to Holy Trinity Episcopal Church & Cemetery (Historic Site 71A-009); part of Duvall Family Cemetery (70-022) was moved to Marietta (Historic Site 70-020) and is now considered a contributing element of that property; Early Family Cemetery (85B-001) was moved to Harmony Memorial Park (proposed Historic Resource 72-045); and Lyles Family Cemetery (80-014) was relocated to St. John’s Episcopal Church and Cemetery, Broad Creek (Historic Site 80-024-07).
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84-023-07    Harbin House/Clagett Store
85A-021    William Robinson House
85A-023    F. A. Rowe House
85A-032-07    J.R. Tayman House
85A-033-16    Marlow-MacPherson House
85B-001    Site of Early Family Cemetery¹
86A-001    Talbert-Hall House
87B-036-04    Aquasco Schoolhouse

Master Plan/Sector Plan Deletions

Since the approval of the 1992 *Prince George's County Historic Sites and Districts Plan*, the District Council has approved a number of other master plans and sector plans that deleted historic resources from the inventory. Additional historic resources were deleted by District Council approval of this plan. The following properties are, therefore, no longer included in the plan inventory: ²

70-044    Bagelmann House
71A-016    Collington School
71B-002-02    Frank Luers House
71B-002-04    Joffe Store
71B-002-14    William Luers House
71B-002-21    Magruder-Bell House
78-000-14a    Keokuk
78-000-14b    Ingleside
78-000-22    Navajo
78-000-23    Strawberry Hill
79-063-08    Eckenrode-Wyvill-Hopkins House
82B-028    William C. Duley House
83-003    Longview
85A-017    J. Eli Huntt Residence
85B-010    Charles S. Early, Sr. House
86A-019    Henry Harrison Sasscer House
86A-023    Thomas Garner House
87A-005    Summers Farm

Staff Proposed Deletions

In addition, because of irreversible physical changes, this plan deleted five historic resources from the inventory because they do not appear to meet historic site evaluation criteria, and the associated properties do not represent any reasonable likelihood for potential archeological significance:

72-011    Mallery House at Beaver Heights
79-001    Bowie-Johnson House
82A-006    Sasscer Tobacco Barn Site
82A-042-20    New Cheltenham Store & Post Office
84-023-02    Sarah Underwood House

Technical Corrections

The following ten D.C. Boundary Markers, identified as historic resources in the 1992 inventory, were deleted from the inventory because it has been determined that they are located in the District of Columbia rather than in Prince George's County.

68-075    D.C. Boundary Marker NE 5
72-020    D.C. Boundary Marker East
75A-025    D.C. Boundary Marker SE 2
75A-026    D.C. Boundary Marker SE 3
75B-002    D.C. Boundary Marker SE 1
76A-017    D.C. Boundary Marker SE 5
76A-018    D.C. Boundary Marker SE 6

² District Council actions on master plans and sector plans since 1992 have also added properties to the HSDP inventory. These additions are included in the complete inventory in Chapter 18 and, as appropriate, in the listing of designated historic sites in Chapter 16.
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76A-019    D.C. Boundary Marker SE 7
76A-020    D.C. Boundary Marker SE 9
76A-035    D.C. Boundary Marker SE 8

Record of Destroyed Historic Sites and Historic Resources between 1992 and 2009

Since the adoption of the 1992 plan, eight historic buildings have been destroyed by fire and one by tornado.

Three are no longer in the inventory:

Pinkney Memorial Church (Historic Resource 68-010-29) burned, and a new structure occupies its location.

Navajo (formerly Historic Resource 78-000-22)\(^3\)

Ingleside (formerly Historic Resource 78-000-14b)\(^3\)

Five other historic sites had their principal building destroyed by fire (or tornado, in the case of Brown’s Tavern); however, these properties retain significant features, so they remain as historic sites in the inventory:

60-004    Ammendale Normal Institute Site
66-001    Brown’s Tavern Site
79-063-07    Bowling-Buck House Site & Outbuildings
82A-009    Site of Sasscer’s Green
82A-034    Site of Ellerslie

\(^3\) Two properties that had been deleted by District Council action (see above) have since been destroyed by fire.
Part One

BACKGROUND
Part 1: Congregants outside Mount Nebo African Methodist Episcopal Church (Historic Site 74B-010) Queen Anne, mid-20th century.

Photo courtesy of Mount Nebo African Methodist Episcopal Church.
Chapter 1

Introduction

The 2010 Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan (HSDP) sets countywide preservation policy and provides citizens and government agencies with guidance on historic preservation. The plan assists in implementing effective historic preservation policies and strategies. It provides information about the county’s historic resources, presents an overview of preservation tools and techniques, and serves as a guide to the roles played by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), the Planning Board, the County Council, and citizens. The plan identifies goals, policies, and strategies that can be used to direct public and private efforts for the next five to ten years.

In November 2008, the Prince George’s County Council, sitting as the District Council, directed The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) to update the 1992 Prince George’s County Historic Sites and Districts Plan. The Council approved 12 goals to be addressed in the plan as well as a public participation process.

The 12 goals reflect issues and initiatives identified in the 1992 plan, such as losses from fire and deterioration, the need for a grant fund, inappropriate rehabilitation, restrictive building code requirements, the limited interpretation of demolition-by-neglect, and endangered burial grounds. The plan contains multiple chapters that discuss a variety of historic preservation issues. Everything from preservation planning to archeology is represented. The chapters were written to stand alone, but many of the goals are interdependent. Therefore, there is some duplication between the chapters. This plan has several purposes, but it will serve as a reference for the various topics for anyone who has an interest in historic preservation-related topics.

Public Participation Process

A public participation program is a critical element of any planning process. Adequate public notice and comment are vital to ensuring that the planning documents truly reflect the views of the citizens, interested organizations, and agencies in the county. Therefore, the public participation process for the HSDP encouraged participation by all stakeholders potentially affected by the plan. Stakeholders included citizens, historic property owners, nonprofit organizations, neighborhood organizations, religious organizations, civic organizations, local business groups, the building industry, the county government, the Board of Education, municipalities, and advocacy groups.

The project team used a variety of outreach techniques, including newsletters (electronic and conventional), first-class mailings to historic property owners to provide notice of public meetings, and press releases. To engage the public in the planning process, the project team used the following approaches:

- Facilitated dialogue on planning issues through workshops and community meetings.
- Continued expansion of the project mailing list with the sign-in lists from each successive meeting.
• Provided illustrative maps of historic sites and districts for viewing at public meetings.

• Conducted one-on-one meetings in person or by telephone, with various business owners, community organizations, and public agency staff unable to attend public meetings.

• Attended municipality, homeowners association, civic group, and religious organization meetings to present updated information about plan concepts and to seek responses.

• Created a project web site that incorporated all meeting information including meeting handouts, summaries, and a meetings calendar.

Three general community meetings were held in late fall 2008. At these meetings the public had an opportunity to learn about the planning process and how they could participate in further discussions. Suggestions resulting from these meetings were collected, reviewed, and incorporated into the planning process. All stakeholder meeting summaries were placed on the HSDP web site in order to allow any interested parties to review and comment on the summaries in case they were unable to attend the public meetings.

In winter 2008 and early spring 2009, follow-up stakeholder meetings were held to address specific topics or issues. All of the county’s municipalities were invited to these meetings and were offered their own presentations on the HSDP amendment process. Eleven municipalities responded and requested HSDP amendment presentations. The HPC was updated at its monthly meetings and individual HPC members also participated in a number of stakeholder and public meetings. At the conclusion of the planning process, in late spring 2009, additional meetings were held to share the planning team’s preliminary findings and to provide stakeholders with additional opportunities for input to shape the master plan. A total of 30 meetings occurred throughout the public participation process from November 2008 through July 2009. A staff draft was released for public comment in September 2009. A contact database was developed for this planning effort; it contained more than 1,700 individuals and approximately 200 affiliations. This database will be invaluable for future public notices of plan-related issues.

### Consistency with Other Plans

Maryland’s Planning Act and Smart Growth Initiatives recently updated these visions in HB 294-2009. The newly established 12 visions for all Maryland jurisdictions to follow as they plan for the future are listed below. The HSDP addresses some of those visions.

1. **Quality of life and sustainability**: a high quality of life is achieved through universal stewardship of the land, water, and air resulting in sustainable communities and protection of the environment.

   The HSDP proposes policies that contribute to the quality of life. By maintaining the existing historic built environment, historic preservation practices are one of the first measures that can be taken for sustainability of neighborhoods and/or communities.

2. **Public participation**: citizens are active partners in the planning and implementation of community initiatives and are sensitive to their responsibilities in achieving community goals.

   The extensive public participation for the HSDP has effectively influenced the proposals in the plan and the dialogue between government officials and the preservation community.

3. **Growth areas**: growth is concentrated in existing population and business centers, growth areas adjacent to these centers, or strategically selected new centers.

4. **Community design**: compact, mixed-use, walkable design consistent with existing community character and located near available or planned transit options is encouraged to ensure efficient use of land and transportation resources and preservation and enhancement of natural systems, open spaces, recreational areas, and historical, cultural, and archeological resources.

   This plan focuses attention on the nonrenewable cultural resources in the county.

5. **Infrastructure**: growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner.

6. **Transportation**: a well-maintained, multimodal transportation system facilitates the safe, convenient, affordable, and efficient movement of people, goods, and
services within and between population and business centers.

7. **Housing:** a range of housing densities, types, and sizes provides residential options for citizens of all ages and incomes.

The residential historic sites provide current and future county residents a choice of housing types.

8. **Economic development:** economic development and natural resource-based businesses that promote employment opportunities for all income levels within the capacity of the state’s natural resources, public services, and public facilities are encouraged.

Materials and labor used in the field of historic preservation are typically from local sources and are a stimulus to the local economy.

9. **Environmental protection:** land and water resources, including the Chesapeake and coastal bays, are carefully managed to restore and maintain healthy air and water, natural systems, and living resources.

The HSDP focuses reinvestment in existing infrastructure, which puts less stress on the natural environment as a whole.

10. **Resource conservation:** waterways, forests, agricultural areas, open space, natural systems, and scenic areas are conserved.

11. **Stewardship:** government, business entities, and residents are responsible for the creation of sustainable communities by collaborating to balance efficient growth with resource protection.

The HSDP assists in this balanced approach to growth by providing additional choices for business and/or community reinvestment. The government programs developed to retain these cultural resources can assist in the sustainability of these important communities.

12. **Implementation:** strategies, policies, programs, and funding for growth and development, resource conservation, infrastructure, and transportation are integrated across the local, regional, state, and interstate levels to achieve these visions.

The HSDP outlines specific implementation strategies in anticipation of an implementation plan developed to identify partners, allocate financial resources, and prioritize initiatives.

**General Plan Context**

The purpose of the county’s 2002 General Plan is to provide broad guidance for the future growth and development of the county and to lay the foundation for all future planning and development activities. The historic preservation goal identified in the General Plan is to “Identify and evaluate all historic resources for designation as historic sites or as contributing to historic districts.” The following historic preservation policies were also identified in the General Plan:

1. Integrate historic sites and districts into the county’s development pattern.

2. Protect historic resources through appropriate regulation and enforcement measures.

3. Encourage stewardship and adaptive use of historic sites and buildings in historic districts.

These policies are a starting point for the goals, policies, and strategies that are being proposed in the HSDP. Because historic preservation is integrated with the main goals of the General Plan, it is important to demonstrate how the General Plan goals relate to historic preservation policies and strategies for the county:

1. Encourage quality economic development: through the revitalization of historic neighborhoods and preservation and rehabilitation of individual historic sites, the county can attract and encourage quality economic development.

2. Make efficient use of existing and proposed county infrastructure and investment: historic properties are irreplaceable resources that are part of the existing infrastructure. By investing in these historic resources, an emphasis can be placed on reinvigorating these sites and neighborhoods. Investment and revitalization of sites and neighborhoods also provide a stimulus to the local economy by the sale of building material and the employment of skilled trades required for restoration of historic buildings.

3. Enhance quality and character of communities and neighborhoods: recognizing and maintaining the architectural character and details of historic buildings and
the character of existing streetscapes can help to enhance historic neighborhoods.

4. Preserve rural, agricultural, and scenic areas: through the protection of environmental settings and, in a larger context, the recognition of the importance of cultural landscapes, it is more likely that rural, agricultural, and scenic areas can be preserved.

5. Protect environmentally sensitive lands: by preserving the historic context of a historic site or district, environmentally sensitive lands may be protected. Recognition of the interconnection between the stewardship of environmental resources and cultural resources is essential to the protection of these important characteristics of the county.

Existing Preservation Framework

Historic Preservation Commission

The Prince George’s County HPC is composed of nine individuals appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council. Appointments to the HPC represent a number of fields of interest: history, architecture, commerce, municipal governance, building preservation and restoration, agriculture as well as representatives of certain organizations: the Prince George’s County Board of Realtors, the Minority Building Industry Association, and the Prince George’s Historical and Cultural Trust. The HPC has the responsibility for evaluating and designating historic sites, for authorizing tax credits for building rehabilitation, and for approving or denying historic area work permits for building alteration, demolition, or new construction. The HPC serves as an advisory body to the Planning Board and to other agencies in reviewing zoning applications, subdivisions, and other development projects, and legislation. The Historic Preservation Section of M-NCPPC’s Planning Department provides support to the HPC.

The HPC’s responsibilities can be divided into four general categories: (1) survey and designation, (2) review, (3) recommendations, and (4) advice and education. Under these categories, the HPC carries out a range of functions as mandated by the historic preservation ordinance (Subtitle 29 of the County Code).

1. Survey and Designation
   - Maintain and update an inventory of historic resources.
   - Research and evaluate historic resources for listing in the county’s HSDP and for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

2. Review
   - Approve or deny historic area work permit applications for alterations to historic sites or for new construction in historic districts.
   - Define environmental settings for historic sites during the development review process.
   - Administer programs providing grants, loans, or tax incentives for the restoration of historic properties.
• Approve property tax credits for appropriate restoration work and for compatible new construction.

3. Recommendations

• Review development referrals (zoning, special exceptions, subdivisions) and make recommendations to limit the impact of proposed projects on historic resources.

• Make recommendations on the use, upkeep, or adaptive use of publicly owned historic resources.

• Recommend programs and legislation to the County Council and Planning Board to encourage preservation efforts.

4. Advice and Education

• Provide advice and assistance to property owners on plans for alteration and new construction.

• Serve as a clearinghouse of preservation information and educational materials for the public.

• Undertake activities to advance the goals of historic preservation.

• Appoint local advisory committees to assist the HPC in its functions.

Certified Local Government Program

The Certified Local Government program (CLG), administered by the Maryland Historical Trust, sets standards for HPC preservation practice. Appointments to the HPC should follow the requirements described in 36 C.F.R.31. The CLG program allows local governments to participate directly in preservation decisions otherwise exercised by state government and to receive special federal matching funds for various local preservation activities. Seventeen of Maryland’s 47 HPCs currently participate in the CLG program, including the Prince George’s County HPC. Each year, the State of Maryland makes at least ten percent of its annual apportionment of the federal historic preservation fund available to CLGs.

The HPC can also participate in the Section 106 review process of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, in which federal agencies take into account the effects of their actions on historic properties.

Highlights of Implementation of the 1992 Historic Sites and Districts Plan

Soon after the approval of the 1992 plan, the Historic Preservation Section produced two important publications focused on county historic sites. Landmarks of Prince George’s County, a 144-page hardcover book of photographs illustrating the history of the county through its historic sites, was produced jointly by M-NCPPC and the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record, National Park Service and published by Johns Hopkins University Press in 1993. Also in 1993, the first edition of the Illustrated Inventory of Historic Sites was published. This smaller spiral-bound publication included photographs and brief descriptions of all historic sites. An expanded second edition was published in 1996; a third and current edition was published in 2006. Also in 1996, the African-American Heritage Survey was published as part of the celebration of the county’s 300th birthday.

Publications related to the survey and documentation of many of the county’s historic communities are listed in Chapter 3: Historic Site and Historic District Evaluation and Designation. Planning studies include the Broad Creek Historic District-Livingston Road Streetscape Guidelines and Alternatives (1995); the Broad Creek Historic District Preservation Planning Study (2002); and the Piscataway Village Rural Conservation Study, Part II: Village Design Guidelines (1995).

The Lower Patuxent Scenic Byway Intrinsic Quality Inventory Report (February 2007) was a first step in the development of a corridor management plan for the Lower Patuxent scenic byway. The Lower Patuxent Scenic Byway was designated as a Maryland scenic byway by the Maryland State Highway Administration and identified by Prince George’s County for its rural location on the Patuxent River and history of tobacco farming.

1 CLG Professional Requirements: (a) In accordance with the minimum professional requirements of the United States Department of the Interior for certifying local governments under 36 C.F.R. Part 61, at least two (2) members of the commission must possess professional or academic training in such fields as history, architecture, architectural history, planning, archeology, anthropology, curation, conservation, landscape architecture, historic preservation, urban design or related disciplines.
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The Antebellum Plantations in Prince George's County, Maryland: a Historic Context and Research Guide was published by M-NCPPC in July 2009. This document is intended as a tool for those studying antebellum life in Prince George’s County. A companion document, List of Free Blacks in Prince George’s County 1790-1860, will assist researchers focusing on the historically small but significant free black population in the county. Postbellum Archeological Resources in Prince George's County, Maryland: An Historic Context and Resource Guide, (published March 2010) focuses on research topics that can be enhanced by archeological investigations of sites from 1865 to 1958.

Other program highlights since the approval of the 1992 HSDP include:

- Continued historic surveys, National Register nominations, and historic site evaluations (see Chapter 3).

- Establishment of the Old Town College Park Historic District (see Part II).

- Development review procedures to protect environmental settings and cultural landscapes (see Chapters 6 and 9).

- Experience in protecting environmental settings (see Chapter 6).

- Passage of archeology regulations in 2005 (see Chapter 8).

- Architectural and engineering assessments (see Chapter 5).

- Establishment and administration of the historic property grant program (see Chapter 10).

- Continued historic preservation tax credit review and approval (see Chapter 10).

- Continued community outreach and work with educational institutions (see Chapters 13 and 14).
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HERITAGE THEMES

Introduction

The Historic Sites and Districts Plan (HSDP) presents a number of themes that represent important aspects of the county’s history, culture, and heritage. These themes provide a framework for evaluating the significance of properties. A summary of the county’s history, upon which local heritage themes are based, is presented in Appendix A—History of Prince George’s County. This chapter summarizes many of the county’s more significant themes. Each theme is illustrated with representative examples; properties may be used to illustrate multiple themes. It is important to note that many themes are interrelated and overlapping and extend through time to tell the story of the county’s history. The examples used here do not include properties in the City of Laurel because its corporate boundaries are excluded from M-NCPPC jurisdiction.

It should be noted that some of the more significant overarching themes have been broken down into more specific themes. For example, transportation is addressed through a range of more detailed themes such as early towns, landings and river crossings, taverns, railroads, streetcar suburbs, and aviation. The theme generally recognized as archeology, which covers both history and prehistory, is examined in greater detail in Appendix E—Prehistoric Context.

Although many significant elements of the county’s history are acknowledged in the thematic summaries that follow, the list of themes and associated properties will expand as further research and investigation broaden our knowledge of the county’s heritage. It is a stated policy of this plan to survey, identify, and research additional historic themes and associated resources that will more fully represent the county’s historic, cultural, archeological, and architectural heritage (see Chapter 3). Heritage themes can and should be used as the basis of educational programs and tours as a way of making history come alive in the context of the county’s multifaceted identity.

Prehistoric and Seventeenth Century Period

Native Americans—The land that became Prince George’s County was occupied for thousands of years before the first Europeans arrived, and there is considerable archeological evidence of Native American settlement along the Patuxent and Potomac Rivers and their tributaries. Examples of notable archeological sites include: Accokeek Creek Site, Nottingham Archeological Site, Mount Calvert Archeological Site, Piscataway Park Archeological Site, and National Archives Archeological Site.

African-Americans—Slavery was an established institution in the Maryland colony before the settlement and creation of Prince George’s County at the end of the seventeenth century. As a result, people of African descent were among the county’s first residents. The impact of those early settlers and their descendants can still be found in farmsteads, rural and suburban communities and their institutions, and in archeological sites throughout the county.

The Eighteenth Century and the Antebellum Period

Early Towns—Charles Town on the Patuxent was first established in 1683 and became the seat of government when Prince George’s County was established in 1696. Five more port towns (Marlborough, Queen Anne, Mill
Town, Nottingham, and Aire) were established in 1706 and Piscataway in 1707. Although little remains from the original settlements of the seven port towns, a number of older structures and sites represent them: Piscataway Tavern, Content and Darnall’s Chance in Upper Marlboro, Mount Calvert at the site of Charles Town, and Harmony Hall at the site of Aire. Another surviving feature of the early port towns includes the channel/canal cut by Humphrey Batts in 1749 to provide easier access to the tobacco warehouse at Aire.

**Agricultural Heritage**—From the earliest settlement and period of the establishment of Prince George’s County in the late seventeenth century until well into the twentieth century, agriculture was the basis of the county’s economy and directly or indirectly provided the livelihood of its residents. Tobacco was the principal crop and created wealth for the leading families of the county. The tobacco heritage is exemplified by the barns of early plantations like Concord, Wyoming, and The Cottage. Other agricultural efforts are represented by the Ashland Hay Barn, associated historically with the Compton Bassett plantation.

**Earliest Plantation Establishments**—The earliest settlements were along the waterways, near the seven early port towns, and near the parish churches. Large tracts of land were developed into plantations; these plantation landscapes, architectural characteristics, and culture are based on and linked to slavery in America. Some surviving plantation houses from this early period are Mount Airy, Billingsley, Bellefields, Mullikin’s Delight, Harmony Hall, Melwood Park, Belair, Wyoming, and Compton Bassett. Most of the earliest plantation sites are represented only by archeological remains, such as the Francis Marbury site (18PR833) in Brandywine and the Garrett’s Chance site (18PR703) in Aquasco.

**Colonial Churches**—When Prince George’s County was established in 1696, two parishes of the Church of England were already in existence: St. Paul’s Parish on the Patuxent River and Piscataway Parish on the Potomac. Early churches survive in both of the original parishes: St. Paul’s at Baden and St. John’s at Broad Creek. Rural chapels for these two churches also survive; Christ Church at Accokeek, which was the “lower” chapel of Piscataway Parish; Addison Chapel at Seat Pleasant, which was the “upper” chapel of the same parish; and St. Thomas’ at Croom, which was the chapel of St. Paul’s at Baden. A new parish, Queen Anne, was created in 1704 out of St. Paul’s; the church built for that parish in 1774 survives as St. Barnabas’ at Leeland. One Roman Catholic church survives from the colonial period: Sacred Heart Church at White Marsh, known also as the Mission of St. Francis Borgia; it was one of the early Catholic Jesuit Missions in the English colonies.

**Later Churches**—As the population of the county increased, the Church of England parishes were divided, and more places of worship were built. Public places of worship were built for Roman Catholics after 1776, and the nineteenth century saw the rise of the Methodist Episcopal Church. There are fine examples of nineteenth-century churches across the county: St. John’s at Beltsville, St. Barnabas at Oxon Hill, Trinity Church in Upper Marlboro, Holy Trinity at Collington, St. George’s in Glenn Dale, Chapel of the Incarnation at Brandywine, St. Ignatius at Oxon Hill, St. Joseph’s at Ammendale, Cheltenham Methodist Church, Holy Family Roman Catholic Church in Woodmore, and Perkins Chapel in Glenn Dale. New churches were built in the early twentieth century, often to replace older churches on the same site to accommodate growing congregations: St. Thomas Methodist Church near Baden, Holy Rosary Roman Catholic Church at Rosaryville, Ridgely Church in the Landover area, Union Methodist Church in Upper Marlboro, Old St. Margaret’s Roman Catholic Church in Seat Pleasant, and Old Bells Methodist Church in Camp Springs.

**The Revolutionary Period**—Reminders of the American Revolution are represented in the archeological site of the munitions and uniform manufactory operated by Stephen West at The Woodyard and by St. Barnabas’ Church at Leeland, the scene of pre-Revolutionary confrontations during the tenure of outspoken Tory rector Jonathan Boucher who was connected to Mount Lubentia.
**Planters’ and Farmers’ Dwellings**—These types of dwellings are represented by Riversdale, Bowieville, Weston, Solitude, Rosemount, Brookefield of the Berrys, Brookewood, Woodstock, the James Hamilton House, The Cottage, Oakland, Strawberry Hill (Upper Marlboro), Villa de Sales, and Sunnyside.

**Early Crossroads Communities**—During the nineteenth century, a number of small rural communities developed along major crossroads. These villages provided goods and services for the dispersed farm population and often contained a store, church, tavern, school, blacksmith shop, and post office. Examples of small village crossroads include Rossville, Croom, Woodville/Aquasco, Brandywine, Naylor, and T.B.

**Commerce, Industry, and Scientific Advancements**

**Commerce**—Most of the early commerce in the county was associated with tobacco, and the crop even served as legal tender for debts. This commerce in the colonial period is best represented by the Market Master’s House and the George Washington House, which served as a store, both in Bladensburg and Kingston in Upper Marlboro. Later commerce is represented by the rural general store, e.g., the Coffren Store in Croom, the Crandell-Rothstein House in Upper Marlboro, the Marlow-Huntt Store in Brandywine, and the Cochrane Store in Aquasco. Later structures reflect the range of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century commercial activity, such as the Prince George’s Bank buildings in Hyattsville and Mount Rainier, the Bank of Brandywine, and the Lustine Chevrolet Showroom in Hyattsville.

**Industry**—The earliest industry in the county is represented by water-powered mills, such as the Adelphi Mill constructed northwest of Hyattsville for the grinding of grain at the end of the eighteenth century. Iron was mined in the upper Patuxent region, and in the 1840s, the Muirkirk Ironworks was established in the Beltsville area. During the Revolution, munitions and uniforms were manufactured at Stephen West’s Woodyard establishment, represented by The Woodyard Archeological Site. Nineteenth-century industry is exemplified by the blacksmith/wheelwright shop at the H.B.B. Trueman Farm. The impact of twentieth-century industry requires further evaluation; numerous building types associated with this time period are currently being identified and documented.

**Agricultural Science**—Early examples of agricultural science are represented by Salubria, the plantation home of agricultural innovator Dr. John Bayne, as well as Riversdale, the plantation of Charles B. Calvert, founder of county and state agricultural societies and of the Maryland Agricultural College. A later example is Mount Calvert, the home of David E. Brown who worked as a field agent for the Department of Agriculture’s experiment station near Upper Marlboro from 1908 through the 1940s and who was instrumental in the development of Maryland Mamouth variety of tobacco. Local scientific interest in agriculture is also represented by the Rossborough Inn on the campus of the University of Maryland at College Park, a building that served as an agricultural experimentation station during the late nineteenth century. Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, founded in 1910 in Beltsville, has played a leading role in the agricultural sciences across the world since the 1930s by engaging in such activities as the maintenance of irreplaceable specimen collections and the development of nationally important cultivars such as the Glenn Dale azalea.

**Medicine**—There are a number of historic sites in Prince George’s County with strong ties to the field of medicine. For example, Dr. Adam Thomson, a prominent eighteenth-century physician, lived at Darnall’s Chance in Upper Marlboro and invented the American method of smallpox inoculation, which reduced the disease’s mortality by half and became the standard procedure in the colonies until the development of the smallpox vaccine. Many local doctors in the nineteenth century practiced their profession from home offices; these are represented by the Dr. Edgar Hurtt House in Piscataway, the Dr. William H. Gibbons House in Croom, the Dr. Charles Fox House in Beltsville, and the Adams-Bowen House in Aquasco. The most significant twentieth century medical facility in the county is the Glenn Dale Hospital, which was built in 1934 as a tuberculosis sanitarium for the District of Columbia.

**Horse Breeding and Racing**—Prince George’s County has played a leading role in Maryland’s horse breeding and racing pursuits since the early eighteenth century. By the middle of the century, there were regular races at Upper Marlboro, and in the 1780s and 1790s, the noted Virginia sire Obscurity stood at Harmony Hall in Broad Creek. This tradition continued in Broad Creek when in the 1930s,
Charles Collins bred Tennessee Walking Horses there. The 250-year history of breeding and racing at Belair is documented through the museum at the early-twentieth-century stone Belair Stable in Bowie. Several other historic sites illustrate this storied tradition, including Kildare, Fairview, and Weston.

Transportation

Waterways, Landings, and River Crossings—The earliest arteries of transportation were local waterways, and the first settlements and subsequent towns were established on major waterways. Landings were established at the tobacco inspection stations and at other locations on the Patuxent and Potomac Rivers. During the nineteenth century, steamboats traveled along these watercourses stopping at old landings, such as Trueman Point. Bridges were built across the Patuxent River near the Duvall sawmill, the town of Queen Anne, and Hill’s Landing among others. These traditional landings and crossings are represented in the twentieth-century truss bridges, Duvall Bridge and Governors Bridge, which replaced earlier spans.

Early Roads—The earliest network of roads in Prince George’s County began to develop in the late 17th century and primarily connected plantations with port towns and churches. As the county grew, more roads were cleared as more churches were constructed, and new towns were created. The county’s early roads are described in a survey conducted in 1739. A network of more than 50 roads was described in the survey, connecting the towns of Upper Marlborough, Piscataway, Queen Anne, Nottingham, Milltown, Aire (Broad Creek), and Beall Town. More roads were added to the earlier network by 1762 and 1828. By the middle of the nineteenth century, a complex system of roadways connected planters with towns, churches, mills, taverns, and other plantations. A recent analysis of the 1828 road survey states that there are landmarks along these roads that still exist.1

Taverns—At strategic points along major roads, especially in principal towns and river crossings, taverns were established. These businesses catered to the needs of travelers and provided gathering places for the exchange of news and opinion. Several early taverns still stand: George Washington House, Rossborough Inn, Piscataway Tavern, Hardy’s Tavern, Horsehead Tavern, and Mary Surratt House.

Railroads—The way of life in Prince George’s County was significantly changed with the construction of two major railroad lines: the Baltimore and Ohio line in 1835 and the Baltimore and Potomac line in 1872. Reminders of the importance of these rail lines survive and are represented by the Bowie railroad buildings, Chew’s Bridge, and the remnants of the Chesapeake Beach railway bridge across the Patuxent River near Mount Calvert.

Aviation—The history of aviation in Prince George’s County dates to the late eighteenth century when pioneering ascents of tethered balloons were conducted by local innkeeper and attorney Peter Carnes in Bladensburg in June 1784. Prince George’s County can boast the oldest continually operating airfield in the world at the College Park Airport, where Wilbur Wright conducted military flight instruction in 1909. In addition, Columbia Air Center in Upper Marlboro, opened in 1941 and operated until 1956 by John Greene, was primarily used by former military personnel.

1 Some of these early roads include Woodmore Road, Governors Bridge Road, Church Road, Oak Grove Road, Mill Branch Road, Queen Anne Bridge Road, Queen Anne Road, Marlboro Pike, Croom Road, Accokeek Road, Piscataway Road, Livingston Road, Old Crain Highway in Woodland, White’s Landing Road, and Milltown Landing Road.
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Tuskegee Airmen and was the first licensed black-owned and operated airport in the country at the time. Another significant aviation resource is the ERCO plant in Riverdale that operated from 1938 until the 1960s and produced the low-wing monoplane known as the Ercoupe, initially developed for military purposes and later adapted for civilian aviation. ERCO’s Art Deco industrial building with its large truss-less factory core remains as a notable landmark in the US 1 corridor. Local military aviation efforts are embodied by Joint Base Andrews (formerly Andrews Air Force Base) established in 1942.

Political and Social History, Religion, Recreation, and The Arts

War of 1812—Prince George’s County was directly affected during the War of 1812 by the British invasion of Washington. As the British marched north and west through the county, their impact was felt at several important sites: Mount Calvert, on the Patuxent near Upper Marlboro; Bellefields and St. Thomas’ Church in Croom; Trinity Church and Darnall’s Chance in Upper Marlboro; Melwood Park; The Woodyard; Mount Lubentia; Addison Chapel; Bostwick Market Master’s House and the Hilleary-Magruder House in Bladensburg; Riversdale; Magruder Spring; Crawford’s Adventure Spring; and Fort Washington (Warburton Manor).

Civil War—Several historic sites represent the Civil War period in Prince George’s County including two forts, Fort Foote and Fort Washington, both used in the defense of the nation’s capital as well as the Mary Surratt House from which John Wilkes Booth escaped after his assassination of President Lincoln at Ford’s Theater in Washington.

Political History—Because of Prince George’s County’s close association with the national capital, it has been much involved with political movements and events. Several historic sites represent this political history: one is Grigsby Station Log Cabin, which stood on the farm where Belva Lockwood was nominated for the U.S. Presidency in 1884; others were the residences of prominent statesmen and politicians, such as Riversdale (home of George Calvert and Charles Benedict Calvert); the Site of Rose Mount (the home of Governor Joseph Kent); Mattaponi in Croom (the home of Governor Robert Bowie); St. James Hill in Piscataway (home of Benedict Semmes); Marietta (the home of Gabriel Duvall); Belair (home of Samuel Ogle and Benjamin Ogle); Fairview (the home of Governor Oden Bowie); the Digges-Sasscer House (the home of Lansdale G. Sasscer); The Cottage (the home of Charles Clagett); and Oxon Hill Manor (the home of Sumner Welles).

Social History—The theme of social history is represented in the many facets of Prince George’s County historic sites. The late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century practice of dueling is represented in the Bladensburg Dueling Grounds. The sport of the hunt is represented in the Marlboro Hunt Club. Other interrelated themes such as recreation and resort communities address social history in an African-American context.

African-American Religious Practices—After the Civil War, the African-American population in Prince George’s County was subjected to segregation and institutionalized discrimination by the racial caste system sometimes referred to as “Jim Crow” laws. Newly freed slaves, resisting the indignities of Jim Crow laws, created communities centered on churches, schools, and benevolent societies that fulfilled religious, educational, and recreational needs. The rise of the African-American beneficial societies is represented in St. Mary’s Beneficial Society Hall and Abraham Hall. Examples of early African-American churches and cemeteries in the county include Holy Family Roman Catholic Church in Woodmore, Queen’s Chapel and Cemetery, Union Chapel and Cemetery, Carroll Chapel, John Wesley Methodist Church and Cemetery, and Brooks Methodist Church.

African-American Resorts and Recreation—Although African Americans existed within a segregated society through the middle of the twentieth century, by the early years of the century a number of communities developed to serve the housing and recreational needs of the local
population. These communities were initially intended as weekend retreats or suburban communities; this theme is represented by historic communities such as Lincoln, Eagle Harbor, and Cedar Haven. In the twentieth century, organized sporting activities, such as local baseball leagues, were held at places like Blacksox Park in present-day Bowie and at Wilmer’s Park in Brandywine. Both Wilmer’s Park and the Notley Hall Amusement Park on the Potomac provided for recreation and entertainment for African-Americans.

The Arts—In the twentieth century, Prince George’s County emerged as an important regional fine arts center. A number of bluegrass, jazz, and R&B music venues in Bladensburg, Brentwood, North Brentwood, and Brandywine thrived for much of the mid- and late-twentieth century. Similarly, institutions like the University of Maryland’s David C. Driskell Center for the Study of the Visual Arts and Culture of African Americans and the African Diaspora became important features of the county’s cultural landscape. Although the visual and performing arts do not encompass historic preservation directly, more survey and analysis of the physical impact of the arts on the landscape should be undertaken in the future to elaborate on this theme.

Civil Society

African American History—African-Americans have played a large part in the history of Prince George’s County, as illustrated in numerous historic sites and broad settlement patterns: St. Paul’s (Free Hope Baptist) Church, the Butler House, Abraham Hall, St. Mary’s Beneficial Society Hall, Mt. Nebo Church, the D.S.S. Goodloe House, St. Thomas Methodist Church, Union Methodist Church, Dorsey Chapel, and the Northampton Slave Quarter Site and Archaeological Park. There are a number of important early twentieth-century African-American suburban communities, including North Brentwood, Fairmount Heights, and Glenarden, as well as the retreat communities of Ardwick, and Cedar Haven and Eagle Harbor on the Patuxent River. Free black families living in the county prior to the Civil War were not able to acquire titles to land until the 1870s or later. Examples of early settlements by free black families are the John Henry Quander House outside Upper Marlboro and the Colbert Family Farm Site near Bowie.

Education—The field of education is well represented in Prince George’s County, from the one-room schoolhouse to the main campus of the University of Maryland. Examples include Friendly School, Seabrook School, Berwyn Heights Schoolhouse, Briarley Military Academy, Rossborough Inn, Greenbelt Center School, and Black Swamp School. Other examples include the nine surviving Rosenwald schools built for African-American students in rural areas in the 1920s and 1930s, such as Ridgeley School and the D.S.S. Goodloe House, home of the first principal of the African-American Maryland Normal and Industrial School (now Bowie State University). Many of the Freedmen’s Bureau schools, built shortly after the Civil War for African-American students, are no longer standing but may represent opportunities for archeological investigation. An important twentieth century landmark in the history of African-American education in the county is the Fairmont Heights High School.

Law—Many important Prince Georgians achieved renown in the legal profession, and their houses and offices survive as reminders of their accomplishments and of the contribution to the legal community. These include Marietta House and Law Office (the home of Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court Gabriel Duvall); Trelawn (home of Joseph K. Roberts, Jr.); the Digges-Sasscer House (home of prominent attorneys Daniel C. Digges, William A. Jarboe, and Lansdale G. Sasscer); the Magruder’s Law Office in Upper Marlboro; the Thomas J. Calloway House in Lincoln; and Trammell-Taylor House in Fairmount Heights.

Civil Rights—In the middle of the twentieth century, local citizens participated in the struggle for civil rights
that gripped the nation, and their activism resulted in substantial local changes in education, fair housing practices, and access to public buildings. A number of local properties in Fairmount Heights, such as the Fairmont Heights High School and the Trammell-Taylor House, are significant for the roles that these buildings and their occupants played in this movement. Tommie Broadwater, the first African-American elected to the Maryland state senate in a district outside the City of Baltimore, attended high school at the Fairmont Heights High School. G. James Gholson, another prominent African-American in the county was principal at that time. Gholson, who was the school’s chief administrator from 1950–1969, later became the chief architect of the Prince George’s County plan to desegregate schools. The Trammell-Taylor House recalls the activities of Judge Taylor who became the first African-American to serve as Assistant State Attorney and later won a judgeship in a countywide elective office. In Deanwood, another community close to the District line, Benjamin and Clara Mitchell lived in the Van Horn-Mitchell House. They were devout Muslims and entertained notable visitors, such as Elijah Muhammed, Muhammad Ali, Malcolm X, and Anwar Sadat at their home in Prince George’s County.

The Twentieth Century

Suburban Growth—In the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, numerous residential suburbs were developed to the north and east of Washington, D.C., along the two railroad lines. Examples of this initial phase of suburbanization include the O’Dea House, the Kleiner-Dillon House, the Pickett House, the Wetherald House, the E. J. Taylor House, the Berwyn Heights Schoolhouse, and the Kleiner-Davidson White House in Berwyn Heights; the Welsh House, the Holden House, the Holden-Sweeting House, the Shepherd-Sibley House, and the McEwen House in Hyattsville; the Cory House and the McDonnell House in College Park; Kelly Cottage, Seabrook Cottage, and Seabrook School in Seabrook; the Straining House in Bowie; the Warren House in Riverdale Park; the Baker-Holliday House, the LaValle House, and the Bowers-Sargent House in Daniels Park; and the Bellamy House in Cheverly. The range of late nineteenth- to mid-twentieth-century suburbs near Washington, D.C., is found in the seven National Register Historic Districts of the US 1 corridor and includes Mount Rainier, North Brentwood, Hyattsville, Riverdale Park, West Riverdale, University Park, and Calvert Hills in College Park. Suburban growth in the county before and after World War II is represented by the planned town of Greenbelt developed in the 1930s by the U.S. Resettlement Administration and by the planned community of Belair at Bowie, developed by William J. Levitt & Sons in the late 1950s. Greenbelt was designated as a National Historic Landmark in 1996. Belair at Bowie can be evaluated for potential listing on the National Register of Historic Places after 2011.

Streetcar Suburbs—The Maryland & Washington Railway was the first streetcar line established in Prince George’s County in 1897. It extended from Washington, D.C., to Hyattsville, Riverdale, and to Laurel by 1902. New suburbs, such as Mount Rainier, Brentwood, North Brentwood, and Cottage City, also grew up along this line. In 1908, the Washington, Baltimore, and Annapolis Railway began operation in the county and facilitated the transport of vacationers to the western shore of the Chesapeake Bay. With the expansion of streetcar service into the winter months, new suburbs, such as Seat Pleasant, Capitol Heights, and Fairmount Heights, were established. In 1908, the Washington, Baltimore, and Annapolis Railway began operation in the county and facilitated the
development of communities, such as Glenarden, Ardwick, Ardmore, and Lincoln.

**Industry**—Commercial and industrial areas developed along major road arteries, such as Baltimore Avenue (US 1), Annapolis Road, Kenilworth Avenue, and along the railroad lines in areas such as Hyattsville, Riverdale Park, Edmonston, and College Park. The Muirkirk Iron Manufacturing Company, located about three miles south of Laurel, was in operation from 1847 to the early 1900s. Industrial buildings consisted of warehouses and light manufacturing, with occupants engaged in storage, distribution, and fabrication. Many science industry firms were also located near the University of Maryland and Goddard Space Flight Center. Sand and gravel operations were common in the northwestern part of the county near Beltsville and Laurel and in southern portions of the county near Brandywine.

**The Federal Presence**—Before World War II, the United States Government initiated a substantial program aimed at decentralizing the federal presence in the District of Columbia. As part of this effort, numerous federal installations were developed in Maryland and Virginia adjacent to Washington, D.C. Before and after World War II, Prince George’s County became the location of facilities such as BARC and the National Agricultural Library in Beltsville, the Patuxent Wildlife Research Refuge in Laurel, the U.S. Department of Agriculture Plant Introduction Station in Glenn Dale, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Goddard Space Flight Center, Andrews Air Force Base (now Joint Base Andrews), and the Suitland Federal Center.

**Multifamily Dwellings**—Significant early- and mid-twentieth-century additions to the local landscape are the individual apartment building and the garden apartment complex. This theme is represented by the International Style apartment buildings within the planned community of Greenbelt, the Art Moderne apartment building in the Old Town College Park Historic District at 7201 Princeton Avenue, and Hilltop Manor, the simplified Colonial Revival style complex in Bladensburg. A notable subtheme for multifamily dwellings is found in the fraternity and sorority houses near the University of Maryland campus in College Park; Theta Chi Fraternity and Kappa Alpha Theta Sorority at 7401 and 7407 Princeton Avenue, respectively, are examples within the Old Town College Park Historic District.

**Ecclesiastical and Residential Architecture**

**Ecclesiastical Architectural Styles**—Although none of the earliest churches and chapels, which were most commonly of frame construction, have survived, there are notable examples of a range of architectural styles used for religious buildings throughout the county.

**Colonial/Georgian**—St. Paul’s at Baden, St. Barnabas’ Episcopal Church at Leeland, and Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Church at White Marsh.

**Late Georgian/Federal**—St. John’s at Broad Creek and Addison Chapel in Seat Pleasant.

**Tudor Revival**—St. Mary’s Episcopal Church in Aquasco and Forest Grove Methodist Church (Chapel 2) at Joint Base Andrews.

**Victorian Gothic**—Trinity Episcopal Church in Upper Marlboro, Christ Episcopal Church in Accokeek, St. Thomas’ Episcopal Church in Croom, St. Thomas Methodist Church in Horsehead, St. Mary’s Roman Catholic Church in Piscataway, Cheltenham Methodist Church, Holy Family Roman Catholic Church in Mitchellville, and Dorsey Chapel in Glenn Dale.
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**Queen Anne/Stick Style**—St. Ignatius Roman Catholic Church in Oxon Hill, St. John’s Episcopal Church and St. Joseph Roman Catholic Chapel in Beltsville.

**Romanesque Revival**—St. James Roman Catholic Church in Mount Rainier.

**Spanish Mission**—Chapel of the Incarnation in Brandywine.

**Rural Vernacular**—Ridgely Methodist Episcopal Church in Landover, Holy Rosary Roman Catholic Church in Rosaryville, Mount Nebo A.M.E. Church in Queen Anne, and Carroll Methodist Chapel in Mitchellville.

**Residential Architectural Styles**—Fine examples of historic domestic architecture survive in Prince George’s County from the turn of the eighteenth century through the first half of the twentieth century. Important examples of each architectural style are listed below.

**Colonial/Georgian**—Belair, Hilleary-Magruder House, Mount Airy, Mount Pleasant, Piscataway House, Admirathoria, Bellefields, Harmony Hall, Bostwick, and Melwood Park.

**Late Georgian/Federal**—Montpelier, Compton Bassett, and Poplar Hill on His Lordship’s Kindness.

**Federal**—Oaklands, Snow Hill, Marietta, Riversdale, Wyoming, Goodwood, Beall’s Pleasure, Mount Lubentia, Pleasant Prospect, Concord, and Mount Calvert.

**Transitional Federal/Greek Revival**—Bowieville, Williams Plains, Pleasant Hills, Brookefield of the Berrys, Pleasant Prospect, Sasscer’s Green, Fairview, and Weston.

**Greek Revival**—Hitching Post Hill, Melford, The Cottage, West End Farm, Holy Trinity Rectory, Coffren House, Bellevue, Oakland, Charles Hill, Belvidere, Trumps Hill, Woodstock, and Gwynn Park.

**Italianate**—Waverly, Straining House, Ashland, Bleak Hill, Mount Clare, and P. A. Bowen House.


**Victorian Gothic**—Bowling Heights and Villa de Sales.


**Colonial Revival**—Boyden House, Boxlee, Beechwood, D.S.S. Goodloe House, and Marché House.

**Spanish Mission**—Bellamy House and Holbrook House.

**Twentieth-Century Estate Mansions**—McCormick-Goodhart Mansion, Oxon Hill Manor, and Newton White Mansion.

**International Style**—The original portions of the U.S. Government’s planned town of Greenbelt.

**Mail-order Plan/Kit Houses**—O’Dea House and Kleiner-Davidson White House in Berwyn Heights, Belmar, and Lustron houses.

**Modern Movement**—Marché House and Rizzo House.
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EVALUATION AND DESIGNATION

Background

The Inventory of Historic Resources is the listing of properties in the Historic Sites and Districts Plan (HSDP) regulated by Subtitle 29, the county historic preservation ordinance of the Prince George’s County Code. Since the adoption and approval of the 1992 Prince George’s County Historic Sites and Districts Plan, the Planning Department’s Historic Preservation Section has engaged in significant historic property survey efforts to expand the range of documented properties in the county through amendments to area master plans or the HSDP. From 1992–2008, the Historic Preservation Commission designated 51 properties as historic sites. Of those designations, 44 properties had been included as historic resources in the 1992 Historic Sites and Districts Plan, and the remaining seven were documented properties that were designated as historic sites through master plan and sector plan amendment projects. In July 2009 a historic property not previously in the Inventory of Historic Resources became a historic site through a new process.¹

Since the adoption and approval of the 1992 Historic Sites and Districts Plan, the Planning Department’s Historic Preservation Section has completed a number of planning studies and documentation projects, most commonly at the request of a municipality or community organization. These publications include: Brentwood Historical Survey (1992); North Brentwood Historical Survey (1992); Landmarks of Prince George’s County (1993); Edmonston Historical Survey (1993); Greenbelt Historic District Study (1994); Broad Creek Historic District–Livingston Road Streetscape Guidelines and Alternatives (1995); Glenarden: The Past in Perspective (1995); Piscataway Village Rural Conservation Study Part II: Village Design Guidelines (1995); Old Town College Park Architectural Survey (1997); Greenbelt Historic District Draft Design Guidelines (1997); East Hyattsville Architectural Survey (1998); Riverdale Park Architectural Survey (2001); Broad Creek Historic District Preservation Planning Study (2002); and the Illustrated Inventory of Historic Sites (1993/1996/2006).

In anticipation of celebrations associated with the county’s tricentennial in 1996, the Historic Preservation Section initiated significant survey and documentation work on county resources from 1994–1996. One of the most notable results of that work was the publication of the Prince George’s County African-American Heritage Survey, 1996. This 166-page publication summarized and updated information that had been collected since the early 1970s about African-American historic resources in the county. An updated version of this publication will be available in 2011. Other historic documentation and registration projects include, in addition to 14 individual National Register nominations and five National Register Historic District nominations, two multiple property documentation projects: African-American Historic Resources in Prince George’s County, Maryland, and Apartment Buildings and Garden Apartment Complexes in Prince George’s County, Maryland: 1934-1955.

In 2002 and 2003 through participation in the Maryland Historical Trust’s Preservation Incentives for Local Governments (PILG) program, Prince George’s County developed a five-year survey and evaluation plan to guide local efforts. This plan summarized past survey and documentation efforts and identified gaps to guide future research. Building on a range of past survey initiatives, the PILG plan identified priorities that could potentially be funded, at least in part, by competitive state grants.

¹ Subtitle 29 provides for the evaluation and designation of historic resources included in the Inventory of Historic Resources. In November 2008, the historic preservation ordinance was revised to provide for the review and designation of any historic property through a three-step public hearing process (see Subtitle 29.120.01), Petition for Designation of Historic Properties, that is not master plan or sector plan dependent.
Although state and local funding sources and staffing soon dissipated, the research priorities remain and still guide the Planning Department’s Historic Preservation Section staff in the establishment of annual work program items.

A number of research topics were identified in 2002 through the PILG project. These included the development of National Register of Historic Places multiple-property documents (MPDs) focused on specific subjects that reflect local heritage themes and types of historic resources. The intent of a MPD is to establish a detailed context statement through which individual properties can be listed in the National Register. The PILG survey and evaluation plan identified a number of subjects suitable for the development of MPDs such as African-American resources, Rosenwald schools, inter-war housing (1918-1941), Sears, Roebuck and Co. mail-order housing; industrial and commercial buildings; post-war (World War II) resources; vernacular buildings; and the modern movement in mid-20th-century architecture. As many of these subjects potentially overlap, one multiple property context document could address many local resource types. For example, a multiple property document prepared for African-American resources could potentially include a discussion of education that could address Rosenwald schools, religious schools, and buildings associated with segregation.

The Planning Department’s work program priorities from 2003-2005 included the completion of the MPDs for African-American resources and apartment buildings and garden apartment complexes. A number of these potential MPDs, based on the PILG plan, remain to be developed. A recently developed multiple property document, Tobacco Barnes of Southern Maryland, includes the Tayman Tobacco Barn (St. Thomas Episcopal Parish Tobacco Barn) in Croom. The tobacco barns of southern Maryland were listed in the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Most Endangered Historic Places list in 2004.

**National Register of Historic Places**

An ongoing initiative for the Planning Department’s Historic Preservation Section staff has been the listing of properties in the National Register of Historic Places. Most of these efforts were initiated by the Department’s Historic Preservation Section staff, some with the assistance of survey and documentation grants from the Maryland Historical Trust. Others were developed by property owners or a municipality, often with technical supervision from Historic Preservation Section staff. Between 1992–2009, 14 individual properties were listed in the National Register, along with seven National Register historic districts, and two National Historic Landmark nominations.


Of the seven National Register districts listed since 1992, the Historic Preservation Section initiated five of the district nominations at the request of municipalities or civic associations: University Park (1996), Calvert Hills (2002), Riverdale Park and West Riverdale (2002), North Brentwood (2003); the section provided technical oversight for a sixth (the Hyattsville Historic District originally listed in 1982 and amended and expanded by the City of Hyattsville in 2004). A seventh historic district nomination for Suitland Parkway (1995) was prepared.
by the M-NCPPC. In addition, two National Historic Landmark nominations were prepared for Greenbelt, Maryland (1997) and Riversdale Mansion (2003).

Two National Register MPD projects were prepared by consultants for the Historic Preservation Section. The purpose of MPDs is to establish context statements for important county themes and provide a thematic overview through which individual properties can be listed in the National Register: African-American Historic Resources in Prince George’s County, Maryland (2004) and Apartment Buildings and Garden Apartment Complexes in Prince George’s County, Maryland: 1934-1955 (2005). The five individual nominations prepared in 2005 represent the first of many potential listings through the African-American MPD. Similarly, the listing of Hilltop Manor Apartments in 2007 was the first of many potential listings under the apartment buildings and garden apartment MPD.

Recent Survey Initiatives
In preparation for the 2008-2010 master plan amendment, the Historic Preservation Section supervised the work of consultants to: (1) update documentation on most historic resources included in the Inventory of Historic Resources; (2) update and expand existing documentation on African-American historic properties based on the 1996 survey publication; (3) systematically inventory historic burial grounds and cemeteries in order to make recommendations about which of these properties might merit inclusion in the inventory either as a historic resource or as a historic site.

Through consultant contracts, the documentation of 115 historic resources was updated; the character of 60 historic communities, which includes two historic districts (Broad Creek and Old Town College Park), was updated and summarized; the documentation of 67 African-American historic properties was updated; and documentation for as many as 50 additional properties was developed for the first time. Significant groundwork was completed identifying a large number of historic communities and concentrations of historic buildings across the county. The documentation of 58 historic communities provides a basis for a new perspective on the history of the county. Appendix B contains a summary of the documented historic communities. The history of these communities will be made available through as many outlets as can be accomplished. This documentation is a beginning to help focus on neighborhood histories in the county.

Community-initiated requests to prepare historic district documentation for four communities were addressed through a consultant contract. Because of the detailed documentation and time required to conduct community outreach aimed at potential historic district designation, no proposed historic districts are included in this master plan. Rather, the documentation requests received and the documentation that will result, will serve as the basis for plan strategies focused on potential historic district designations once the Historic Sites and Districts Plan is approved.

Issues
During stakeholder meetings for the plan, a number of issues were noted regarding the historic preservation program’s evaluation and designation tools and strategies: the need to broaden the range of historic resources and historic themes represented in the Inventory of Historic Resources; the value of presenting historic resources thematically in addition to geographically; and the need to enhance connections between historic resources that may be isolated and unrelated to their current surroundings.

The ability to retain the historic context of an individual historic site or a historic district is often vital to its historic, aesthetic, and cultural value and its preservation. However, since historic properties may be isolated from one another as a result of the course of development, the impact of existing conditions and zoning pressures should be examined to avoid further compromising those remaining historic properties. In addition, where physical connections between properties no longer exist, or where physical characteristics have disappeared, cultural associations may still remain. Particularly in these cases, interpretive and thematic connections should be encouraged through signage and other educational tools.

Since the establishment of the county’s historic preservation program, the Planning Department’s ongoing survey initiatives have greatly expanded the public’s understanding of a wide range of properties and places that may merit inclusion in the Inventory of Historic Resources. Both the 1981 and the 1992 Historic Sites and Districts Plans presented thematic lists of resources as well as numerical and geographically organized lists.

---

2 Two of the 60 communities documented, Broad Creek and Old Town College Park, already designated as county historic districts, are documented in Chapter 17.
The current plan also includes a list of representative properties organized thematically. Once documented and protected, thematically linked properties should also be interpreted and publicized.

M-NCPPC staff should continue to address identified local heritage themes as survey and documentation priorities and work with the community to identify additional emerging themes that should be the focus of future survey and documentation efforts. Additional work on themes, such as the impact of the federal government, twentieth-century construction practices, and aspects of cultural heritage, will always be needed.

Recent documentation efforts have further focused on numerous African-American properties, twentieth century communities, and graveyards and archeological sites that reflect the history of the county and its populations. This work has added considerable information to long-identified historic themes including agriculture, architecture, industrialization, transportation, education, and religion. However, some of these property types may present issues not effectively addressed by historic site or historic district designation. Properties of historical or cultural significance, rather than architectural significance, may not lend themselves to effective regulation through the historic area work permit (HAWP) process and may present issues regarding the fair and consistent implementation of the requirements of Subtitle 29. As such, new standards and guidelines may be required to address properties of social and cultural significance rather than architectural significance.

In order to acknowledge the significance of properties that may not meet designation criteria or where the property owner may not be interested in historic site designation and its associated regulations, county agencies and other interested organizations should develop an honorific, nonregulatory program to identify and highlight such sites and communities.

**Local Historic Site and District Designation**

The county’s historic preservation program is based on the regulations enacted to protect historic resources. The Historic Preservation Ordinance protects three categories of properties—historic sites, historic resources, and historic districts—all of which are listed in the Inventory of Historic Resources. The historic site and historic district designation process is codified in the ordinance in Subtitle 29-104, 29-118, 29-119, and 29-120.01. A property can also be added to the inventory as a historic resource or as a historic site through a functional master plan or sector plan amendment or through the new process described in Subtitle 29.120.01.

With this revision to the ordinance, the historic site/historic district designation process has been made considerably more flexible and responsive to interested property owners. Taken together, the county’s master plan/sector plan process and the new petition procedure are local examples of nationally accepted best practices for identifying, designating, and regulating buildings in a transparent manner.

The documentation required for either county designation or National Register listing must be comprehensive. As a result, the documentation process and the outreach and education efforts associated with a successful historic district designation effort require the allocation of significant time and resources. These resources must be prioritized and should, therefore, be based on clear and substantial support for these efforts from the community and potentially affected property owners. Although a number of historic communities may appear to be eligible to become historic districts, historic preservation staff’s experience with historic district proposals has been that it takes years to build the necessary understanding and support. Historic Preservation Section staff engages in regular outreach by attending municipal, citizens association, and homeowners association meetings by request to promote the benefits of the National Register program and the county’s historic preservation program. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, this plan did not designate any new historic districts.

A local community preservation organization leader who steps forward to work with county historic preservation staff and elected officials is an important key to the success of a historic district proposal. In addition, a working group of property owners potentially affected by the historic district should participate in developing design guidelines for a historic district. This effort helps to build consensus and understanding before the formal proposals go to public hearing. Listing in the National Register of Historic Places, which does not establish restrictions on properties, can be considered an important first step that provides for recognition. This may lead to a desire to provide protection through the establishment of a county historic district.
Goal: Continue evaluations to designate more historic sites and historic districts throughout the county.

Policy 1: Identify, survey, and document individual historic properties, historic communities, and historic landscapes throughout the county to reflect its diverse heritage.

Strategies

1. On an ongoing basis, and with the assistance of the community and interested citizens, identify areas where future survey and documentation work is needed to expand information about important county heritage themes and maintain the Inventory of Historic Resources as a reflection of current preservation interests.

2. Annually prioritize surveys for funding consideration to support consistent progress in the documentation of historic resources.

3. Develop criteria for how documentation projects will be prioritized—such as the concentration of potential resources, potential threats to historic properties, or the identification of new resource types not yet documented or protected.

Policy 2: Designate additional historic sites and historic districts that expand upon existing and emerging heritage themes to reflect the diverse heritage of the county.

Strategies

1. Continue to expand the size and character of the Inventory of Historic Resources and documented properties to include properties of social, cultural, and archeological significance as well as properties of historical and architectural importance.

2. Explore new ways to build support for county historic district designation by consulting with other jurisdictions on best practices.

3. Foster community consensus on historic district proposals by developing district-specific design guidelines.

4. Consider periodically assigning historic preservation staff to a municipality or community as a technical resource person, to conduct site visits, explain the designation process, and assist with historic preservation questions.

Policy 3: Pursue county historic district designation for existing National Register historic districts.

Strategy

1. Promote the protections and benefits that are available with local historic district designation through regular communication with municipalities, community, and civic groups.

Policy 4: Encourage the nomination of individual properties and communities for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Strategies

1. Promote the protections and benefits that are available with National Register listing through regular communication with municipalities, community, and civic groups.

2. Address the geographic and thematic breadth of historic resources in the county with analysis and recognition through National Register multiple-property nominations, as appropriate.

3. Continue to identify, document and protect historic properties associated with African-Americans and Native Americans by continued contact and outreach with community organizations.

4. Encourage public agencies to engage in appropriate stewardship of historic properties by listing properties as historic sites and eligible properties in the National Register of Historic Places.

Policy 5: Enhance the visibility of county and National Register historic districts throughout the county.

Strategies

1. Develop a program that encourages the use of consistent and recognizable signage for both county and National Register historic districts.

2. Enhance internet-based information sources focused on county-designated and National Register-listed properties.

Policy 6: Develop an honorific, nonregulatory program that recognizes the cultural significance of individual properties and communities that may not
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meet historic site and historic district designation criteria.

Strategy

1. Work with preservation partners and community organizations to develop a consistent program of signage, web-based educational programs, and printed materials to recognize culturally significant properties and communities.
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PRESERVATION PLANNING

Background

In Prince George’s County, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) administers the county’s historic preservation ordinance (Subtitle 29 of the Prince George’s County Code) and fosters preservation and appreciation of the county’s historic environment and archeological sites. The HPC and the Historic Preservation Section staff of M-NCPPC work in partnership with property owners, business owners, developers, and municipalities to preserve the county’s historic resources. Effective county historic preservation planning efforts depend on substantial and consistent involvement from individuals and organizations at the grass-roots, municipal, and county levels.

Historic preservation programs can only be successful when committed and knowledgeable historic property owners and preservationists actively engage with local elected officials and participate in the regulatory process. Historic property owners are both stewards and partners with government in the protection and enhancement of the county’s historic resources. Property owners require technical advice, the opportunity to interact and exchange ideas, and often require financial assistance in maintaining their historic sites.

Since it is essential to first know what resources exist before any measures can be introduced for their protection, initial planning efforts focus on resource identification, survey, and documentation. Subsequent steps typically include the adoption of regulations and standards for design review, resource designation, and incentives for adaptive use and revitalization, along with plans for public acquisition and interpretation. No less significant are the planning efforts that focus on heritage education, partnerships, and community outreach.

M-NCPPC’s historic properties database has been greatly updated since the 1992 plan. This system provides preservation planners with information that assists with both routine information requests and long-range planning projects. The database contains a complete inventory of all historic sites, historic resources, and documented properties. The database also includes associated photography; general data on the historic, architectural, or archeological character of a property, including the presence of outbuildings, archeological features, and cemeteries; a listing of evaluation criteria used to designate the property; a summary of all development referrals, historic area work permits; and preservation tax credits or easements affecting the property.

Another technological accomplishment since 1992 is the inclusion of multiple layers within the county’s Geographic Information System (GIS). PGAtlas includes the GIS system for the county. Currently, GIS layers include all historic resources, historic sites, county historic districts, environmental settings, individual National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) properties, and NRHP historic districts. These layers are available to the public and provide baseline information for anyone interested in basic information about cultural resources, including location, delineated environmental settings, or the boundaries of county and NRHP Districts.

Preservation planning has been part of the master and sector planning process since the adoption and approval of the 1981 Historic Sites and Districts Plan. The goals, policies, and strategies for implementation outlined in
adopted and approved planning documents are public policy.

**M-NCPPC-owned Historic Properties**

M-NCPPC has a long tradition of stewardship of historic properties, beginning with the purchase of Riversdale Mansion in 1949. Today, M-NCPPC owns more than 20 historic properties, all managed by the Department of Parks and Recreation. As of 2009, the Department of Parks and Recreation operated four historic house museums open to the public: Riversdale, Surratt House, Montpelier Mansion, and Darnall’s Chance. The Natural and Historical Resources Division of M-NCPPC’s Department of Parks and Recreation also operates two archeological parks, Mount Calvert Historical and Archaeological Park and Northampton Slave Quarters and Archaeological Park. The department also manages six historic properties as rental venues: Adelphi Mill, Billingsley, Dorsey Chapel, Oxon Hill Manor, Snow Hill, and Newton White Mansion. A number of historic buildings are used as department offices, such as Abraham Hall that serves as the headquarters for the Black History Program, and Marietta that serves as the Natural and Historical Resources Division offices. Still others such as Dorsey Chapel and Seabrook School are open to the public periodically.

The properties owned or managed by M-NCPPC and are either already designated as historic sites, historic resources, or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are shown in Appendix C. Properties without notations will be evaluated for designation or listing in the future.

**Issues**

There are several ways in which preservation planning can be more effectively addressed in the county’s development review process. The Planning Department is responsible for providing comments and recommending conditions that become part of staff reports presented to the Planning Board and the County Council for consideration in development cases. However, some parts of the zoning ordinance do not allow for preservation to be a measure of whether the development should be approved. Preservation values need to be more closely integrated into the evaluation of development proposals. The assessment of a development, its resulting density, stormwater management, traffic, noise, lighting, and other factors cannot be limited to the area of the specific development proposal but should be assessed with regard to the impact on adjoining neighborhoods and historic sites and historic districts.

Although all permits reviewed by M-NCPPC are monitored for potential impact to historic sites, consistent monitoring of approved development conditions affecting historic resources in a rapidly growing county is also important. Inspectors are needed to adequately monitor compliance with approved conditions designed to ensure resource preservation and compatible new development.

In order for preservation planning to advance in a significant way, more contact with individual property owners and stakeholders is critical. There are many ways to develop web-based tools to reach a larger audience. Since there is a finite number of planning professionals in any organization, the internet is one of the more efficient ways to reach any audience. Web-based tools can assist by providing information on best practices relating to materials conservation, stewardship of historic properties, interconnections between historic preservation and environmental organizations, and links to information.

Preservation planning tools already in place, such as PGAtlas and planning publications available on the internet, should be more widely used by anyone interested in preservation issues in the county. The GIS layers, identified in the introduction, are already available to the general public, but the availability of a tool and its widespread use are two separate issues. The current GIS layers provide access to multiple data sets that could be utilized if they were more widely known. A web-based resource center could provide accurate and continually
updated information for any interested parties who need to know the location, significance, and levels of protection of historic sites, historic resources, and historic districts. More coordination within the preservation community and true collaboration with stakeholders in historic preservation can be a useful way to develop strategies that can benefit the cultural resources that all parties agree deserve protection. The community of preservation-minded stakeholders that have come together to attend meetings and to provide comments on plan drafts should continue to exchange ideas and participate in the implementation of the goals, policies, and strategies represented in this public document. Preservation planning cannot exist in a vacuum. Instead, information that is shared with the largest number of participants with an opportunity for stakeholders to participate in the formulation of policy is the only way that the principles articulated in this plan can be implemented and reach a broader audience.

Workshops to benefit historic property owners in the sometimes challenging and expensive task of maintaining their properties will be essential to help convey best practices to this constituency. Deploying preservation planning professionals to a broader community throughout the county to explain the preservation issues that affect their properties can also increase awareness and provide a way to keep these issues at the forefront of community decision-making and educate a new generation of young people who will be the stewards of these important sites in the future. On-line tutorials and a current list of qualified contractors and preservation consultants can also extend the knowledge base and help ensure the quality of preservation practices in the county.

The historic properties owned by M-NCPPC are a key element of the preservation and maintenance of the county’s cultural heritage for the benefit of the public. Although it is often suggested that M-NCPPC should continue to acquire historic properties, the fundamental question remains: how many more properties should be owned and maintained by public agencies such as M-NCPPC, and is this the most effective means to ensure their long-term preservation?

Although publicly owned historic resources and archeological sites do not benefit from financial incentives and most available grant programs, M-NCPPC is subject to the regulations associated with the county’s historic preservation ordinance. Therefore, M-NCPPC must lead by example in its stewardship of public property, regardless of whether or not it is accessible to the public. To do so, M-NCPPC should pursue local historic site designation and/or listing in the National Register of Historic Places as appropriate and should commission historic structure reports for its properties.

Better coordination between the Planning Department and Department of Parks and Recreation is essential to preservation-related activities that affect M-NCPPC properties. Staff members from the Planning Department and the Department of Parks and Recreation should coordinate efforts to identify properties for land acquisition that would add to existing programs or park priorities. Archeological sites should be similarly evaluated using criteria established through the archeological research, survey, and assessment project administered by the Natural and Historical Resources Archaeology Program. The importance of existing historical and natural features would be determined through consultation with appropriate staff.

**Goal:** Encourage the use of preservation planning tools to preserve cultural heritage and promote the quality of life in Prince George’s County.

**Policy 1:** Ensure that planning efforts and zoning and subdivision regulations are consistent with the objectives and policies promoting historic preservation.

**Strategies**

1. Review and update area master plans and sector plans for consistency with the goals, policies, and strategies of the approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan (HSDP).

2. Review internal policies to ensure that all development proposals affecting historic sites and county-designated historic districts conform to policies and strategies of the approved HSDP.

3. Ensure that potential development impacts to historic and cultural resources are reviewed comprehensively by all relevant agencies and departments. Such a comprehensive review may help to avoid the isolation of historic sites from their historic context.
4. Coordinate regularly with county agencies and departments as necessary to ensure compatibility of strategic goals and objectives with the goals, policies, and strategies of the approved HSDP.

5. Develop standard conditions of approval, as appropriate, for development applications that require the issuance of a performance bond to ensure the completion of a project affecting a historic site or property within a county-designated historic district.

6. Consider the use of overlay zones to address issues such as use, building height and setback, parking, and design guidelines adjoining historic districts.

Policy 2: Ensure that planning efforts meet the needs of the preservation constituency.

Strategies

1. Develop a strategic plan for implementation to establish planning priorities, benchmarks of progress, and the responsibilities of government agencies, historic property owners, the real estate and development industries, and preservation and environmental organizations.

2. Prepare historic preservation planning studies, master plans, and sector plans when appropriate. These plans can be on a smaller scale with local communities in mind. An example is the Broad Creek Historic District Planning Study of 2002 or the Lower Patuxent Scenic Byway Intrinsic Qualities Inventory Report of 2007. More small-area sector plans, with a historic preservation emphasis as a tool for revitalization, should be developed when appropriate.

3. As master and sector plans are developed, provide specific preservation proposals for individual properties. A recent example of a sector plan that proposed planning strategies for individual historic properties was the Bladensburg Town Center Sector Plan and SMA (June 2007).

4. Promote historic preservation as a major opportunity in the Envision Prince George’s initiative.

5. Encourage and enable the community to participate actively during master and sector plan preparation.

6. Provide the Prince George’s County Historic Preservation Commission with the staff digest of testimony of all master plans, sector plans, and functional master plans and allow appropriate comment prior to Planning Board and District Council work sessions. In addition, amend the Prince George’s County Code to allow for Historic Preservation Commission review and comment.

7. Assist in efforts to establish state heritage areas, scenic byways, and architectural conservation district overlay zones as such proposals are developed through master and sector plans or state or locally initiated planning efforts.

8. Coordinate with local, state, and federal transportation agencies to protect historic sites from any transportation activities that may have a negative impact by providing information to affected property owners and complying with local, state, and federal review requirements.

Policy 3: Educate historic site owners and property owners within county historic districts about the regulations and incentives associated with the county’s historic preservation program.

Strategies

1. Create and promote workshops, mailings, publications, and internet-based information on the Historic Preservation Commission’s rules of procedure, policies, and guidelines and on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and best practices on issues affecting historic property owners.

2. Develop presentations on the county’s historic preservation program for regular delivery to interested municipalities, homeowners associations, nonprofit organizations, and civic groups.

Policy 4: Promote the rehabilitation of the county’s historic resources through technical support to municipalities and community preservation organizations.

Strategies

1. Support volunteer efforts and financing options to assist homeowners facing challenges in meeting building maintenance requirements in historic districts.

2. Explore options to partner with county agencies and housing development organizations to create a tailored home maintenance assistance program for historic properties. Such a program could help support home maintenance and weatherization for historic properties.
that does not compromise the historic integrity of the property.

3. Establish an internet-based preservation resource center with participation from M-NCPPC staff, consultants, contractors, educators, and other interested parties.

Policy 5: Develop a strategic plan for future county/M-NCPPC acquisition, restoration, maintenance, and interpretation of historic properties.

Strategies

1. Ensure that historic structure reports and structural conditions assessments are prepared for all historic properties owned by M-NCPPC, as applicable, through partnership between the Planning Department and the Department of Parks and Recreation.

2. Develop guidelines and criteria to help target and prioritize acquisitions of properties based on their historical or archeological significance, including their contribution to the cultural landscape of an area.

3. Improve coordination among appropriate divisions within M-NCPPC to ensure agreement on priorities and compatibility of project goals and objectives with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

4. Ensure that all publicly funded preservation projects comply with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Guidance can be provided by Planning Department Historic Preservation Section staff for such projects.

5. Develop a curatorship management plan for selected M-NCPPC-owned historic properties, as appropriate, to ensure that they are continually occupied and maintained in order to make financially viable properties available to prospective curators.

Policy 6. Continually engage and assist the preservation constituency in preservation planning efforts.

Strategies

1. Undertake a biennial summit meeting of preservation organizations, public agencies, and other stakeholders following the approval of the strategic plan of implementation to review progress toward meeting the strategic plan benchmarks (see Chapter 15).

2. Inform stakeholders identified during the HSDP amendment process of preservation planning issues on a regular basis. These stakeholders should continue to provide advice and guidance during the implementation stage of preservation planning efforts for both master and sector plans and the HSDP. These groups can serve as advisors to ensure that preservation projects are implemented.

3. Communicate preservation planning best practices as part of master and sector plan activities and special studies.

4. Create case study highlights of preservation successes that involve collaboration with other departments or preservation partners.

5. Publicize notable preservation projects to draw attention to successes.

Policy 7: Enhance the historic preservation and cultural heritage content of the M-NCPPC web site.

Strategies

1. Provide access to the planning documents and maps through the internet.

2. Expand M-NCPPC’s web site to contain educational information and related links. M-NCPPC’s web site could be linked to similar sites sponsored by county preservation organizations and could assist with queries regarding historic sites for county residents, potential residents, researchers, and interested parties.
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HISTORIC PRESERVATION REGULATIONS

Background
Linking the past to the present through the preservation of older structures and neighborhoods is a primary goal of historic preservation. It is an attempt to enhance the public welfare, which is a justified governmental concern. Historic preservation encompasses a range of federal, state, and county regulatory requirements and financial incentives that can be implemented individually or in combination with one another. Since the beginning of the modern preservation movement in the 1930s and especially since 1966, the year the National Historic Preservation Act, was enacted, an increasing number of useful regulations and programs have been implemented to assist in the preservation of historic resources. Furthermore, both federal and state courts have held that governments may legislate to protect community aesthetics, a concept basic to many historic preservation ordinances.

Issues
Since the enactment of the county’s Historic Preservation Ordinance (Subtitle 29 of the Prince George’s County Code) in 1981, the county’s preservation program and the field of preservation have benefitted from significant regulatory and technical advances. In order to reflect these advances, the ordinance requires periodic revisions to reflect the current regulatory environment and local preservation issues and concerns. Revisions to the ordinance may address, among other things, the adequacy of definitions, provisions for adequate enforcement, demolition-by-neglect, procedures for proposed reductions to environmental settings, and revisions to historic area work permit (HAWP) criteria and procedures. Program regulations should make certain that the county is sending a clear and consistent message in support of historic preservation and adherence to applicable regulations and review processes.

The definitions section of the preservation ordinance may need to be revised for consistency, accuracy, and to reflect legislative intent. The definitions section should explain terms used throughout the ordinance (e.g., alteration). With the use of consistent and understandable terms and definitions, better decision-making will result.

Over the years, the Historic Preservation Commission has had to address unapproved work at historic sites and historic resources ostensibly because property owners were unaware of the requirements of the HAWP process. Although some of the work was suitable for retroactive approval, some of it was not compliant with HPC-adopted policies, guidelines, and regulations. Unapproved work at historic sites is a continuing problem. Therefore, the need for ongoing public information and communication with property owners cannot be overstated. In addition to necessary public information and communication, the proper enforcement of building permit and HAWP regulations is required. Additional resources focused on property inspection would address this problem.

Demolition-by-neglect is difficult to enforce, partly because the process often allows a property to deteriorate to an unsafe condition and partly because the county building inspectors’ caseload is not focused on historic preservation. As a result, the provision has not been effectively enforced. Revisions to the ordinance definition would strengthen this provision.

The establishment and revision of environmental settings for historic sites in the context of a development proposal have frequently resulted in the protection of only a minimal amount of land associated with a property’s underlying zoning. This practice has sometimes resulted in the diminution of cultural landscapes and exposed historic sites to incompatible new development. There is a need for revisions to ordinance provisions to better protect environmental settings.
A property owner’s initial contact with information about historic properties is typically a real estate agent. Although the preservation ordinance requires disclosure of historic site, historic resource, and/or historic district status of a property pending transfer, many owners remain unaware of their responsibilities. As a result, the need for public information on the county's preservation program should begin before transfer and continue regularly throughout the course of property ownership. Real estate brokers should be informed regularly about the regulations and incentives associated with historic property designations and historic property ownership.

There have been instances when a property that appeared to meet historic site designation criteria was demolished or significantly altered because it was not included in the Inventory of Historic Resources. These buildings were lost or irretrievably altered because there was no mechanism in place for their preservation. Therefore, ordinance language and related enforcement measures specifically addressing this gap in resource protection are needed.

**Goal: Improve implementation of existing historic preservation regulations.**

**Policy 1: Protect historic resources through the use of appropriate legislative and legal measures.**

**Strategies**

1. Prepare and enact comprehensive amendments to the historic preservation ordinance following the guidance provided by analysis developed during the preparation of this plan to reflect nationally recognized best practices. The potential amendments may include refinements to definitions, clarifications of provisions for adequate enforcement, demolition-by-neglect, revisions to HAWP criteria and procedures, and to explicate the procedures for establishing environmental settings.

2. Consider adding more precise language to the preservation ordinance to clarify and strengthen provisions that are intended to prevent demolition-by-neglect and increase associated fines.

3. Consider amending language in the preservation ordinance to address specific cultural significance criteria for the designation of historic cemeteries and archeological sites.

4. Consider amending language in the preservation ordinance to clarify procedures for establishing and revising environmental settings that encourage the retention of traditional cultural landscapes.

5. Review and revise, where appropriate, the ordinance-specified appeals process that addresses the procedures for property owners, public agencies, and other citizens to appeal decisions regarding historic preservation actions.

6. Review and revise, where appropriate, the Historic Preservation Commission’s rules of procedure for approval by the County Council to reflect best practices for meeting procedures.

**Policy 2: Ensure uniform and efficient enforcement of the preservation ordinance.**

**Strategies**

1. Continue to compile and maintain a historic property database, historic property inventory files, and a portfolio of photographs of existing conditions for each historic resource.

2. Ensure that rehabilitation of historic sites and new construction within historic districts are conducted in accordance with HAWP approvals.

3. Provide trained staff to address enforcement of historic preservation regulations so that projects are conducted in accordance with an approved HAWP, as required.

4. Consistently provide the Historic Preservation Commission, the Planning Board, and the County Council with conditions of approval for development applications that ensure the protection, stabilization, and rehabilitation of historic sites and their environmental settings.

**Policy 3: Ensure interim protection for historic properties threatened with alterations or demolition that are not included in the Inventory of Historic Resources.**

**Strategy**

1. Develop preservation ordinance language and associated provisions in other parts of the county code to delay the granting of a permit for grading, alterations, and/or new construction in order to allow for the evaluation of a property for potential designation as a historic site.
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Policy 4: Provide well-informed, consistent, and fair administration of the historic preservation ordinance.

Strategies

1. Continue to participate in and fulfill the requirements of the Certified Local Government (CLG) program to maintain a preservation ordinance compliant with federal requirements by filing the required annual report, participating in training workshops for the Historic Preservation Commissioners, applying for CLG grants to fund qualifying historic preservation projects, and supporting the statewide network of CLG communities.

2. Improve the knowledge and expertise of the Historic Preservation Commission’s new commissioners and the entire body through training and annual retreats to ensure that they are informed of best practices.

3. Advertise the availability of Historic Preservation Commission position openings on the internet, and publish notices of openings in local newspapers. The notice should describe the mandated federal CLG appointment requirements.

4. Review and revise HAWP criteria and procedures to ensure consistent decisions that implement the purposes of the historic preservation ordinance.

Policy 5: Continue to ensure that historic property owners, applicants, and presenters before the HPC are informed about the regulations and requirements of Subtitle 29.

Strategies

1. Develop new informational materials to assist those interested in undertaking projects to describe the steps, requirements, and time frames associated with the successful completion of an application or review process.

2. Work with the real estate community to inform sellers and buyers of historic properties about disclosure requirements, relevant preservation regulations, and financial incentives available through county, state, and federal programs.

3. Work with the real estate community to ensure the submittal of an executed historic property disclosure form to the Historic Preservation Commission, thereby demonstrating compliance with the ordinance provision.

4. Continue to ensure that letters are sent annually to the owners of historic sites informing them of their responsibilities under the historic preservation ordinance and the financial incentives available for approved rehabilitation work.

5. Work with the real estate community to develop and distribute a homeowner welcome package for new owners of historic sites within the county that includes a history of the property and its significance, the range of financial incentives available for approved rehabilitation and repair work, explanation of the HAWP process, and other obligations under the historic preservation ordinance.

6. Work with preservation partners to offer a continuing education training course for real estate brokers designed to provide background information on local history and architecture and the requirements and incentives provided by the county's historic preservation program.

Policy 6: Continue to monitor state and federal programs and legislation related to historic preservation, and take positions on matters of county concern.

Strategies

1. Work with local and state legislators, as appropriate, to initiate new legislation and approve regulatory changes to maintain best practice standards.

2. Maintain current information on state and federal historic preservation programs, and provide copies of appropriate materials to the public.
Photo:
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ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS

Background

The historic preservation ordinance defines an environmental setting:

“The entire parcel of land, within those boundaries existing as of the date the historic resource is delineated on the master plan for historic preservation, and structures thereon, on which is located a historic resource, unless otherwise specified on such master plan, or unless reduced by the Commission, and to which it relates physically and/or visually, as determined by the (Historic Preservation) Commission.” The ordinance further establishes that “Appurtenances and environmental settings shall include, but need not be limited to, walkways and driveways (whether paved or unpaved), vegetation (including trees, gardens, and lawns), rocks, pasture, cropland, and waterways.”

The function of an environmental setting of a historic site is to protect the natural and cultural features associated with a historic resource. These features reflect the historic, architectural, cultural, and/or archeological significance for which the property is designated.

When a resource is proposed for designation as a historic site, an environmental setting is concurrently proposed for delineation. Staff evaluates the site characteristics in order to determine the most appropriate environmental setting for the conservation of the property’s historic and cultural features. A recommendation for the environmental setting is presented to the HPC for approval in conjunction with the request for designation. Once determined through the formal action of the HPC, an environmental setting establishes the area within which the HPC can regulate changes to a historic site and determines the jurisdictional limits of the HPC in the review of historic area work permits.

A subsequent request can be made by the property owner to re-delineate the environmental setting of a historic site. A request for reconsideration may be initiated by the desire of the owner to sell, transfer, or develop the property. The application to revise an environmental setting can be filed with the HPC and should include a statement of justification for the proposed revision. In these cases, proposals to revise an environmental setting are evaluated using the same criteria as the original delineation, focusing on the long-term conservation of the significant physical and cultural features of the property relative to the site.

In practice, at the time of designation as a historic site, the environmental setting normally includes the entire historic parcel to ensure retention of the most significant historic features of the property. A more specific inventory of site features and delineation of a detailed environmental setting is conducted when a development activity is proposed. This approach may be seen as paying insufficient attention to the issue of environmental setting at time of designation or it can be seen as deferring the delineation until other pertinent information such as archeological surveys that are not required until time of development, can be incorporated into the decision process.

A better understanding of the significance of archeological sites by applicants, the public, and decision-makers would aid in their retention, protection, and interpretation as part of the environmental settings of historic sites. Archeological sites have not always been effectively protected within an environmental setting. As discussed further in Chapter 8, archeological sites, even those only partially investigated, should be considered to be of equal importance with the above-ground features of a historic site when an environmental setting is established.
Issues
The delineation and conservation of an appropriate environmental setting during the development process has been a recurrent issue for the HPC and the Historic Preservation Section staff. The development of a property associated with a historic site often requires subdivision of the property. Although an application may be submitted with the presumption that the environmental setting can be reduced to achieve the maximum development density based on the underlying zone, this approach often is not compatible with conservation of the historically significant characteristics of the site.

To address this concern, in 2007 the Planning Department engaged a consultant to analyze a representative group of environmental settings that had been established or revised through development activities and to evaluate the effectiveness of current policies and regulations in the conservation of an appropriate environmental setting. The end task of the study was to provide policies, strategies, and legislative recommendations to address impacts on environmental settings that resulted in loss of cultural resources or incompatible relationships between new development and historic sites.

The consultants were asked to evaluate 25 projects, in various stages of completion, that required a revision to the environmental setting of a historic site due to development activities. For each project, the consultant identified the viewsheds associated with the environmental setting and assessed positive and negative impacts. Nine of the 25 projects were selected for a more detailed evaluation of the “as-built” results of decisions and actions associated with the development process. This analysis found that, although existing zoning and subdivision provide for some buffering of development adjacent to historic sites, current regulations and/or conditions imposed through the development review process do not provide for consistent conservation of the significant historic and scenic qualities of environmental settings.

Specific issues identified include:

- Massing and building heights that are incompatible with the adjacent historic site and/or negatively impact its environmental setting.
- The inappropriate orientation of new buildings to a historic site and its environmental setting.
- Grading that negatively alters the natural topography and landscape forms adjacent to a historic site.
- Incompatible siting of new construction to an environmental setting with regard to height and massing.
- Entry features and/or signage that negatively impact views from scenic and historic roads of historic sites.
- New circulation patterns that negatively impact the historic approach to a historic site or artificially isolate an environmental setting.

The final task of the consultant study was to propose design criteria and policies to guide the appropriate and defensible delineation of environmental settings for long-term conservation.

Goal: Develop more effective mechanisms to protect the environmental settings of historic sites.

Policy 1: Delineate an appropriate environmental setting at the time of historic site designation that protects the significant natural and cultural features of the property, including archeological resources.

Strategies

1. Clarify the process for establishment of environmental settings through the adoption of policy guidance, and initiate legislative revisions if required.

2. Clarify the criteria and considerations for the delineation of environmental settings through the adoption of Historic Preservation Commission policy.

3. Ensure that all significant features within the environmental setting of a historic site are protected through a best practices approach to resource conservation.
4. Protect significant archeological features through inclusion in the delineation of environmental settings or through the provision of landscape buffers, open space buffers, or conservation easements.

5. Coordinate with the agricultural preservation programs to ensure that easement agreements on historic sites or resources include the conservation of significant natural and cultural elements of the site.

6. Coordinate with utility easement holders by enforcing the requirement to submit a HAWP to protect the environmental settings of historic sites.

Policy 2: Identify and conserve the environmental settings of historic sites in all Development Tiers.

Strategies

1. Encourage development patterns that are compatible with a historic site and its environmental setting with regard to building setbacks, lotting patterns, street layouts, lighting, and buffering treatments.

2. Develop zoning ordinance and subdivision regulation provisions that identify and encourage compatible land uses, development patterns, and building types adjacent to environmental settings.

3. Develop modified or performance-based standards that provide flexibility with regard to the size and arrangement of new development lots to encourage the enhancement of environmental settings.

Policy 3: Evaluate and mitigate the potential impact of development applications on historic sites and environmental settings during the application review process.

Strategies

1. Provide consistent notification to and coordination with historic property owners and planners when zoning requests are initiated to ensure the best outcome.

2. Evaluate the implications of the proposed zoning change through illustrations showing allowable building mass in relation to the historic site.

3. Create development application submittal requirements that aid in the identification of impacts on historic sites, such as viewshed analyses, building massing and height modeling studies, streetscape studies, conceptual site grading, conceptual circulation patterns, lot layouts, conceptual building siting, and conceptual landscaping, including buffering and screening.

4. Develop well-crafted conditions for the protection of environmental settings during the development process that fully identify the responsible parties, the required action, the timing mechanism related to the action, and how compliance will be assured.

Policy 4: Develop incentives for preserving the environmental settings of historic sites when development is proposed.

Strategies

1. Consider legislation to provide tax credits and/or other financial incentives to encourage the conservation of significant natural and cultural features within environmental settings.

2. Consider the development of a program to purchase or transfer development rights from environmental settings.

3. Develop policies to ensure consistent long-term funding for the conservation, maintenance, and preservation of cemeteries, landscape features, historic sites, and environmental settings under the authority of a homeowners association or similar entity established during development processes.
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Protection of Cemeteries

Background

Historic burial grounds and cemeteries, like buildings, contain information on the county’s social, cultural, and architectural heritage. Cemeteries provide genealogical data and information on the history of a particular place, religious practices, and lifestyles, display the folk art of tombstone carving, and preserve natural features of the landscape including old trees and mature plantings. The location of a burial ground in relation to buildings and other landscape features can provide cultural data on those who created and used it. The orientation of markers and the placement of burials also provide valuable cultural information. This valuable data can be lost if it is destroyed or removed from its historic context.

Prince George’s County was inhabited by Native Americans for thousands of years before European settlement, and Native American burials are occasionally encountered in archeological surveys. Archeological investigations have revealed habitations at the confluence of Piscataway Creek and the Potomac River dating as far back as the Late Archaic Period (around 3,000 BC). Later during the Woodland Period (around 800 AD), the Piscataway people constructed an extensive village, referred to as Moyaone, near Accokeek Creek. Investigations of sites associated with the Accokeek village have provided insights into prehistoric Native American burial practices. The skeletal remains were interred in communal graves called ossuaries. The ossuary pit was lined with animal skins and contained burial gifts. These practices were observed up until the time of European contact. Prehistoric and historic period Native American burial grounds are commonly unmarked but have been uncovered periodically by ground-disturbing activities or during the course of archeological surveys.

The first European settlement in the county was characterized by large, dispersed plantations that cultivated tobacco as the main cash crop. Settlements developed along the major waterways, including the Patuxent and Potomac Rivers and their significant tributaries. Those residents who lived near and were members of churches were able to bury their dead in church burial grounds. Later, the most common burial practice through the nineteenth century was to inter the deceased in small family plots close to the main house. Slaves were sometimes also buried in or near family plots but were often interred in separate burial grounds farther away from the main house.

Early grave sites were rarely marked by large permanent markers and were more often identified by wooden markers or field stones that have since disappeared. Many family plots were forgotten or fell into disrepair after a change in ownership or family relocation. Historical documents, such as deeds, wills, or family histories, may contain information on the location of grave sites. Members of the county’s long-established communities and local preservation groups are often most knowledgeable about the locations of former house sites and their associated burial grounds. Significant public outreach efforts were enacted during the plan amendment process to solicit input from residents and interested organizations on the locations of burial grounds.

Slave burials are particularly difficult to identify as they were rarely enclosed by a fence or rarely contained permanent markers. Land records occasionally mention a plot allocated for slave burials on a plantation. Slave burials were often marked by uncarved stones, wooden markers, or vegetation, such as yucca plants or daffodils. The locations of ante-bellum and post-bellum African-
American burial grounds were often passed down orally within rural African-American communities. As an example of the importance of oral history as a tool to locate African-American burial grounds, one such site was recently identified by a longtime African-American neighbor of a property under development near Upper Marlboro.

The National Register multiple property document, *African American Resources in Prince George’s County* (2004), notes that in buildings associated with African-Americans, “the combination of frame construction and intense, continued use minimized the likelihood of particular buildings surviving...their surviving elements—churches, cemeteries, or road junctions—can provide potentially important information about the web of kinship and interrelationships within the African-American community.” African-American burial grounds, therefore, are important to preserve because they can be the last remaining vestige of a rural community that developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In order to effectively manage and protect them, historic burial grounds and cemeteries must first be documented. Nearly 230 known historic burial grounds and cemeteries in the county have been located through survey work by the Historic Preservation Section staff. Many of these are also recorded in *Stones and Bones, Cemetery Records of Prince George’s County, Maryland*, published in 1984 (with an addendum in 2000) by the Prince George’s County Genealogical Society. Of the known historic burial grounds and cemeteries, approximately one-half are family burial plots, one-quarter are church cemeteries, and the remaining quarter are municipal cemeteries or commercial/semi-public memorial parks.

In 2006, Historic Preservation Section staff developed a cemetery survey form to record the general characteristics of historic burial grounds and cemeteries within the county. At that time, 125 burial sites and cemeteries were documented, and each location was recorded using a hand-held global positioning system (GPS) device. As part of the preparation for the Historic Sites and Districts Plan amendment, a comprehensive survey of burial grounds has been conducted in the county to collect general information on the type, condition, and date of known historic cemeteries. This information will be downloaded into a Geographic Information System (GIS) that will be made available to the public on the Planning Department’s mapping web site, www.pgatlas.com. This will provide important location information to developers, local government, and community groups while safeguarding the precise locations to avoid vandalism.

In and of themselves, historic burial grounds and cemeteries are usually not considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. A cemetery may be eligible for listing in the National Register if it derives its primary significance from:

1. graves of persons of transcendent importance;
2. the age of the burials;
3. distinctive design features;
4. association with historic events;
5. the potential to yield important information; or
6. the cemetery being the only remaining feature associated with an important person, culture, settlement, or event.2

Burial grounds and cemeteries in Prince George’s County that are currently designated as historic sites are typically a contributing element to a designated historic church or building. However, there are exceptions to this practice such as the Steed Family Cemetery (Historic Site 81B-001) and the Skinner Family Cemetery (Historic Site 86B-004).

---

Regulations

Under Maryland statute, all burial sites and human remains are protected from disturbance (Criminal Law Article, Title 10-402, 10-403, and 10-404). If a parcel of land that is being subdivided contains a burial site, an easement for entry and exit must be provided [Article 66B Land Use, Subdivision Controls, Title 5.03 (d)]. Reasonable access to a burial site on private property must also be provided to any person whose purpose is to restore, maintain, or view the site (Real Property Article, Title 14-121 and 14-122).

In addition to state law, the Prince George's County subdivision ordinance (Section 24-135.01) provides protection for cemeteries as part of the subdivision process. This legislation was enacted in 1990 in response to a marked increase in subdivision applications in the late 1980s. The provisions stipulate that when a proposed preliminary plan of subdivision includes an abandoned, private, or family cemetery—and there are no plans to relocate the remains—the developer shall observe the following requirements:

1. The cemetery shall be demarcated in the field prior to the submittal of the preliminary plan.

2. An inventory of the cemetery elements (such as walls, gates, landscape features, and tombstones) and their condition shall be submitted as part of the preliminary plan application.

3. The placement of lot lines shall promote the long-term maintenance and protection of the cemetery.

4. A wall shall be constructed out of stone, brick, metal, or wood to delineate the cemetery boundaries.

In addition to these requirements, the Planning Board may require the developer to undertake additional measures to ensure the future protection of the cemetery. The ordinance affords the Planning Board flexibility in determining the appropriate treatment for cemeteries on a case-by-case basis. Accordingly, as part of the development approval requirements, the owner/applicant may need to establish a satisfactory ownership structure, establish a perpetual maintenance fund, and/or create a cemetery preservation plan. In addition, in compliance with state law, the owner may be required to provide adequate public access to the site (CB-33-1990).

Issues

Historic burial grounds are often subject to neglect because of their isolated locations or because their locations are no longer known. In addition, historic burial grounds and cemeteries are often threatened by development. These circumstances can be addressed by educating property owners, homeowners associations, and developers about appropriate methods to protect and maintain these important historic and cultural features. A historic cemetery preservation and maintenance guide should be developed to educate the public on best practices and assist them in identifying and prioritizing appropriate conservation measures and maintenance issues.

Because ownership of some burial grounds is unknown, best efforts should be made to identify descendants or interested parties. If no family members or interested parties are found, municipalities or local civic groups should be encouraged to acquire and maintain abandoned burial grounds.

Historic cemetery delineation surveys should be performed on burial grounds that are located on properties to be developed. Often, family burial plots or even older church cemeteries will contain a number of unmarked burials. Ground penetrating radar, the stripping of topsoil, or other methods should be employed to ensure that the limits of a historic cemetery have been defined.

All burial sites and cemeteries are protected by state law. However, it is essential that the municipal and county governments be informed about the locations of historic cemeteries so property owners and developers can be alerted to their existence and cemeteries can be preserved. Sometimes jurisdictions employ the use of a cemetery advisory board to inspect cemeteries, prioritize
rehabilitation needs, recommend acquisition of abandoned cemeteries, raise funds for perpetual maintenance, and conduct public education programs. An advisory board that is knowledgeable about the conditions of local cemeteries can effectively shape cemetery preservation efforts. However, financial and staffing resources would have to be considered.

Historic burial grounds and cemeteries in the county would be afforded some additional protection if designated as historic sites. This would ensure that they are regulated by the historic preservation ordinance. Designation could confer eligibility for tax credits and grants for approved restoration and preservation work. However, cemeteries and burial grounds present different review issues than buildings or archeological sites and are, therefore, subject to different levels of review. A graveyard or cemetery is a collection of separate elements that form a cohesive landscape. The historic preservation ordinance provides for review of architectural elements of standing structures. Since graveyards are primarily landscapes that include natural and built resources, review of work within cemeteries may only need to involve review of fences, significant grading, entrance features, or larger monuments that could be incompatible with the scale of other stones within the cemetery. Review guidelines should be developed to address the future design and development of historic cemeteries to retain significant elements. Aspects of cemetery review could include cemeteries and burial grounds that are most threatened by neglect and lack of long-term maintenance.

Goal: Develop a program that identifies and protects historic cemeteries.

Policy 1: Conduct a reconnaissance level survey of all known burial grounds and cemeteries in the county.

Strategies:

1. Create a GIS point layer that records the location of every known historic cemetery in the county that is linked to the cemetery inventory database. A hand-held GPS device can be used to collect the point data in the field. Individual brief descriptions should be developed for each cemetery based on collected survey data and linked to the point layer.

2. Identify burial grounds and cemeteries that may not be listed in *Stones and Bones* or otherwise known to the general public by partnering with local residents and preservation groups.

3. Conduct oral interviews to identify previously unknown and unrecorded burial grounds. Oral interviews will be especially important in identifying unmarked slave and African-American burial grounds in rural areas of the county.

4. Create a Prince George’s County cemetery inventory database that lists all known cemeteries and burial grounds and provides information on their location, condition, and significant elements.

Policy 2: Protect all historic burial grounds and cemeteries.

Strategies

1. Create a cemetery inventory based on criteria developed by the Planning Department’s Historic Preservation Section that is based on best practices used in other jurisdictions.

2. As burial grounds and cemeteries are surveyed, add those that meet criteria to the cemetery inventory.

3. Consider designating more historic burial grounds and cemeteries as historic sites.

4. Require developers to identify known historic burial grounds and cemeteries on natural resource inventories by adding this as a condition of approval.

5. Require developers to establish the boundaries of a burial ground or cemetery on a developing property through historical documentation or archeological investigations prior to approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision. Deed records should be consulted to determine if the burial grounds were described by metes and bounds. Archeological techniques, such as the use of ground-penetrating radar, should be employed to delineate the boundaries of a cemetery.

6. Discourage developers from relocating burial grounds and cemeteries from properties by providing incentives for preservation-in-place.
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7. Establish an “Adopt a Cemetery” program aimed at municipalities and local civic and preservation groups to assist in long-term preservation and maintenance of burial grounds and cemeteries.

8. Revise Subtitle 24-135.02(a)(4) to allow for flexible and compatible solutions to required protective measures for burial grounds and cemeteries in subdivision cases. The subdivision cemetery regulations currently require an appropriate wall or fence. Not all cemeteries were surrounded by a fence or wall and other treatments, such as a vegetative buffer, may be more appropriate. Protective measures should ensure that the historic configuration and appearance of the burial ground is preserved.

9. Work with county genealogical and historical societies or other interested parties to locate descendants of those buried in rural family cemeteries.

10. Form partnerships with descendants of those buried in rural family cemeteries or other interested parties to maintain and care for them.

Policy 3: Preserve the historic fabric, setting, and character of historic burial grounds and cemeteries.

Strategies

1. Establish environmental settings for burial grounds and cemeteries that include all natural and manmade features, such as trees, hedges, plants, fences, markers, and stones, that are contributing elements. An inventory should be made of all significant features that contribute to the historical significance of a burial site, and these should be included in the environmental setting for burial sites that are elevated to historic site status.

2. Develop a cemetery preservation and maintenance manual and other educational materials to provide county residents with best practice guidance on how to preserve and maintain historic burial grounds and cemeteries.

3. Develop guidelines for the treatment of historic burial grounds and cemeteries that are subject to redevelopment. Emphasis should be placed on identifying burials outside of the marked boundaries and establishing the extent of the cemetery as well as providing for appropriate fencing or buffering and continued maintenance.

4. Develop guidelines setting forth the specific types of work requiring a historic area work permit for cemetery conservation and repairs including specific items that could be considered as ordinary maintenance.

5. Consider developing a grant program that provides for the restoration and maintenance of historic burial grounds and cemeteries listed in Appendix D.

6. Encourage the use of the Prince George’s County historic preservation tax credit for approved restoration and conservation work by owners of historic burial grounds and cemeteries designated as historic sites or listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
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Photos:
Warington Cemetery at Newton White Mansion (Historic Site 73-006)
Markers at Gibbons ME Church Site & Cemetery (Historic Site 86B-001)
Concord-Berry Family Cemetery (Historic Site 75A-001)
Chapter 8

PLANNING FOR ARCHEOLOGY

Background

Since 1988, the Natural and Historical Resources Division (NHRD) Archeology Program of the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation has been exploring the diversity of the county’s archeological resources. Through excavations, exhibits, and public outreach, the archeology program supports the NHRD’s numerous museums and historic sites. Hands-on volunteer programs and student internships provide opportunities for citizens and students to become involved in the process of discovering the past by participating in archeological excavations and artifact processing and analysis. Archeology program staff also assist other NHRD sites, the Planning Department, county agencies, State’s Attorney’s Office, and developers to comply with Prince George’s County’s archeological regulations and state and federal standards for archeology.

The archeology program manages three archeological parks: The Northampton Slave Quarters and Archaeological Park, Cherry Hill Cemetery, and the Mount Calvert Historical and Archaeological Park. Two sites, Northampton and Cherry Hill, were identified through the subdivision review process prior to the adoption of the archeological regulations. The early identification of these sites during the development review process enabled them to be preserved and protected through acquisition by the Department of Parks and Recreation. Both sites were explored through archeological investigations and then developed as outdoor museums.

M-NCPPC has played an integral role in ensuring the recordation, protection, and stewardship of archeological resources. Yet, as the organization’s public land holdings have increased to more than 27,000 acres, well-defined planning procedures are needed to ensure the protection, preservation, and interpretation of archeological resources for future generations. As a result, the NHRD archeology program has initiated the archeological research, survey, and assessment project to address the need of the Department of Parks and Recreation in managing nonrenewable archeological resources located on M-NCPPC parkland. The primary goal of the project is to identify those archeological resources located on parkland so informed decisions can be made about the development of particular parks. Adequate identification and characterization of sites will allow for more effective park planning and development.

In February 2004 the Prince George’s County Planning Board implemented an archeology review initiative in the subdivision review process to focus on the identification and investigation of archeological sites, including prehistoric Native American and historic period occupations. The initiative required that potential archeological sites must be considered in the review of subdivision applications, and potential means for preservation of these resources should be considered. In November 2005 the County Council passed and the County Executive signed new regulations (Subtitle 24-104, Section 24-121 (18), and 24-135.01) that require review of all subdivision applications to determine whether archeological investigations should occur on these properties. The new regulations also implemented the Guidelines for Archeological Review (available on the Prince George’s County Planning Department web site: http://www.pgplanning.org/Assets/Planning/Historic+Preservation/Archeology-Guidelines.pdf).

All subdivision applications are reviewed by the Planning Department’s staff archeologist. Phase I (identification) archeological investigations are required on all subdivision properties that may have the potential to contain archeological sites important to the understanding of the history of human settlement in Prince George’s County or may be potentially eligible for inclusion in the National
Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Special emphasis is placed on identifying slave quarters and graves as well as archeological evidence of the presence of Native American people.

In conducting the review, various historical documents and databases are consulted to determine the probability that a property contains significant cultural resources. Significant cultural resources retain the qualities that meet the county or NRHP criteria, in particular, for archeological sites, retaining integrity of context. Phase I archeological surveys are required to cover the entire project area, not just the areas within the limits of disturbance. Phase I work plans are submitted to the Historic Preservation Section of M-NCPPC for approval before any work begins. Phase I archeological surveys are required to be completed and an acceptable draft report on the findings submitted to Historic Preservation Section staff at least 45 days prior to the scheduled Planning Board hearing date to allow time for adequate review.

If identified archeological sites are considered potentially eligible for the NRHP, a Phase II (evaluation) archeological investigation is required to determine National Register eligibility. If archeological sites are determined eligible for the NRHP or are important to the understanding of the history of the county, Phase III (mitigation) investigations, which may consist of avoiding the site (through preservation-in-place) or data recovery through excavation, are required. If staff informs the applicant that a Phase II or Phase III investigation is needed, the timing for receipt of an acceptable draft report will generally correspond with the submittal of a required specific design plan or detailed site plan) or, in some cases, prior to approval of a grading permit. Work plans are submitted to Historic Preservation Section staff for review and approval before any work begins.

If the land included in a subdivision application contains or may have an impact on a cultural resource or if a Phase II study has determined that the archeological site may be eligible for the NRHP, the subdivision application is referred to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The HPC’s recommendations address the impact of proposed projects on cultural resources and whether archeological sites should be designated as historic sites based on the criteria of Section 29-104 of the historic preservation ordinance. The HPC’s recommendation is forwarded to the Planning Board within the prescribed action time frame of the subdivision case.

If a Phase II study has determined that an archeological site within a subdivision application is eligible for the NRHP, Phase III archeological mitigation is necessary. The purpose of the Phase III treatment is to avoid, minimize, or mitigate (through data recovery) adverse impacts to an archeological site that has been identified as significant. Preservation-in-place is generally preferable for archeological sites with high interpretive value and is encouraged by the Prince George’s County Planning Board because new techniques may be developed that can extract more information from sites without excavation or limited excavation. Archeological sites are finite in number. Once the sites are destroyed, the information contained in them is forever lost. Archeological sites also provide a sense of place. The Planning Board may utilize preservation easements or conservation agreements and performance bonds as ways to preserve significant archeological sites in perpetuity and provide interpretation. Property subject to a preservation easement is described by metes and bounds and includes the identified boundaries of the archeological site and a nondisturbance buffer determined by the Planning Board. Preservation easements are held by M-NCPPC or other entities qualified to hold easements, such as The Archaeological Conservancy, and are noted on the final plat. Any ground disturbance within the boundaries of the easement should be reviewed and approved by Planning Department Historic Preservation Section staff.

All Phase I archeological surveys that have been conducted in Prince George’s County under the 2005 regulations are being recorded in a layer in the Planning Department’s Geographic Information System (GIS). This layer indicates the subdivision properties on which archeology surveys have been conducted but does not show the locations of individual sites. The Maryland Historical Trust also maintains a GIS layer that documents all archeological surveys that have been conducted in the state. Abstracts from the Phase I archeological reports will be linked to the archeology survey layer to provide a brief description of what types of cultural resources were identified on the subdivision property. This GIS layer is used as a planning tool to establish which areas of the county may require more intensive investigations.
Before the 2005 subdivision regulations were enacted, archeological surveys in the county were conducted under Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act and by the Department of Parks and Recreation archeologists. These surveys have identified archeological sites covering the full range of human occupation in the county from the Paleoindian period (10,000-7,500 BC) to the present. Historic Preservation Section staff coordinate with the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, and other federal agencies for all properties that require Section 106 review. Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Maryland Historical Trust Act of 1985, federal and state agencies are required to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, and take steps to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects on these resources. As Maryland’s State Historic Preservation Office, the MHT is charged with reviewing projects involving state and federal approvals or assistance to assess potential effects to significant prehistoric and historic resources and ensure compliance with historic preservation laws and regulations.

Since the county’s archeological initiative began in 2004, and as of July 2009, more than 600 development cases, including zoning cases, special exceptions, preliminary plans of subdivision, detailed site plans, and specific design plans, have been reviewed. A Phase I survey was required for approximately 36 percent or 216 properties. A Phase II investigation was required for 37 cases, and a Phase III was required for 18 cases. Through these investigations, more than 300 archeological sites have been identified. New findings have included information about very early eighteenth-century settlement, plantation layout, slave lifeways, and remains of late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century farm life. Thirteen subdivision properties contain archeological sites that were preserved in place in conservation areas or in open space. One archeological site, the Colbert Family Farm Site (18PR950), was recommended for designation as a historic site.

When significant archeological resources are identified on a preliminary plan of subdivision, Planning Department Historic Preservation Section staff contact M-NCPPC’s Department of Parks and Recreation park planners regarding the acquisition of significant sites. Other nonprofit groups, such as The Archaeological Conservancy, are also contacted to determine if they have an interest in acquiring significant archeological resources. The Archaeological Conservancy, established in 1980, is the only national nonprofit organization dedicated to acquiring and preserving the best of our nation’s remaining archeological sites. Based in Albuquerque, New Mexico, the conservancy also operates regional offices in Mississippi, Maryland, Ohio, and California.

Historic Preservation Section staff require that the curated artifact collection and associated documentation from archeological investigations be deposited with MHT’s state-of-the-art archeological research facility, the Maryland Archeological Conservation Lab (MAC Lab), at the Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum in Calvert County, Maryland. The Planning Board encourages such contributions because they ensure a stable curation and storage environment, add to the store of public knowledge, and ensure accessibility for historic research for future generations. Subdivision applicants are required to donate artifacts recovered from the various stages of archeological investigations to the MAC Lab and pay the one-time storage fee.

To assist in the understanding of the archeological record, to date, the Planning Department has developed two historic contexts for the historic period in Prince George’s County. The first, Antebellum Plantations in Prince George’s County, Maryland: A Historic Context and Research Guide, 2009 is a tool for cultural resource managers, county planners, and other researchers studying antebellum plantations in Prince George’s County. Included in the context is a discussion of the agricultural development of the county in the antebellum period, an analysis of known plantations, model plantation layouts, and suggested research topics and questions. A companion document, List of Free Blacks in Prince George’s County,
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1790-1860 (2009), copied from the federal census records of the period, was published separately. Entries from each census year have been tabulated; each table is unique to a particular census year. The purpose of this document is to assist researchers focusing on the historically small, but significant, free black population in the county. If used in combination with other primary historical records such as maps, land records, and tax records, these tables represent a useful tool for genealogical and historical research, as well as for locating the physical remnants of the lives of free blacks across the landscape of Prince George's County in the pre-Civil War era.

A second publication, Postbellum Archeological Resources in Prince George’s County, Maryland: An Historic Context and Resource Guide, 2010, focuses on seven research topics from the period 1865 to 1958 that can be explored by conducting archeological investigations. Many late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century archeological sites are not appreciated for the information they can provide on changes that were occurring in the county during the postbellum period. Research topics and questions are posed for each of the seven areas of interest.

Appendix E of the plan provides an overview of the prehistoric period of the county’s history, based on The Maryland Preservation Plan (2005). Additional contexts should be developed for prehistoric archeological resources. A compilation of information on known prehistoric sites in the county can be useful in determining which aspects of prehistoric history and culture are little understood or inadequately represented in the archeological record. Contexts can assist archeological consultants in determining how to treat archeological sites identified in Phase I surveys.

Issues

Although archeological investigations are required under the county’s subdivision regulations, there are numerous development cases that do not go through the subdivision process, such as sand and gravel mining operations. The current law does not require a Phase I survey for detailed site plans or specific design plan cases associated with a preliminary plan approved before the enactment of the current archeological regulations. Additional legislation should be developed for inclusion into the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that archeological surveys are conducted as early in the development process as possible, at the zoning stage, as well as for special exceptions. The earlier that archeological sites can be identified on developing properties, the more time the applicant will be able to work with Planning Department Historic Preservation Section staff to avoid significant cultural resources. This early planning will help avoid significant costs later in the development process.

Although current archeological techniques are fairly successful at defining the boundaries of archeological sites, there is always the possibility that buildings or features that do not leave a large archeological footprint will be missed. Therefore, an appropriate nondisturbance area should be established around the archeological site to prevent impact to undiscovered remains of associated outbuildings and features. Treatment plans for archeological sites preserved on subdivision properties should include language regarding unanticipated discoveries during the course of grading or other ground disturbance. If previously unidentified archeological features or human burials are encountered during the course of construction, all work should halt in the vicinity of the discovery and Planning Department Historic Preservation Section staff should be notified so that a course of action can be determined.

Archeological sites can be used to convey to the public important aspects of a community’s history and can be promoted as heritage tourism amenities. Archeological sites that can be preserved in place on subdivision properties should be preserved in open spaces or conservation areas, if possible, and interpreted as appropriate. The Planning Board’s Guidelines for Archeological Review should be amplified to establish requirements for preserving significant archeological sites in place.

When significant archeological sites are identified, interpretive signage and web sites should be developed to educate the public on the unique information contained within archeological sites and how that data can inform citizens about the history of a particular area. Significant data obtained from the excavation of archeological sites should be conveyed to the public through interactive web sites, signage that ties similar types of sites together, and interpretive brochures that promote heritage tourism in the county. Moreover, data obtained from significant archeological sites in the county can be used to develop lesson plans for elementary, middle, and high schools. Educating the general public on the benefits of archeology can build stronger constituencies for historic preservation. The Guidelines for Archeological Review currently do not
describe standards for signage and should be revised to provide guidance to developers on the general specifications for interpretive signs and suggested content. Interpretive signs should be placed in areas of the subdivision where they will be viewed by the maximum number of people. When possible, signage should be placed along trails within the development or along well-traveled routes.

To provide further protection to significant archeological sites that are discovered in the course of subdivision projects, these sites should be designated as county historic sites, subject to regulation under Subtitle 29. Significant archeological sites should be evaluated for historic site status by the HPC prior to approval of the final plat or detailed site plan. Based on the proposed development surrounding the archeological site and the property’s zoning, a nondisturbance buffer should be established to ensure that grading or other ground disturbing activities do not occur too close to the site boundaries.

Further recognition of significant archeological sites could be provided through nomination of those sites to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Although placement of archeological sites in the NRHP does not prevent those sites from being destroyed (unlike designation as a county historic site), listing provides recognition at the federal level that the site is important to the nation, state, or local community. It also assures that federal agencies will consider impacts to the site under federally funded projects. Historic site designation would protect the resource under the provisions of Subtitle 29 that would require the submission of a historic area work permit (HAWP) for any ground-disturbing activities proposed on the site.

In certain cases, archeological investigations are needed when an owner of a historic site applies for a HAWP. For instance, when foundations are disturbed, or grading or ground disturbance is necessary, a limited archeological investigation may be needed because the property itself may have the potential to yield valuable contributions to the county’s history. If grading is necessary, large machinery, such as bulldozers with large tracks, should be avoided. Assistance should be provided to help property owners in finding grant funding to offset the expenses of such investigations.

All contributing cultural resources should be included in the environmental setting of a historic site. Archeological investigations may be necessary when sites are evaluated for historic site or historic district status. For example, the site of the African-American blacksmith shop, which once stood near St. Thomas’ Church in Croom, was recently brought to the attention of Historic Preservation Section staff. The archeological remains of the shop could provide historical information on the African-American community that developed near the church.

Comprehensive archeological surveys should be conducted on parkland that is slated for development before the park is designed so that any significant resources can be avoided or mitigated. Attempts should be made to preserve any significant archeological sites in place, provide for future investigations, and develop interpretive exhibits for the public. Significant archeological sites should be incorporated into the overall park plan. This work should be planned at the earliest stages of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budgeting process.

Goal: Incorporate archeological resource protection into the local land use and comprehensive planning processes through site identification and preservation.

Policy 1: Ensure that archeological resources are considered and protected through all phases of the development process.

Strategies

1. Consider additions to county regulations to ensure better protection of archeological resources.

2. Identify prehistoric and historic archeological sites on all properties subject to the county’s subdivision regulations.
3. Request a Phase I archeological survey on properties subject to the subdivision regulations that have a moderate-to-high probability of containing prehistoric or historic archeological resources.

4. Digitize aerial photographs of the county from the 1940s and 1950s to more accurately predict site locations and trace the historical development of the county.

5. Develop prehistoric and historic contexts that summarize previous work in the county and provide research themes and questions that can assist in evaluating the research potential of each site.

6. Develop a layer in the Prince George's County GIS system (www.pgatlas.com) that identifies properties that have been subject to an archeological survey under the subdivision regulations.

7. Conduct archeological surveys on properties in the process of being evaluated for historic site or historic district status. Include any contributing cultural resources within the environmental setting of a historic site or within the boundaries of a historic district.

8. Assist owners of historic sites applying for HAWPs with sources of funding when a need for archeological investigation is identified.

9. Ensure that heavy track vehicles are not used in archeologically sensitive areas.

Policy 2: Develop a comprehensive archeological survey plan for M-NCPPC properties that are planned for development.

Strategies

1. Conduct archeological surveys on parkland before a park is designed to avoid or mitigate significant archeological sites.

2. Preserve significant archeological sites on parkland in place, provide for future investigations, and develop interpretive exhibits for the public. Incorporate significant archeological sites into the overall park plan.

3. Develop an archeological research, survey, and assessment program to address the needs of the Department of Parks and Recreation in managing archeological resources located on parkland.

Policy 3: Develop a comprehensive archeological survey plan for the early port towns.

Strategies

1. Compile historical data on the early port towns to determine the size and extent of the towns and the likely locations of buildings.

2. Work with local universities to conduct archeological field schools in the early port towns.

Policy 4: Promote public understanding of the significance of archeological resources.

Strategies

1. Create partnerships with local universities and preservation organizations to use students or volunteers to assist in the survey and identification of archeological sites on parkland and county historic sites.

2. Develop lesson plans for elementary, middle, and high schools from the data obtained from significant archeological sites, and hold a workshop for teachers on how to implement those lesson plans.

3. Deliver public lectures or hold events highlighting the significant information obtained from archeological surveys on the county’s history.

Policy 5: Encourage preservation-in-place of significant archeological sites with high public interpretive value.

Strategies

1. Designate significant archeological resources as historic sites, and establish an environmental setting that creates an appropriate nondisturbance buffer around the site.

2. Nominate significant prehistoric and historic archeological resources to the National Register of Historic Places.

3. Encourage the incorporation of significant archeological resources as cultural assets in development applications.

4. Consider revisions to the Planning Board’s Guidelines for Archeological Review to establish a minimum nondisturbance buffer around an archeological site.
5. Consider revisions to the *Guidelines for Archeological Review* to require preservation easements for archeological sites preserved in place.

6. Clarify the *Guidelines for Archeological Review* to address Phase III treatment plans that provide for the mitigation of unanticipated discoveries during grading of subdivision properties.

7. Provide incentives to property owners, such as tax credits and grants, to preserve-in-place significant archeological resources.

8. Partner with nonprofit groups, such as The Archaeological Conservancy, or public agencies to acquire significant archeological sites and develop long-term preservation and interpretive plans.

**Policy 6: Develop a comprehensive interpretive program that organizes site types by themes to reflect the preservation themes identified in the State of Maryland’s Preservation Plan.**

**Strategies**

1. Develop interpretive signage and web sites to convey to the public information collected about archeological sites identified through development projects as well as through parkland development.

2. Develop guidance on public interpretive measures for inclusion in the *Guidelines for Archeological Review*.

3. Provide abstracts from the archeological reports to inform the public of the findings of archeological investigations.
Photos:
Phase II archeological excavations at possible slave quarter associated with Brookefield of the Berrys (Historic Site 86A-020)
Nineteenth century ceramics recovered from possible slave quarter at Brookefield of the Berrys (Photos courtesy of Greenhorne & O’Mara, Inc.)
Phase III archeological investigations at the Riverview Road Archeological Site (Historic Site 80-051)
Cultural landscapes provide us with a sense of place and reveal our relationship with the land over time. They are part of our heritage and part of our lives. Cultural landscapes reveal much about our culture, our populations, and express our regional identity. Landscapes can be read on many levels—for example, landscape as nature, habitat, artifact, system, history, place, and aesthetic. When people learn how to “read” the landscapes that are part of their surroundings, they begin to understand how changes affect these special places and learn to become better stewards of our significant cultural landscape heritage.

A cultural landscape may be defined as a geographic area that includes cultural and natural resources associated with a historic event, activity, person, or group of people. Cultural landscapes exist in both rural and urban environments and can range from thousands of acres to houses with small front yards. The farms in the Rural Tier can be considered a cultural landscape as can a street in Mount Rainier. They can be manmade expressions of visual and spatial relationships that include plantations, estates, cottages, farmlands, public parks, institutional campuses, cemeteries, scenic highways, civic plazas, and industrial sites. The treatment and management of these cultural landscapes should be considered in concert with the management of historic property.1

In defining a cultural landscape, it is important to identify the humans who shaped it, the artifacts within it, and the natural features present. Each of these three elements is influenced and shaped by the others. A cultural landscape may consist of a single property or a group of properties that together express a coherent theme, such as the Mount Vernon viewshed and the Route 1 heritage corridor. They also exist in relationship to their ecological contexts. As with historic buildings, these special places reveal aspects of the origins and development of a place. Through their form, features, and the ways they are used, cultural landscapes reveal much about our evolving relationships with the natural world. They provide scenic, economic, ecological, social, recreational, and educational opportunities that help individuals and communities understand themselves. The preservation and interpretation of these cultural landscapes can yield an improved quality of life, identity, and sense of place. Cultural landscapes in Prince George’s County have been shaped by, and reflect, significant local heritage themes, including the county’s agricultural past, political developments, the expansion of the federal government in Washington, D.C., and transportation networks.

Cultural landscapes can be loosely grouped into four categories: historic sites and their environmental settings, designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes. Examples of each category are Ridgely Church and Cemetery, a historic site; Belair Mansion and Mount Calvert, designed landscapes; the Village of Croom and the Trueman Point Landing, historic vernacular landscapes; and Piscataway Park in Accokeek, an ethnographic landscape.2

An ethnographic landscape may also be thought of as an area that is defined by the cultural groups associated with

---

1 This definition and discussion of cultural landscapes is based on information published by the National Park Service/U.S. Department of the Interior Preservation Brief 36, “Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes, 1994”.

2 The Applied Ethnography Program of the National Park Service has defined an ethnographic landscape as: “...a relatively contiguous area of interrelated places that contemporary cultural groups define as meaningful because it is inextricably and traditionally linked to their own local or regional histories, cultural identities, beliefs, and behaviors. Present-day social factors such as a people’s class, ethnicity, and gender may result in the assignment of diverse meanings to a landscape and its component places.”
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Many elements of Prince George’s County’s rural and urban landscapes are disappearing in the wake of new development. “Big box” retailers and chain stores are diverting business from small rural crossroad communities that once served the basic needs of local families. Railroad and streetcar commuter lines have disappeared with the advent of the automobile, transforming suburban communities near Washington, D.C. Older, smaller houses within suburban communities are being torn down and replaced with larger structures whose architectural features and scale are incompatible with the surrounding community. These “teardowns” also occur on infill lots where new houses do not conform to the character of a neighborhood.

All elements of a cultural landscape should be inventoried and their integrity assessed. Cultural landscape reports should be developed that identify the significant elements and features within a landscape, the historical development of the landscape, its change over time, its boundaries, and a treatment program. Spatial relationships between cultural landscape elements are also important and should be preserved and maintained. A cultural landscape should also be placed in its historic context to link it with historical trends in the county. Community input is crucial to identifying significant natural and cultural features within a landscape. Certain landmarks or natural features within a community often work together to create a sense of place for residents. Criteria for inventorying cultural landscapes should be developed and used to identify important cultural and natural features.

Some efforts to identify and inventory significant cultural landscapes have already been initiated in Prince George’s County. These include two historic designed parkways that are designated as National Register Historic Districts, Baltimore-Washington Parkway and Suitland Parkway. Piscataway National Park, located in the southwestern part of the county, was established in 1952 to protect the viewshed of Mount Vernon. An additional 73 acres was recently added to the protected viewshed in 2008. Mount Vernon and its viewshed is being considered for designation as a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

The Planning Department’s Environmental Planning Section reviews all development applications involving scenic and historic roads in the county and provides the Planning Board with recommendations on their treatment during the course of development. The county’s Master Plan of Transportation lists all designated historic roads. (Scenic roads are designated through master/sector plans or by County Council resolution.)

A Scenic Roads Study was undertaken by the Prince George’s County Planning Department in 1984. The study identified 170 miles of scenic roads throughout the county, but the policy recommendations were never adopted. A Rural Historic Landscapes and Scenic Roads Study was conducted in 1988 in two project areas—the Bleak Hill Historic Survey Area and the Croom Road Corridor. Again, the policy recommendations were never adopted.

More recently, the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) has established a scenic byways program to identify significant historical features along driving routes. A corridor management plan (CMP) has to be completed in order to obtain funding from SHA for implementation.
of the plan’s recommendations. The Lower Patuxent Scenic Byway was designated as a Maryland scenic byway by the Maryland State Highway Administration and identified by Prince George’s County for its rural character, location on the Patuxent River, and history of tobacco farming. A CMP for the Lower Patuxent River Scenic Byway is underway, and several elements of the CMP have been completed by the Planning Department—the Croom Road Tobacco Barn Survey Report (2006) and a Lower Patuxent River Scenic Byway Intrinsic Quality Inventory Report (2007).

Goal: Foster awareness of cultural landscape preservation as a way to preserve the character of rural and urban communities.

Policy 1: Expand the integration of rural and urban cultural landscape preservation into historic preservation planning.

Strategies

1. Develop criteria to inventory the county’s rural and urban cultural landscapes that reflect established and emerging heritage themes.

2. Develop criteria to inventory ethnographic landscapes that are significant to Native American groups.

3. Include analysis of a cultural landscape as part of the environmental setting evaluation process.

Policy 2: Preserve significant cultural landscape features during all phases of the development process.

Strategies

1. Develop a mechanism to require a cultural landscape treatment plan for a developing property in order to ensure that the defining features of a landscape are protected.

2. Maintain the natural and historic features of scenic and historic roads, such as cross sections, hills, curves, and aesthetic features.

3. Consider using protective mechanisms, such as overlay zones, for the protection of significant cultural landscapes, such as the Mount Vernon viewshed. A sector plan and a development district overlay zone could be used to regulate height, architecture, lighting, landscaping, and other elements that impact cultural landscape viewsheds.

Policy 3: Strengthen partnerships with environmental organizations working for the inclusion of cultural landscapes as part of open space preservation.

Strategies

1. Identify and create a list of partners in cultural landscape preservation, and identify ways in which collaborations might take place, such as through the establishment of scenic and agricultural easements.

2. Work with partners to inventory thematic tour routes, scenic byways, and other cultural landscapes.
Chapter 9·Cultural Landscape Preservation

Photos:
The Orchard at Bostwick (Historic Site 69-005-09), 2008
Tayman Tobacco Barn (Historic Site 86A-027-45)
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HISTORIC PRESERVATION INCENTIVES

Background

Property owners need encouragement to maintain and preserve historic and cultural resources. As in the conservation of natural resources, the preservation of historic resources is considered a public good. Historic and cultural resources are nonrenewable; once lost, they are gone forever. Several financial incentive programs currently assist historic property owners, but data indicate that some incentives are not well used in the county and appear to have a limited effect. The county needs to be more aggressive in promoting the availability and use of incentive programs to help preserve the county’s historic and cultural resources.

Current Incentives

Tax Incentives

Tax incentive programs generally address three important objectives: they provide financial benefits to owners of buildings regulated by preservation laws; they counter public and private land use policies favoring demolition and new construction; and they encourage the rehabilitation of historic structures. Although no single incentive program accomplishes all three objectives, meaningful tax incentives have been adopted at the federal, state, and county levels. Some property owners can take advantage of all three levels of incentives for one project.

County Tax Credit—The county property tax credit for improvements to historic sites and properties within local historic districts has been in existence since 1981. Although the program provides a ten percent credit for approved rehabilitation work and a five percent credit for compatible new construction in a historic district, it has been used infrequently. From 2000–2008, only 24 owners of historic sites have received credits, with $375,506 in total approved credits. This represents a small portion of the more than 400 eligible historic sites and many other eligible properties within the county’s two local historic districts. In the period between 2000–2008, the widest use of the program occurred in 2006 with seven approvals and $20,178 in credits. Because the credit is only applied to the county property tax portion of the tax bill, most owners are not able to take full advantage of the credit, even over the five-year period.

Allowing the credit to extend five additional years would provide a modest additional incentive; more incentive would be provided if the credit were increased. The value to the county of protecting its heritage through repair and restoration of historic sites would outweigh the amount of money credited through the program. The preservation of historic resources adds tremendously to the quality of life in the county, making it a more desirable place to live and work. Cost-effectiveness studies of tax incentive programs (most recently, a report commissioned by Preservation Maryland on the state’s tax credit program) have found that the short-term erosion of the property tax base is more than made up by the long-term increases in property values, construction, collateral spending, and job creation.

Tax abatement programs are common throughout Virginia and exist in some Maryland cities, such as Annapolis and Baltimore. Generally, the relief is equal to the amount expended in the rehabilitation, which must increase the value of the structure by 20-40 percent. The duration of these initiatives would require amendments to the state enabling legislation.

the relief varies from 5–15 years. A tax abatement program would both provide a further incentive for the designation of historic sites and districts and direct additional funds to those properties most endangered by neglect.

**State Tax Credit**—Conversely, the Maryland Sustainable Communities Tax Credit Program, which is applicable in National Register historic districts and is administered by the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT), has seen more widespread use in the county. During the same period, MHT approved $1,556,545 in credits for 83 projects in Prince George’s County. The state’s program is more financially beneficial (a 20 percent refundable state income tax credit) and applies to a broader range of resources (contributing structures within National Register districts as well as National Register properties and county-designated historic sites and districts5, both depreciable structures and residences are eligible.) The rehabilitation of single-family, owner-occupied dwellings comprises virtually all of the state tax credit projects in the county.6 Under the Sustainable Communities Act of 2010, a 25 percent credit for “certified historic structures” that are high-performance, commercial buildings is also available.

**Federal Tax Credit**—The federal government’s rehabilitation tax credit program, jointly administered by the National Park Service and State Historic Preservation Office, is the nation’s most effective federal program to promote urban and rural revitalization and to encourage private investment in rehabilitating historic buildings. This investment was stimulated by federal tax incentives first adopted in 1976 and expanded in 1978 and 1981. The tax incentive program attracts private investment to the historic cores of cities and towns and generates jobs, enhances property values, creates affordable housing, and augments revenues for federal, state, and local governments.

The program provides for a 20 percent federal income tax credit on the cost of the rehabilitation of certified historic structures and can be “carried forward” 20 years and “carried back” one year. Structures eligible for this program must be listed in the National Register of Historic Places or contribute to a National Register district. The rehabilitation must be substantial (rehabilitation costs must exceed the adjusted basis of the building), the structures must be depreciable (the building must be income-producing, not an owner-occupied residence), and the work performed must meet the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for Rehabilitation*. Because the county does not possess a large inventory of historic commercial buildings or historic buildings suitable for commercial uses, this program has been rarely used. From 2000-2008, only two projects received a total of $530,000 in credits.7

**Municipal Credits**—In early 2009, the Mount Rainier City Council approved a new historic preservation tax credit, providing owners of historic structures with a ten percent city tax credit for repairs already approved by MHT through the Maryland Heritage Structure Rehabilitation Tax Credit Program. The city’s credit is limited to repairs on windows and exterior doors that are architecturally compatible with the resource. Data on the administration and use of this program are not yet available, but it is an encouraging start. Taking advantage of available tax incentives simultaneously at the federal, state, county, and municipal levels is often what makes a rehabilitation project viable.

**Grants**

**Prince George’s Heritage Grants**—Prince George’s Heritage, Inc. (PGH), a nonprofit organization, provides grants of up to $4,000 to support historic preservation projects of public and private historic resources in Prince George’s County. The Heritage Grants Program supports projects to preserve and restore historic buildings as well as projects to promote greater awareness and appreciation of the historical and cultural heritage of Prince George’s County. Two grant competitions are held each year, with applications due on February 1 and August 1. In special circumstances, an emergency grant review may be conducted upon request for applications that cannot wait for the next grant cycle. Applicants must match the PGH grant funds dollar-for-dollar with their own funds or with funds raised from other grant programs or sources. In-kind contributions or “sweat equity” may be eligible to meet the matching requirement. If the grant is for architectural work to a historic site, the project must adhere to the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties* and/or conditions in an applicable historic area work permit.

---

5 Provided the designation meets National Register eligibility criteria.
6 Only three projects were classified as “commercial” by the state’s program during this period.
7 Two more projects with $306,000 in credits were scheduled to be completed in 2009-2010.
Chapter 10: Historic Preservation Incentives

County Grants

Historic Property Grant Program for Capital Grants

In April 2008 the County Council approved legislation authorizing the Prince George’s County Planning Board to create the Prince George’s County Historic Property Grant Program. The program provides grants to individuals, nonprofit organizations, or foundations, and to political subdivisions for the purpose of acquiring, preserving, restoring, or rehabilitating historic properties. A total of $500,000 was allocated in each of the Planning Department’s FY 2009 and FY 2010 budgets.

The program was announced to the public in May 2008 soon after the Planning Board approved the program guidelines. Thirty-seven applications were received and requests for grant funds totaled over $2,200,000. With the aid of Planning Department Historic Preservation Section staff and the Historic Preservation Commission, the Planning Board allocated $500,000 of the FY 2009 budget among 16 projects and $500,000 of the FY 2010 budget among 15 projects. The program requires that grant recipients convey a perpetual preservation easement to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) to ensure protection of the property. If the property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places, easement grantees may qualify for a charitable deduction when calculating income tax, pursuant to Internal Revenue Code regulations.

It is clear from applications received in 2008 and 2009 that the demand far exceeds the available funds. The program is a strong tool for preservation and unusual in its ability to provide grants to private property owners.

Potential Incentives

State Grants—The MHT Capital Historic Preservation Grant Program provides support for the acquisition, rehabilitation, and restoration of historic properties. MHT’s Noncapital Historic Preservation Grant Program provides support for research, survey, planning, and educational activities involving architectural, archeological, or cultural resources. These competitive capital and noncapital programs, offered once a year, are supported through an annual appropriation from the Maryland General Assembly. Capital grant awards generally range from $5,000 to $50,000, with the average award in FY 2009 being $42,000. Noncapital grant awards generally range from $5,000 to $50,000, with the average award in FY 2009 being $30,000. MHT also offers museum assistance grants. Between 1998–2008, MHT awarded over $2.7 million to nonprofit organizations, municipalities, and M-NCPPC in preservation and museum assistance grants for many different types of projects including archeology, arts, education, exhibits, decorative streetlights, gardens, hands-on learning, interpretive signage, marketing, murals, museum programs, operating assistance, planning, preservation/restoration, and research.

The Maryland Heritage Areas Authority provides dollar-for-dollar matching grants to nonprofit organizations and governments for capital and noncapital projects located within a Maryland Certified Heritage Area. Grants can support projects involving historical, cultural, or natural resources, sites, events, or facilities. Eligible projects must (1) have a heritage tourism component; for example, the project involves a visitor destination such as a museum, visitor center, or nature center; (2) help to provide facilities and services that support heritage tourism, such as rehabilitating a historic building as a bed-and-breakfast, restaurant, or other tourism-related retail use, or (3) sponsor an event that will help to create a long-term increase in visitation to the heritage area.

The Anacostia Trails Heritage Area (ATHA) was created in 1997 and covers 84 square miles in the northern part of the county. For FY 2011 ATHA received $237,500 in grants from the Maryland Heritage Areas Authority for projects such as the heritage area management grant, ATHA Office and Visitors Center buildout, Brentwood Heritage Tour, War of 1812 Bladensburg/Port Towns mural, and the Banner Program Expansion.

Potential Noncapital Grant Program—In 2001 and 2003, two historic sites, Brown’s Tavern and Belleview, both in advanced states of deterioration, were demolished for development. Through Memoranda of Understanding between the property owners and the Historic Preservation Commission, a total of $350,000 in mitigation funds was provided to the Prince George’s County government for the creation of a non-capital grant program dedicated to the preservation of historic properties in the county. Qualifying noncapital preservation grant projects include historic survey and documentation, planning, education, and outreach activities. Due to the fact that the source of the funding was from the private sector, noncapital grant projects do not require easements. Guidelines, policies,
and procedures for the dispersal of noncapital grants are being developed.

**Potential Revolving Fund**—A preservation revolving fund is a pool of capital created and reserved for historic preservation, with the condition that the money will be returned to the fund to be reused for similar activities. This is accomplished by partnering with neighborhoods and community-based organizations, retaining and developing affordable housing, collaborations with others to preserve and develop real estate, and serving as a catalyst for public and private investment.

A revolving fund could be used to purchase endangered properties that could be rehabilitated for owner-occupied, affordable housing and to make rehabilitation loans to owners who cannot obtain conventional financing due to income level and/or the condition of the building and area. Loans for historic commercial properties may stimulate other development by providing gap financing for revitalization projects and storefront improvement loans for façade improvement. The revolving fund could provide incentive grants for signs, awnings, and storefronts.

Funds are typically committed on a short-term basis and are “revolved” back into a capital fund when a building is resold or loans are paid back. The revolving fund could be operated by a county nonprofit preservation organization. The county should take the lead in fostering the development of such a revolving fund.

**Goal:** Provide financial incentives that support the preservation of historic properties.

**Policy 1: Fund and administer historic preservation grant programs.**

**Strategies**

1. Continue to fund and administer the Prince George’s County Historic Property Grant Program.

2. To encourage continued funding of this program, develop promotional materials about completed projects.

3. Track the impact of grant-funded projects on the immediate neighborhood and whether the projects are the impetus for further investment in the neighborhood or community.

4. Develop and approve guidelines and procedures for the noncapital preservation grant program.

**Policy 2: Promote state and federal preservation tax incentives in tandem with the county preservation tax credit as strong incentives for revitalization.**

**Strategies**

1. Encourage historic property owners to take advantage of the state and federal tax credits and incentives as well as the local incentives to make preservation projects economically viable.

2. Encourage citizens to work with local elected officials to lobby for the continuation of the state’s tax incentives for historic buildings.

3. Consider amending the county preservation tax credit provisions to increase the percentage of the credit, and allow the credit to extend over a ten-year period instead of the existing five-year period.

4. Work with local elected officials to draft state enabling legislation to increase the percentage of the county preservation tax credit and allow the credit to extend over a ten-year period.

5. Work with local elected officials to draft parallel county legislation.

**Policy 3: Provide for reduced and/or delayed increases in property tax assessments following the substantial rehabilitation of a historic site or property in a local historic district.**

**Strategies**

1. Work with officials to draft state enabling legislation for reduced property assessments and/or delayed increases in property tax assessments.

2. Work with local elected officials to draft parallel county legislation.
Policy 4: Provide incentives for maintaining the environmental setting around a historic site. This incentive could be provided through a property tax credit or through an agricultural tax assessment.

Strategies

1. Work with local officials to develop state-enabling legislation. The incentive would be an offset to the development pressure created by underlying zoning that would otherwise allow for more development on the property.

2. Work with local elected officials to develop and pass county legislation to provide incentives for the maintenance of environmental settings around historic sites.

3. Encourage and facilitate the use of preservation easements through promotional materials.8

Policy 5: Investigate the establishment of a county revolving fund to stimulate community revitalization in historic neighborhoods and commercial areas.

Strategy

1. Consider convening preservation nonprofit groups, banks, and county government officials to frame a revolving fund to stimulate community revitalization through leading, technical assistance, and development in historic areas.

---

8 Preservation easements have become a popular preservation tool for a variety of reasons. Preservation easements may increase tax deductions that can boost after-tax rates of return in real estate syndications and partnerships; they can reduce the taxable basis in a structure so that the Investment Tax Credit minimum rehabilitation expenditure test is met. The Federal Tax Code allows a charitable contribution deduction for value of a "qualified real property interest" to a "qualified organization" when given exclusively for conservation purposes." In the past several years, organizations have been established specifically for the purpose of accepting preservation easements. Their programs are most active (and are advertised most widely) in cities with large concentrations of eligible resources. (National Park Service Technical Preservation Services staff determines eligibility.) Easements can also be held by M-NCPPC, MHT, or other qualified county preservation nonprofits.
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Background

Well-maintained historically, culturally, or architecturally significant buildings, whether they are commercial, residential, religious, or institutional structures, are often regarded as some of the most valued elements in a community. These buildings remind residents and visitors of an area’s unique history and provide a visible link to it. Although historic buildings sometimes do not retain their original uses, their rehabilitation and adaptive use can create unique, interesting, and innovative spaces for modern purposes. These buildings can create the basis for a specially designated zone or district that may attract investment and tourism-related development activities.

Prince George’s County has many historically significant communities, towns and municipalities. Appendix B provides a short history and description of 58 of those communities that have been surveyed and documented as background for the Historic Sites and Districts Plan. In general terms, these historic communities fall into one of two primary categories and can be described as either (1) rural crossroad communities, such as Rossville, T.B., Brandywine, and Aquasco, that developed as convenient settlements for local workers, farmers, and tradesmen; or (2) planned subdivisions, such as Mount Rainier, Fairmount Heights, North Brentwood, Riverdale Park, Hyattsville, Calvert Hills, and Greenbelt, that were developed as suburban communities dependent initially on the railroad and streetcar and later on the automobile. Many of the county’s historic communities have strong historic and architectural identities reflected in collections of buildings and streetscapes that demonstrate the evolution of American architecture from the late nineteenth century through the middle of the twentieth century.

Although Prince George’s County today has numerous urban areas, it does not have many historic commercial centers. The county’s most discernible historic main street is the US 1 corridor as it extends from Laurel in the north to the District of Columbia boundary to the south. Many plans and strategies for revitalization have been recently developed for portions of US 1 including the Anacostia Trails Heritage Area Management Plan (September 2001), the Gateway Arts District Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (November 2004), the Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan (January 2004), and the Bladensburg Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (June 2007). Other commercial corridors such as Old Marlboro Pike, MD 450, and Central Avenue are long-standing transportation routes that have more recently evolved to include commercial uses.

Issues

The preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings and streetscapes are vital tools for maintaining and reviving the character of the county’s historic communities and for spurring economic development along its historic main streets. The National Trust for Historic Preservation’s historic preservation-based economic development strategy, the Main Street “Four-Point Approach” has been adopted and used in Prince George’s County through the Main Street Maryland program. The program is a community-driven, volunteer-based, comprehensive, revitalization strategy that uses historic preservation and rehabilitation as an economic development tool. Main Street’s comprehensiveness comes from its four basic tenets: (1) organization of the revitalization efforts using volunteer and public-private partnerships; (2) promotion of the entire business district as a unique place to shop, play, work, invest, and live; (3) a focus on aspects of design that make the business district aesthetically pleasing; and (4) economic restructuring of the local economy, which involves knowing the district’s market and creating opportunities for new development and job creation. In 2008, Main Street Maryland incorporated a fifth point:

Neighborhood and Commercial Revitalization
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Well-maintained historically, culturally, or architecturally significant buildings, whether they are commercial, residential, religious, or institutional structures, are often regarded as some of the most valued elements in a community. These buildings remind residents and visitors of an area’s unique history and provide a visible link to it. Although historic buildings sometimes do not retain their original uses, their rehabilitation and adaptive use can create unique, interesting, and innovative spaces for modern purposes. These buildings can create the basis for a specially designated zone or district that may attract investment and tourism-related development activities.

Prince George’s County has many historically significant communities, towns and municipalities. Appendix B provides a short history and description of 58 of those communities that have been surveyed and documented as background for the Historic Sites and Districts Plan. In general terms, these historic communities fall into one of two primary categories and can be described as either (1) rural crossroad communities, such as Rossville, T.B., Brandywine, and Aquasco, that developed as convenient settlements for local workers, farmers, and tradesmen; or (2) planned subdivisions, such as Mount Rainier, Fairmount Heights, North Brentwood, Riverdale Park, Hyattsville, Calvert Hills, and Greenbelt, that were developed as suburban communities dependent initially on the railroad and streetcar and later on the automobile. Many of the county’s historic communities have strong historic and architectural identities reflected in collections of buildings and streetscapes that demonstrate the evolution of American architecture from the late nineteenth century through the middle of the twentieth century.

Although Prince George’s County today has numerous urban areas, it does not have many historic commercial centers. The county’s most discernible historic main street is the US 1 corridor as it extends from Laurel in the north to the District of Columbia boundary to the south. Many plans and strategies for revitalization have been recently developed for portions of US 1 including the Anacostia Trails Heritage Area Management Plan (September 2001), the Gateway Arts District Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (November 2004), the Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan (January 2004), and the Bladensburg Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (June 2007). Other commercial corridors such as Old Marlboro Pike, MD 450, and Central Avenue are long-standing transportation routes that have more recently evolved to include commercial uses.

Issues

The preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings and streetscapes are vital tools for maintaining and reviving the character of the county’s historic communities and for spurring economic development along its historic main streets. The National Trust for Historic Preservation’s historic preservation-based economic development strategy, the Main Street “Four-Point Approach” has been adopted and used in Prince George’s County through the Main Street Maryland program. The program is a community-driven, volunteer-based, comprehensive, revitalization strategy that uses historic preservation and rehabilitation as an economic development tool. Main Street’s comprehensiveness comes from its four basic tenets: (1) organization of the revitalization efforts using volunteer and public-private partnerships; (2) promotion of the entire business district as a unique place to shop, play, work, invest, and live; (3) a focus on aspects of design that make the business district aesthetically pleasing; and (4) economic restructuring of the local economy, which involves knowing the district’s market and creating opportunities for new development and job creation. In 2008, Main Street Maryland incorporated a fifth point:
clean, safe, and green communities. This point reinforces the principles of smart growth and sustainability. Although currently there are no main street communities in the county, both Hyattsville and Mount Rainier have been recognized as main street communities in the past. Historically, challenges in the implementation of the Main Street Maryland Program have revolved around consistent staffing and ensuring continued support of the public and private sectors.

The preliminary documentation of the county’s historic communities in Appendix B is an important first step in bringing public attention to the need for appreciation and enhancement of the character, streetscapes, and buildings in these areas. It is important that the historic resources in these communities are regarded as a ready catalyst for revitalization efforts. Revitalization and streetscape improvement programs should be built around the character of the county’s existing historic neighborhoods.

**Planning and Implementation Tools for Neighborhood Conservation and Commercial Revitalization**

Community revitalization efforts often combine multiple preservation, planning, zoning, and implementation tools to successfully accomplish desired results. The designation of a special district is a means to organize and focus investment in a particular area to achieve a range of outcomes, such as historic preservation, business improvement, or economic revitalization. Examples of these special districts may include enterprise zones, business improvement districts, historic districts, arts districts, or neighborhood conservation areas. Designating neighborhoods and/or commercial areas in which tax incentives, regulatory flexibility, or other financial benefits are made available can help channel targeted investment to support strong communities. More planning and financial resources need to be devoted to assisting in such efforts.

Historic district designation is discussed in Chapter 3. At this time, only two areas in Prince George’s County have been designated as county historic districts: Broad Creek and Old Town College Park. The purpose of establishing a historic district is to ensure the retention and protection of historic buildings and to maintain the historic scale and character of an area when new construction is reviewed. In a historic district, all changes to buildings must be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) according to adopted design guidelines for the district and according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The historic district may have a local advisory committee that makes recommendations to the HPC. The HPC can approve or deny any proposed change within the boundaries of the historic district.

Another tool to protect the existing character of historic communities is the Architectural Conservation Overlay Zone, a provision in the Zoning Ordinance. The intent of the zone is to preserve the architectural character of neighborhoods, to retain affordable housing, to promote appropriate development or new construction, to preserve and stabilize property values, and to protect desirable and unique physical features of existing residential and commercial property. The zone is a defined area that is superimposed by the District Council over other zones in the district. The area must include ten or more contiguous acres, follow property lines, streets, or permanent natural...
features, and must not include property in more than one municipality. In order for the overlay zone plan to be initiated, the proposed district also needs to meet at least one of four other specific requirements found in Sec. 27.213.19 of the County Code. In this zone, an architectural conservation plan must be approved by the District Council, and all development is subject to the approval by the Planning Board of a detailed site plan. The architectural conservation plan provides the requirements for development within the district. No architectural conservation districts have been established as of 2009.1

Adaptive use is a process by which structurally sound older buildings are rehabilitated for economically viable new uses. Within the context of adaptive use, the building may be restored or renovated. Adaptive use has become of mutual interest to those groups concerned with the preservation of our cultural, historic, and architectural heritage, to the real estate community striving to widen development opportunities, and, more recently, to the environmental conservation community. It is often said that “the greenest building is one that already exists.” Sometimes overlooked in the discussion of green construction, the rehabilitation of historic buildings is inherently sustainable. Historic buildings often feature energy-efficient elements as part of their design, such as high ceilings and operable windows. Most importantly, the rehabilitation or adaptive reuse of historic buildings makes use of the structure’s embodied energy (the amount of energy used in the harvest, manufacture, and transportation of materials and in the construction of a building) and requires and produces less waste than new green construction. Even if a rehabilitated historic building does not feature “green” design, if located in a densely populated area, it can legitimately claim substantial climate benefits that are attributable to reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMTs). Recent analysis of the Maryland Heritage Structure Rehabilitation Tax Credit Program indicates that tax credit projects in Baltimore are reducing VMTs at the rate of between 30 and 40 percent.2

Leadership in Engineering and Environmental Design (LEED) is an internationally recognized green building certification system developed by the United States Green Building Council (USGBC), providing building owners and operators a concise framework for identifying and implementing practical and measurable green building design, construction, operations, and maintenance solutions. LEED is flexible enough to apply to both commercial and residential buildings, and two of the program’s initiatives, LEED-EB and LEED-ND, may benefit commercial revitalization and neighborhood conservation efforts.

The LEED for Existing Buildings (LEED-EB) Rating System helps building owners and operators measure operations, improvements, and maintenance on a consistent scale, with the goal of maximizing operational efficiency while minimizing environmental impacts. LEED-EB addresses building cleaning and maintenance issues and systems upgrades. It can be applied both to existing buildings seeking LEED certification for the first time and to other LEED certified projects.

In 2009, USGBC incorporated changes in its LEED Green Building Rating Systems that reflect the sustainable benefits of historic preservation. LEED’s newest rating system, LEED-Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) presents many changes to the rating system. LEED 2009 features credits weighted according to life cycle assessment (LCA) criteria. LCA is a holistic, scientific approach that evaluates a building’s energy intake and expenditure over the course of its lifetime. With regard to incorporating the sustainable benefits of historic preservation, LEED 2009 includes changes that benefit rehabilitation projects, particularly in the LEED for new construction and major renovation, most often used for large-scale rehabilitation projects.

Although LEED-ND is designed for new neighborhoods and infill, it does address the rehabilitation of historic buildings by recognizing historic preservation laws and core concepts established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. It allows the exemption of historic districts from LEED requirements if the historic design does not follow the guidelines outlined in neighborhood pattern and design and prohibits the demolition of part or all of any historic building listed at the federal, state, or local level, unless the demolition has been approved by the local historic preservation review board or similarly empowered entity. Future versions of LEED are expected to incorporate more preservation concerns, perhaps including a specific rating system for the rehabilitation of historic buildings.

---

1 Draft legislation to make revisions to this zoning technique is under consideration but was not reviewed in 2010.
LEED certification is commonly only sought for the rehabilitation of larger-scale commercial and industrial structures. Although the county has a limited number of these types of historic resources, this plan acknowledges that sustainable building and planning practices are growing nationwide and that historic preservation and the revitalization of existing communities will play a major role in that trend.

Goal: Encourage the rehabilitation of historic properties to preserve and revitalize historic neighborhoods and commercial areas.

Policy 1: Create a collaborative process through which all levels of government work to retain and complement the existing fabric of the county’s historic communities.

Strategies

1. Provide public financing and technical assistance to support community-based organizations and municipalities involved in neighborhood conservation and commercial revitalization.

2. Encourage adaptive use, compatible new design, and appropriate streetscape enhancement and façade improvement programs.

3. Encourage community leaders and elected officials to promote the major historic assets of the county’s historic commercial areas, such as the US 1 corridor, Old Bowie, and Upper Marlboro. Economic development information packages should promote these assets to serve as an incentive for increasing development in existing and historically well-established commercial areas.

Policy 2: Encourage National Register and/or local designation of all eligible commercial areas. Substantial tax incentives for the rehabilitation of historic properties for commercial use are available for those listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Strategies

1. Provide technical and financial assistance to communities in pursuing specialized programs, such as Main Street Maryland designations for commercial revitalization.

2. Promote federal and state historic preservation tax credits to encourage adaptive use of historic buildings.

Policy 3: Encourage local historic district designation of older communities in order to protect their character before plans for revitalization are developed.

Strategy

1. Promote all rehabilitation financing options and incentives available for designated historic districts. Information could be made available through county agencies engaged in economic development and community reinvestment.

Policy 4: Improve public understanding of the inherent sustainability of historic preservation.

Historic preservation is a green practice in that each structure contains embodied energy in the form of labor and materials. The county should work to educate citizens about the environmental benefits of preservation and adaptive use over replacement for buildings and their components to dispel misconceptions on efficiency.

Strategies

1. Encourage the county delegation to draft state legislation, such as tax credits, that reward LEED certification for the rehabilitation of historic structures.

2. Encourage developers to obtain LEED certification when rehabilitating historic commercial structures. LEED certification allows developers to take advantage of state and local government incentives.

3. Provide information on life-cycle costs and savings for window and door repair, insulation, and retention versus replacement to inform homeowner decisions.
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HERITAGE TOURISM

Background
The National Trust for Historic Preservation defines heritage tourism as “traveling to experience the places, artifacts, and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present.” Heritage tourism may include the promotion of cultural, historic, and natural resources as part of an overall tourism and marketing campaign. Heritage tourists seek out authentic sites and specialized activities such as historic buildings, festivals, and local food ways, crafts, and traditions. Heritage tourism has been shown to attract visitors who spend more money at local businesses and stay longer at heritage sites than other leisure tourists. Over the years, heritage tourism has been growing in importance within the tourism industry and is increasingly part of economic development strategies nationwide.

The benefits of heritage tourism to the preservation of historic resources are substantial. Using historic resources as the central focus of tourism efforts is one way that communities can showcase their heritage assets. In many ways, this is the same philosophy espoused by Main Street revitalization programs. By identifying viable and sustainable economic uses for historic buildings and places, communities encourage private investment. Therefore, the community, government agencies, and private investors should work together to establish connections between well-maintained, interesting historic and cultural sites and the ability to attract tourism dollars.

The historic sites, historic districts, parklands, and trail system, as well as the available cultural activities in Prince George’s County, make it an attractive place to live and visit. These strengths contribute greatly to the quality of life in the county and should play an increasingly important role in the growth of the county’s economy. Apart from the considerable economic advantages of tourism, another less tangible but valuable outgrowth of tourism is the inevitable surge of community pride that results. Residents gain a new appreciation for the uniqueness of their community. A strong countywide tourism program can inspire residents to work toward a common goal and learn more about their shared heritage. Thus, an effective heritage tourism program yields economic, educational, and cultural rewards.

Issues
During a heritage tourism workshop organized by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) in spring 2009 and through comments made at a number of community meetings held as part of the Historic Sites and Districts Plan amendment process, participants identified several major barriers experienced by museum property managers and others interested in promoting the county’s heritage assets.

With its extensive park system, diverse collection of historic sites, and tourism-related initiatives, Prince George’s County has a proven record of heritage tourism development. However, to remain successful in a competitive environment such as the Washington, D.C. region, the county should continually renew its commitment to heritage tourism development in innovative ways to expand this portion of the local economy. The Maryland Heritage Areas Program, which presently includes the Anacostia Trails Heritage Area, could be expanded to include other certified heritage areas to promote a sustainable level of heritage tourism that strengthens communities within the county and improves the quality of life. Dramatic as they are, the benefits of heritage tourism are not always clear to residents, elected officials, and business owners.

Participants in the heritage tourism workshop identified the following issues of concern for the county’s current heritage tourism efforts:

1 See www.culturalheritagetourism.org/howtogetstarted.htm
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1. Lack of public awareness.

Too few citizens, local government officials, preservation and tourism practitioners, and traditional economic development professionals are aware of the wide range of benefits available from heritage tourism development. The county needs to build a broader constituency that understands what heritage tourism is and the ways it can contribute to economic development, the conservation of natural and built resources, and the overall quality of life in the county.

2. Fragmentation of effort and lack of integrated leadership.

There are numerous heritage tourism activities and initiatives underway in the county, but there is no formal mechanism to coordinate these efforts and no entity charged with providing countywide vision and leadership.

3. Needed improvements to visitor service infrastructure.

Some heritage sites and areas lack adequate visitor services to meet current and future needs. More careful attention needs to be given to signage, transportation issues, and the quality of the visitor experience.

4. Lack of committed marketing efforts.

A number of heritage sites and areas have engaged in creative marketing initiatives, but there is a need for a more committed and integrated marketing effort at the county level that will draw new visitors to the county’s heritage attractions and encourage extended visitation.

5. Insufficient investment.

Despite the amount of investment in the county on heritage tourism to date, the level of investment does not support the scope of opportunities that heritage tourism presents for the county and its historic communities. The current level of investment has not resulted in a comprehensive program that builds on the quantity and quality of the county’s heritage resources.

Goal: Use historic resources in promoting heritage tourism to stimulate the local economy.

There are major opportunities to expand heritage tourism in Prince George’s County. The economic benefits can be substantial, but the desired expansion will require significant commitment on the part of both public and private entities. With a more formal organizational structure and the commitment of additional public and private resources, the county can become a national leader in heritage tourism and experience the benefits that consistent, strategic investment can bring to the county and its citizens.

Policy 1: Increase public and professional awareness of heritage tourism resources.

Strategies

1. Adopt an expansive approach to the definition of heritage resources that provides for flexibility and future development of heritage tourism opportunities.

2. Develop methods to update and expand the county’s inventory of heritage tourism resources.

3. Assess area infrastructure and related resources such as signage and transportation services that will be critical to supporting the tourism industry.

Policy 2: Develop a comprehensive heritage tourism plan and program for the county that encompasses a wide variety of heritage tourism sites.

An integrated, fully funded marketing campaign that provides a consistent message and image should be a central component of the heritage tourism development strategy. The marketing campaign should include both short- and long-term strategies. It should recommend ways to coordinate present and future marketing efforts across
agencies and organizations. It should provide guidance for organizations and sites at the local and regional levels interested in undertaking their own marketing campaigns and encourage thematic and regional initiatives that market groups of sites.

**Strategies**

1. Ensure that heritage tourism program leadership and funding is provided.

2. Consider the development of additional certified Maryland Heritage Areas in the county to promote linkages between historical, cultural, and natural resources for sustainable economic development through heritage tourism.

3. Encourage planning and coordination of events between local heritage areas and local cultural resources. Programs should be developed that focus on local cultural resources, such as museums, theaters, performing arts, local foodways, and recreation areas, in conjunction with programs at local heritage sites.

4. Create a comprehensive brochure and web site focused on the local heritage tourism program, and explore other collaborative projects.

5. Consider establishing a countywide heritage resource advisory board to work with county heritage tourism professionals to identify, promote, and assist with the county’s heritage tourism program.

6. Develop a far-reaching heritage tourism marketing and branding campaign with a countywide focus. A comprehensive branding effort that links marketing materials, destinations, and signage can elevate the profile of the county’s cultural heritage attractions in the marketplace.

7. Create both general subject and location-specific maps of historic resources, focused on public transportation routes (Metro kiosks, Metro maps, etc.) The 1996 Passport to the Past booklet and program developed by M-NCPPC as part of the county’s celebration of its tricentennial and the African American Heritage Sites in Prince George’s County brochure, prepared in 2008, are examples of collaborative efforts to market all county heritage tourism attractions open for visitation.

8. Market heritage tours, in cooperation with other heritage tour programs, such as those of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Smithsonian Institution Resident Associates Program.

9. Link heritage tourism initiatives directly to a visitor’s Washington, D.C., experience through marketing, educational programs, and direct participation with local attractions, such as National Harbor and its proposed Disney development and the National Children’s Museum, through the establishment of a National Capital Historic Gateway Heritage Area.

10. Promote and assist partner organizations in seeking and administering federal and state grant programs.

11. Create and strengthen partnerships with heritage tourism professionals outside of the county.

12. Promote the use of the county’s historic and cultural resources as film and television locations. As production companies search for lower costs and new locations, communities across the country are marketing themselves as film production sites. It is important for preservationists and heritage tourism professionals to be able to effectively market their properties for this purpose.

**Policy 3: Expand the use of current and emerging information technologies in all stages of heritage tourism development and promotion.**

**Strategies**

1. Develop a coordinated, internet-based heritage tourism network, encouraging web site enhancement and maintenance as well as the use of other web-based avenues of information dissemination such as blogs and travel networking sites.

2. Assist in the coordinated development of smartphone and geocaching applications in heritage tourism programs and internet-mapping destinations.

3. Market regional heritage tourism itineraries using the National Register travel itinerary web site as a model.

4. Create a coordinated and comprehensive list of programs currently offered at museums and historic sites. Encourage collaboration between all heritage tourism sites in the county to keep web-based and print activity calendars current.
Policy 4: Ensure long-term support of heritage resources through the education of young people. This appreciation, engendered at an early age, makes it more likely that young people will support these efforts in the future.

Strategies

1. Explore educational opportunities for school-aged children and young adults that focus on experience-based educational activities in addition to traditional tours and exhibits. Students could participate in the maintenance and promotion of heritage tourism destinations such as a student ambassador program, tour guide programs, or building trade internship programs.

2. Work with municipalities, school districts, and other organizations including historic preservation organizations to encourage students and their parents to visit publicly owned sites in the county.

3. Develop heritage tourism-related internships for trade school students, and college and graduate students with local historical societies, preservation organizations, or government agencies.

Photos:
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Partnerships

Background

A key component of the county’s historic preservation program has been the involvement of many stakeholders in identifying and addressing specific needs and concerns. Articulating a vision for historic preservation and appropriate community development may be challenging because the vision must reflect the interests and goals of a wide range of stakeholders. The planning process allows for the contribution of ideas and concerns through periodic public workshops, design charrettes, and public hearings. Although useful, these opportunities are only a few of the ways in which the values and concerns of all stakeholders can help shape community planning efforts.

Since the beginning of the county’s historic preservation program in 1981, stakeholders have included citizens, citizen advisory committees, county government, M-NCPPC, the Board of Education, the Historic Preservation Commission, the Historical and Cultural Trust, the Prince George’s County Historical Society, Prince George’s Heritage, state government and Preservation Maryland, Maryland Association of Historic District Commissions, National Trust for Historic Preservation, and National Park Service as well as a number of municipal and local preservation organizations.

More recently, the African-American Heritage Preservation Group, formed in 2007, has been an active participant. These organizations and others are listed in Appendix F. The range of these stakeholders continues to be expansive and includes preservation organizations, regulatory commissions, residents, developers, community development advocates, civic associations, and many others. Each is capable of contributing a unique and valuable perspective to both broad community plans and specific projects. These perspectives have proven to be particularly critical for advancing the goal of using historic preservation to help improve the quality of life. The means of engaging the community and stakeholders range from early Historic Sites and Districts Plan stakeholder participation to ongoing feedback and evaluation of the plan’s implementation as projects are undertaken. Ensuring a high level of public awareness of the historic preservation program is one of the most fundamental strategies to guarantee that community needs and possible solutions are fully considered. This strategy can help local leaders better identify and support actions that meet those needs.

Issues

At a time when, on a national scale, the need for preservation of historic and cultural resources is so great and available resources are so scarce, it is clear that neither government agencies nor private organizations can afford to act alone. By building cross-sector relationships that will permit risks and costs, as well as benefits and profits to be shared, historic preservation interests can address the issue of funding and the challenges of marketing and dissemination of information. Existing historic sites, cultural/educational community organizations, and private businesses currently operating in the county are ripe for partnerships of this kind.

The process of citizen involvement and partnerships facilitates the community’s ability to own, advance, and sustain preservation efforts. For example, the undertaking of local histories, oral and written, within the African-American community has built upon the substantial interest in the county’s diverse heritage and cultures. In any community, the process of compilation of its history creates a new knowledge and sense of pride of its past. As multiple ethnic groups undertake this research, more awareness of community landmarks may engender support for their preservation.
Whether regional, countywide, or local, the partnerships of the future should exploit the broadening interest in heritage preservation in Prince George’s County. Such partnerships may help to compensate when governmental intervention cannot always meet the need for an important project. Nevertheless, government actions will continue to play an important role in providing incentives for sustaining and shaping those partnerships.

In the past, successful preservation partnerships have been established and nurtured to improve countywide programs and activities. Partnerships will be a cornerstone in effectively leveraging needed financial resources and will cultivate advocates for the successful implementation of the Historic Sites and Districts Plan’s goals and policies.

Goal: Encourage partnerships with a broader constituency to advance the goals of historic preservation.

Policy 1: Maintain and strengthen existing preservation partnerships with county, state, and federal government agencies and organizations.

It is important for M-NCPPC and the county to work with preservation partners to increase awareness of preservation activity in the county by highlighting successful local, state, and national preservation projects.

Strategies

1. Highlight select current preservation projects through a dedicated area on the M-NCPPC web site.

2. Consider regularly nominating projects for award programs, such as awards from the National Trust for Historic Preservation and Preservation Maryland, to draw attention to the preservation program of Prince George’s County.

3. Continue to undertake Historic Preservation Month activities each year in order to recognize and celebrate the designation of historic sites, significant rehabilitation projects in the county, and individuals responsible for notable preservation initiatives.

4. Apply for the countywide Preserve America designation to recognize all of the communities’ efforts to promote Prince George’s County as a unique place and to help ensure that the county protects and celebrates its heritage, uses its historic assets for economic development and community revitalization, and encourages people to experience and appreciate local historic resources through education and tourism programs. If the Preserve America designation is approved, this White House initiative will recognize the county for its historical and cultural diversity and for its several nationally recognized historic landmarks.

5. Continue to cosponsor and coordinate workshops with federal, state, and local historic preservation agencies and organizations to advocate and educate participants about appropriate preservation technology and techniques.

6. Work with other county preservation partners to continue to promote the preservation and protection of M-NCPPC-owned cultural, historic, architectural, and archeological resources.

Policy 2: Encourage the formation of new partnerships to promote historic preservation and to expand and strengthen the historic preservation community.

1. Continue to engage new partners, such as environmental groups, arts and entertainment groups, and historic and genealogical organizations, that may have similar goals and interests.

2. Encourage, promote, and build partnerships with African-American and Native American heritage organizations to identify concerns and develop strategies to better protect cultural resources.

3. Engage the Hispanic/Latino, Asian, and other more recent immigrant populations in heritage awareness programs, and monitor potential resources for future evaluation of significance.
4. Work cooperatively to share responsibilities and rewards in implementing preservation initiatives. This cooperation should work toward gaining access to media, corporate sponsorships, and private investment opportunities.

5. Promote collaborative efforts by conducting annual meetings with county government officials, municipal officials, chambers of commerce, the convention and visitor bureau, and/or other local officials to plan local activities and seek partnerships to complete them.

6. Continue to maintain and share a contact list of individuals and organizations interested in historic preservation issues to keep the public informed about important events and issues.

7. Use emerging technologies to improve communication among organizations and individuals interested in historic preservation.

8. Seek partnerships with public and charter high schools, private schools, the home school community, the University of Maryland, Bowie State University, Prince George's Community College, and local trade schools to promote and implement historic preservation objectives.
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**HERITAGE EDUCATION**

**Background**

According to the International Council on Monuments and Sites, cultural heritage is an expression of the ways of living developed by a community and passed on from generation to generation, including customs, practices, places, objects, artistic expressions, and values. As a part of the affirmation and enrichment of cultural identities and as a legacy belonging to all people, cultural heritage gives each particular place its recognizable features and is the storehouse of human experience.1

Heritage education is an approach to teaching and learning about history and culture that uses information available from material culture and the built environment as primary instructional resources. Heritage education strengthens a person’s understanding about history and culture and enriches appreciation for the artistic, technological, social, and economic contributions of men and women from all cultures. Heritage education nourishes a sense of continuity and connectedness with our historical and cultural experience; it encourages citizens to consider their historical and cultural experiences in planning for the future and fosters stewardship of our local, regional, and national heritage legacies.

**Issues**

Heritage education efforts aimed at all age groups, especially the county’s youth, are critical to ensuring the future stewardship and appreciation of Prince George’s County heritage and heritage resources. Therefore, educational institutions, government agencies, and nonprofit organizations should collaborate to provide and promote historic preservation and heritage education initiatives. The county’s heritage resources can be better utilized to engage students through educational experiences beyond the classroom. Ensuring that citizens are aware of heritage resources and preservation activities is a key issue to be addressed.

An important part of a comprehensive heritage education program should include outreach efforts aimed at homeowners, developers, and others explaining why historic resources are significant in the county and what steps the county is taking to protect these resources. Effective heritage education programs can help inform the public about the many benefits of preservation and help citizens understand local history and why historic resources are worth preserving. Such a program should include information on history, formal historic tours, property research support, tax credit, financing information and assistance, preservation best practices, and other materials on participation and benefits of historic preservation.

**Goal:** Promote heritage education to increase understanding and support for protection of the county’s cultural heritage.

**Policy 1:** Develop a comprehensive heritage education and outreach program.

**Strategies**

1. Compile a list of historic preservation organizations and existing educational programs available at museums and historic resources. Make this information accessible on the internet.

2. Create an internet information guide to highlight the components of heritage education and outreach on local offerings.

3. Support the creation of heritage festivals, county history days, and other community celebrations in which historic resources can be featured.

---

1 “Definition of Cultural Heritage, References to Documents in History.” Selected by J. Jokilehto (Originally for ICCROM, (1990), revised for CIF: 15 January 2005)
4. Coordinate with preservation organizations, county government agencies, and the state historic preservation office to ensure that a full spectrum of education and outreach is provided.

5. Create case study highlights of heritage education best practice examples in the county, including those efforts that involve collaboration with other departments or preservation partners.

Policy 2: Encourage heritage education for school-aged children and young adults. Engaging children early and regularly is critical so that they can develop an understanding of the historic built environment.

Strategies

1. Assist in organizing a county history day for school children through which different M-NCPPC properties could be used in lesson plans.

2. Collaborate with educators to develop lesson plans that use historic resources as part of the county curriculum.


4. Encourage student competitions and prizes that feature cultural heritage themes, and explore issues surrounding historic resources.

5. Teach students about the history of the county while introducing them to architecture and historic preservation through a series of walking tours, workbooks, and architecture identification exercises.

6. Utilize the state-mandated community service requirement to engage high school students in heritage education initiatives sponsored by the county’s preservation partners and nonprofit organizations.

7. Expand opportunities for the county’s youth to develop awareness of historic and cultural resource stewardship by increasing educational, volunteer, and employment opportunities at M-NCPPC-owned and other historic properties.

Policy 3. Cultivate relationships with colleges, universities, and trade schools to promote heritage education and traditional building practices.

Universities and colleges can be great resources for intellectual capital and research assistance. At the same time, the real-world process of local government decision-making provides an excellent opportunity for student learning. Recognizing these shared benefits, many educational institutions are able to assist local communities and governments to address preservation issues through research and community-based projects.

Strategies

1. Create and strengthen partnerships with historic preservation, anthropology, history, and education departments at regional universities.

2. Provide preservation, planning, and archeology students the chance to assist on projects as interns, and provide organizations a way to expand their temporary workforce to complete short-term projects while students gain experience.

3. Assemble a speakers bureau to assist in the coordination of educational programs with local schools.

4. Facilitate workshops, hands-on demonstration techniques, and informational sessions to share the knowledge of the traditional building trades.

The preservation of the built environment is dependent on the work of skilled people in all of the traditional building trades. These artisans preserve, maintain, and restore historic buildings and help safeguard architectural heritage for the future. Interdisciplinary workshops could be designed to attract people of many backgrounds, ages, and skill levels, including tradespeople, contractors, engineers, conservators, educators, preservationists, and students.

Policy 4: Encourage historic preservation and heritage education beyond the classroom.

Strategies

1. Produce educational presentations that publicize the county’s historic resources, historic preservation programs, and the local efforts to protect, preserve, and enhance these resources.
2. Hold a yearly forum or regular meetings to educate the public about historic resources. These programs might include workshops, themed panel discussions, and community question-and-answer sessions.

3. Develop Prince George’s County-based historic preservation workshops for continuing education credits for professionals, including architects, real estate brokers, engineers, and attorneys.

4. Publish articles on topics of common interest in appropriate trade and professional publications.

5. Make classroom presentations on historic preservation-related topics, and participate in career days at schools.

6. Prepare portable exhibits for local and regional display, focusing on the county’s heritage education.

Policy 5: Promote and reinforce aspects of African-American and Native American cultures as a means of increasing awareness and appreciation for the historic legacy of Prince George’s County.

Strategies

1. Highlight the diversity of historic properties within the county to raise awareness of their importance to culture and identity.

2. Strengthen educational efforts focused on the presence of African-American and Native American resources for residents and visitors.

Policy 6: Integrate the concept of sustainability into heritage education efforts.

Strategies

1. Develop educational tools for various audiences (e.g., policy makers, community-based preservation organizations, historic building owners and managers, and students in primary, secondary, and higher education) to promote preservation as a key component of sustainability.

2. Encourage historic preservation professional degree programs to expand the understanding of sustainability through historic preservation.

3. Bring together the county’s environmental stakeholders with preservation organizations to help promote preservation as a sustainable solution.
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Chapter 15

IMPLEMENTATION

Introduction
The Historic Sites and Districts Plan (HSDP) serves as a policy guide for elected officials, government agencies, historic property owners, the real estate and development industries, and preservation and environmental organizations. The plan offers many policies and strategies to address historic preservation issues facing the county. Its goals, policies, and strategies will be realized through planning implementation mechanisms. These approaches include legislative changes to applicable ordinances, capital improvement program commitments, operating budget initiatives, the incorporation of policy guidance in master plans and sector plans, and a strategic plan for implementation.

Strategic Plan for Implementation
The strategic plan for implementation will establish a full set of priorities and benchmarks of progress. It will identify the responsibilities of the various stakeholders to carry out the strategies within defined time periods. The strategic plan should be prepared by the Prince George’s County Planning Department and a task force representing all stakeholders (including, but not limited to, the Prince George’s County Historic Preservation Commission, Prince George’s County Historical and Cultural Trust, Prince George’s County Historical Society, Prince George’s African-American Heritage Preservation Group, and Prince George’s Heritage, Inc.). The recommendations of the task force should be submitted to the County Council for review and approval. Successful implementation will take time and require the efforts of all stakeholders—government, the private sector, nonprofit organizations, and historic property owners.

Implementation Actions
This plan proposes that four essential types of actions should be addressed in the strategic plan of implementation—protection, stewardship, incentives, and education:

- Protect historic sites and their environmental settings, historic resources, historic cemeteries, archeological resources, and cultural landscapes from development impacts.
- Encourage strong stewardship of historic sites.
- Provide adequate incentives to assist property owners.
- Educate the county’s children, citizens, and visitors about the county’s historic, cultural, architectural, and archeological heritage.

Following the approval of the strategic plan, the HSDP proposes that a biennial summit of preservation organizations, public agencies, and other stakeholders be held to review the progress toward meeting the benchmarks.

There will be many challenges to face in providing the necessary resources to implement the plan. Meeting these challenges should be guided by the most pressing preservation needs at this time. As the strategic plan for implementation is being developed, the following policies and strategies are offered as the highest priorities to address the most critical needs.
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**Highest Priority Actions**

**Protection**—To protect historic sites and their environmental settings, historic resources, historic cemeteries, archeological resources, and cultural landscapes from development impacts.

### Chapter 3: Policy 4: Strategy 4

3.4.4: Encourage public agencies to engage in appropriate stewardship of historic properties by listing properties as historic sites and by listing eligible properties in the National Register of Historic Places.

### Chapter 4: Policy 1: Strategies 3 and 5

4.1.3: Ensure that potential development impacts to historic and cultural resources are reviewed comprehensively by all relevant agencies and departments.

4.1.5: Develop standard conditions of approval, as appropriate, for development applications that require the issuance of a performance bond to ensure the completion of a project affecting a historic site.

### Chapter 5: Policy 1: Strategy 1

5.1.1: Prepare and enact comprehensive amendments to the historic preservation ordinance to reflect nationally recognized best practices following the guidance of the analysis provided during the development of the HSDP.

### Chapter 7: Policy 1: Strategy 4

7.1.4: Create a Prince George’s County cemetery inventory database that lists all known cemeteries and burial grounds and provides information on their location, condition, and significant elements.

### Chapter 8: Policy 1: Strategy 1 and Policy 2: Strategy 1

8.1.1: Consider additions to county regulations to ensure better protection of archeological resources.

8.2.1: Conduct archeological surveys on parkland before a park is designed to avoid or mitigate significant archeological sites.

### Chapter 9: Policy 2: Strategy 1

9.2.1: Develop a mechanism to require a cultural landscape treatment plan in order to assure that the defining features of a landscape guide the development of a property.

**Stewardship**—To encourage strong stewardship of historic sites.

### Chapter 4: Policy 3: Strategy 1, Policy 5, and Policy 5: Strategy 2

4.3.1: Create and promote workshops, mailings, publications and web-based information about the Historic Preservation Commission’s Rules of Procedure, policies, and guidelines and on the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* as well as best practices focused on issues affecting historic property owners.

4.5: Develop a strategic plan for future county/M-NCPPC acquisition, restoration, maintenance, and interpretation of historic properties.

4.5.2: Develop guidelines and criteria to prioritize acquisitions of properties based on their historic and archeological significance, including their contribution to the cultural landscape of an area.

### Chapter 5: Policy 2: Strategy 3

5.2.3: Provide trained staff to address enforcement of historic preservation regulations to ensure that projects are conducted in accordance with an approved historic area work permit (HAWP), as required.

### Chapter 7: Policy 3: Strategy 2

7.3.2: Develop a cemetery preservation manual to provide county residents with best practice guidance on how to preserve and maintain historic burial grounds and cemeteries.

**Incentives**—To provide adequate incentives to assist property owners.

### Chapter 6: Policy 4: Strategies 1 and 2

6.4.1: Consider the development of legislation to provide tax credits and/or other financial incentives to encourage the protection of specific natural and cultural features within environmental settings.
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6.4.2: Consider the development of an easement program, addressing the release of certain development rights within environmental settings.

Chapter 8: Policy 1: Strategy 8

8.1.8. Assist owners of historic sites who apply for HAWPs with sources of funding when a need for archeological research is identified.

Chapter 10: Policy 1: Strategies 1 and 4, and Policy 2: Strategy 3

10.1.1: Continue to fund and administer the Prince George’s County Historic Property Grant Program.

10.1.4: Develop and approve guidelines and procedures for the noncapital preservation grant program.

10.2.3: Consider amending the county preservation tax credit provisions to increase the percentage of the credit and allow the credit to extend over a ten-year period instead of the existing five-year period.

Education—To educate the county’s children, citizens, and visitors about the county’s historic, cultural, architectural, and archeological heritage.

Chapter 3: Policy 3: Strategy 1

3.3.1: Promote the protections and benefits that are available with local historic district designation through regular communication with municipalities, community, and civic groups.

Chapter 8: Policy 6: Strategy 1

8.6.1: Develop interpretive signage and web sites to convey to the public information collected from archeological sites identified through development projects and parkland development.

Chapter 11: Policy 1: Strategy 3

11.1.3: Encourage community leaders and elected officials to promote the major historic assets of the county’s historic commercial areas, such as the US 1 corridor, Old Bowie, and Upper Marlboro.

Chapter 12: Policy 2: Strategy 1 and Policy 3: Strategy 1

12.2.1: Ensure that heritage tourism program leadership and funding is provided.

12.3.1: Develop a coordinated, internet-based heritage tourism network

Chapter 13: Policy 1: Strategies 3 and 5

13.1.3: Continue to undertake Historic Preservation Month activities each year in order to recognize and celebrate the designation of historic sites, significant rehabilitation projects in the county, and individuals responsible for notable preservation initiatives.

13.1.5: Continue to cosponsor and coordinate workshops with federal, state, and local historic preservation agencies and organizations to advocate and educate participants about appropriate preservation technology and techniques.

Chapter 14: Policy 2: Strategy 2, Policy 4: Strategy 1, and Policy 5: Strategy 1

14.2.2: Collaborate with educators to develop lesson plans that use historic resources as part of the county curriculum.

14.4.1: Produce educational presentations that publicize the county’s historic resources.

14.5.1: Highlight the diversity of historic properties within the county.
Chapter 15·Implementation

Photo:
Restoration Work at Kingston, 2010 (Historic Site 79-019-13)
Part Three

INVENTORY
Historic Sites

The following pages provide a brief description of the county’s historic sites, the Broad Creek Historic District, and the Old Town College Park Historic District. The 73 individual listings in the National Register of Historic Places are indicated; however, the seven National Register districts, Mount Rainier, North Brentwood, Hyattsville, Riverdale Park, West Riverdale, University Park, and Calvert Hills, and the Greenbelt National Historic Landmark District are not described here because they are included in the detailed descriptions of historic communities that are included in Appendix B.

The first two digits of the identifying number for each historic site reflect the planning area in which the resource is located; for example, 69-001 means Planning Area 69, site number 1. A series of three numbers indicates that the site is located in a historic community; the second number identifies the community, and the third number identifies the site within that community, e.g., 68-010-02 is site number 2 within historic community number 010, located in Planning Area 68. The abbreviation NR indicates that the property is individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places; the abbreviation NHL indicates that the property is a national historic landmark. The abbreviation E indicates that the property is subject to a preservation easement, and ES indicates that an environmental setting that is less than the entire property has been established. Designated archeological sites are described, but their precise location remains undisclosed to protect them.

Legend:

NR National Register
NRHD National Register Historic District
NHL National Historic Landmark
E Easement
ES Environmental Setting

Properties designated as historic sites must meet specific criteria for historic, cultural, archeological and/or architectural significance found in Subtitle 29-104. To be determined historically or culturally significant, a property must be of:

1a Significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county, state, or nation;

1b The site of a significant historic event;

1c Identified with a person or a group of persons who influenced society; or

1d Exemplify the cultural, economic, social, political, or historic heritage of the county and its communities.

To be determined architecturally significant, the property must:

2a Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction;

2b Represent the work of a master craftsman, architect or builder;

2c Possess high artistic values;

2d Represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

2e Represent an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or county, due to its singular physical characteristics or landscape.

The final line of each entry identifies the criteria by which each historic site has been designated. In the 1981 plan, those properties that were already listed in or in the process of nomination to the National Register of Historic Places were considered to have met Subtitle 29 criteria and were designated as historic sites without criteria.
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60-004 Ammendale Normal Institute Site
NR ES
6011 Ammendale Road, Beltsville
• 1875-1900
• Site of monumentally scaled Queen Anne-style novitiate building and school damaged by fire in 1998 and demolished in 2006
• Property retains St. Joseph’s Roman Catholic Chapel and historic cemetery (60-007)

60-007 Saint Joseph’s Roman Catholic Chapel & Cemetery
NR
6011 Ammendale Road, Beltsville
• 1880, Queen Anne-style brick chapel, with pointed-arch windows and jigsawn brackets and vergeboards
• First Roman Catholic church in Beltsville area. Associated with Ammendale Normal Institute (60-004) on land of Admiral Daniel Ammen; outstanding example of ecclesiastical architecture

61-002 Orme-Shaw House
11601 Caverly Avenue, Beltsville
• c. 1780, 1895, 1½ story log house with 2½ story frame gable-roof later addition
• Important example of late 18th-century log dwelling house; built for Priscilla Edmonston Orme; home of Evan Shaw after 1823
• Criteria 1d, 2a, 2d

61-007 Dr. Charles Fox House (Coffin House)
4931 Powder Mill Road, Beltsville
• c. 1886, 2½ story frame dwelling with unusual clipped gable-roof treatment
• A prominent Victorian landmark and home of well-known local physician
• Criteria 1c, 2a, 2e

61-009 Saint John’s Episcopal Church & Cemetery
11040 Baltimore Avenue, Beltsville
• 1877 gable-roof brick church, bell tower with Stick-style detail and 1920s parish hall
• Third church on the site of Zion Parish; designed by Baltimore architect John R. Niernsee; cornerstone laid by Bishop William Pinkney
• Criteria 1c, 1d, 2e

61-011 McLeod-Forrester House
11034 Montgomery Road, Beltsville
• c. 1840, c. 1870, 2½ story frame house with bull’s-eye windows on a large landscaped lot
• Built for George McLeod, Scottish florist/gardener; Victorian dwelling with attached earlier wing
• Criteria 2a, 2e

61-012 Sellman House
Building 23, Sellman Road, Beltsville (USDA)
• c. 1905, 2½ story square frame dwelling with projecting bays, Tuscan-columned porch and widow’s walk balustrade; now residence for USDA employees
• Unusually large example of the hip-roof square Colonial Revival-style house, a form popular in Prince George’s County in first decade of 20th century
• Criteria 2a, 2e
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61-013  **Gallant House**  
3124 Powder Mill Road, Adelphi  
- Mid-19th century, 1920s, multipart, frame gable-roof house with 2½ story antebellum main block and 20th-century additions  
- Rebuilt and enlarged dwelling with Craftsman-style decorative detail including exposed rafter ends, shed dormers, and a rubble-stone chimney  
- Criteria 2a, 2e, 2d

62-003  **Oaklands & Cemetery**  
E ES 13700 Oaklands Manor Drive, Laurel  
- c. 1798, 3 story brick mansion with elegant Georgian ornamentation and 1870s mansard roof  
- Built for Richard Snowden, of the wealthy Snowden family, prominent iron manufacturers; fine example of Federal-style architecture  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

62-004  **Snow Hill**  
NR 13301 Laurel Bowie Road, Laurel (M-NCPPC)  
- c. 1800, two-story brick plantation house with gambrel roof and fine late-Georgian ornamentation; incorporated parts of earlier house destroyed by fire  
- Built for Samuel Snowden, another member of the Snowden iron working family; atypical roof profile

62-006  **Montpelier & Cemetery**  
NHL 9650 Muirkirk Road, Laurel (M-NCPPC)  
- c. 1783, 5-part Georgian mansion with 2½ story hip-roof center block and semi-octagonal wings; elegant interior detail; domed-roof summer house on the grounds  
- Built for Major Thomas Snowden; 20th-century home of Breckinridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State under Wilson and Roosevelt; outstanding example of formal Georgian architecture; only surviving 18th-century summer house in Maryland

62-008  **Muirkirk Furnace Site**  
7011 Muirkirk Road, Beltsville  
- 1847 (established) site of iron furnace now hidden by a modern industrial complex; one kiln remains  
- During peak years produced 7000 tons of pig iron/year; the furnace property covered 10 acres, including houses for the workmen and the original supply store; founded by Ellicott family and operated by Coffin family until 1920  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d

62-010  **Briarley Academy (Old Hotel)**  
11777 Old Baltimore Pike, Beltsville  
- c. 1860s, 1911, multipart frame structure which includes the original 19th-century dwelling, a two-story hip-roof building with a five-bay main facade, and numerous additions  
- Originally a farmhouse built by George Humes, converted into a resort by Benjamin B. Bradford in 1911; bought in 1929 by the Montague family & leased to Cpt. Sydney Lodge who established a military academy there  
- Criteria 1d, 2e
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62-013  **Walnut Grange**  
Building 209, Powder Mill Road, Beltsville  
- 1805, 2 story T-shaped brick house, formerly of unusual butterfly shape; west wing destroyed in 1850s but semicircular bays of center section survive  
- Stands on tract of “Black Walnut Levels”; built for Mary Snowden Herbert, daughter of Thomas Snowden of Montpelier  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2e

62-016  **Edward Gross House Site**  
10623 Gross Lane, Beltsville  
- 1916, 2½ story frame gable-roof house with one-story wraparound porch; destroyed by fire February 1996  
- Dwelling and property occupied by emerging middle-class black landowners in the early 20th century  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

62-023-07  **Abraham Hall**  
NR E 7612 Old Muirkirk Road, Rossville (M-NCPPC)  
- 1889, 2 story, frame front-gabled building with entrance through a paneled double door in the main façade  
- A rare surviving example of late 19th-century benevolent society hall; focal point of the black community of Rossville  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

62-023-17  **Thomas Matthews House**  
7700 Old Muirkirk Road, Beltsville  
- c. 1888, 2 story, 3 bay vernacular single-family dwelling with I-house form; covered with stucco in the 1920s  
- Constructed by Thomas Matthews in the post-Civil War African-American settlement of Rossville; Matthews was a laborer and an original founder of the community’s Queen’s Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church  
- Criteria 1a,1d, 2a, 2e

62-023-21  **Queen’s Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery**  
7410 Old Muirkirk Road, Rossville  
- Site of two 19th-century African-American chapels; still retains its historic cemetery although the current 20th-century brick church is now located across the street  
- Significant to the history of the African-American community of Rossville  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2d

64-001  **Snowden Hall**  
Building 16, Laurel Bowie Road, Laurel  
- 1820s, 1850s, 1936, side-gabled Georgian-plan brick house raised in mid-19th century to full two stories; flanking 20th-century wings added and building renovated in 1936 to become headquarters of Patuxent Wildlife Research Center  
- Significant as one of the principal homes in Prince George’s County of the prominent Snowden family; last of the neighboring Snowden estates to pass out of Snowden family ownership  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2d
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64-002  **Duvall Bridge**
Telegraph Road, Laurel
- 1907, rare example of steel Pratt truss bridge; roadbed is closed to traffic
- One of three such surviving bridges in the county; replaced earlier wooden bridge connecting Dr. Charles Duvall's plantation, Gladswood, with his mill in Anne Arundel County; site of important early river crossing
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

64-005  **Perkins Methodist Chapel & Cemetery**
8500 Springfield Road, Glenn Dale
- c. 1861, 1 ½ story gable-roof frame meeting-house with bracketed cornice and gabled entry vestibule.
- Built during the division in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the 1860s on land donated by J. T. Perkins; one of the few surviving mid-19th-century rural chapels in the county
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

64-006  **GSFC Magnetic Test Site**
NHL
10100b Good Luck Road, Beltsville
- 1966, 60-foot square building constructed of nonmagnetic materials
- Unique facility for testing large satellites and calibrating spacecraft magnetometers; essential for operation of U.S. manned and unmanned space program; part of Goddard Space Flight Center

64-007  **Holst Cabin**
Patuxent Wildlife Research Center
- 1933, 2 story log chalet with cantilevered second story and fieldstone fireplace
- Built as weekend retreat for William and Ione Holst before acquisition of property by federal government in 1936
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2c

65-005  **Cool Spring Farm (Miller’s House)**
2201 Cool Spring Road, Adelphi
- 1790s, 2 story side-gabled brick house with exterior chimney; expanded in 1937 increasing main block by one bay in place of original one-story wing
- Dwelling of the operator of nearby Adelphi Mill, rebuilt in 1937 by descendants of 19th-century miller
- Criteria 1d, 2d

65-006  **Adelphi Mill & Storehouse**
8402 Riggs Road, Adelphi (M-NCPCC)
- c. 1796, 2 story stone grist mill on Northwest Branch; small stone storehouse built into slope on opposite side of road
- Scholfield brothers built mill on Adelphi tract, later owned and operated by George Washington Riggs, founder of Riggs banking house; oldest and largest mill in Washington, D.C., area
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e
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65-007 McCormick-Goodhart Mansion (Langley Park)
NR
8100 15th Avenue, Langley Park
- 1924 massive 2½ story Georgian Revival brick mansion with Ionic entrance portico
- Designed by George Oakley Totten, Jr., for Frederick and Henrietta McCormick-Goodhart who named it Langley Park after the Goodhart family estate in England
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

65-008 Green Hill
2009 Van Buren Street, Hyattsville
- c. 1870, c. 1920, 3-part structure: oldest frame section covered with stone veneer; principal sections stone with hip roofs; 2 story columned portico at central entrance
- First (now obscured) section probably built by William Dudley Digges in 1817; Pierre L’Enfant lived here as Digges’ guest in 1824, and was buried here in 1825 (later reinterred at Arlington National Cemetery); 1863-1936 home of family of George Washington Riggs, founder of Riggs National Bank; in 1936, the property became the headquarters of Resurrectionist Fathers and in 1960 home to the Pallottine Seminary
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2d, 2e

65-010 D.C. Boundary Marker NE 3
6200 block Eastern Avenue, Takoma Park
- 1792; one of 40 stone boundary markers surveyed by Andrew Ellicott and delineating the boundary of the District of Columbia in Maryland and Virginia
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2d, 2e

65-011 D.C. Boundary Marker NE 4
5400 Sargent Road, Hyattsville
- 1792; one of 40 stone boundary markers surveyed by Andrew Ellicott and delineating the boundary of the District of Columbia in Maryland and Virginia
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2d, 2e

65-013 Green Hill Overseer’s House
6606 22nd Place, Hyattsville
- c. 1923 Colonial Revival-style dwelling with an inset front porch and unusual sloping roof
- Dwelling formerly associated with Elisha F. Riggs’ early 20th century model dairy farm at Green Hill and designed by Baltimore architect Riggin Buckler
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2b

65-015 Rizzo House
6911 21st Avenue, Lewisdale
- 1948-1952, Art Deco/Moderne style residence of yellow brick with flat roof
- Built from plans sold by L. F. Garlinghouse Plan Company of Topeka, Kansas; designed by Iva G. Lieurance, the only known woman credited for design work associated with the mail-order house movement
- Criteria 2a, 2c, 2e

66-001 Brown’s Tavern Site
ES
10260 Baltimore Avenue, College Park
- Site of c. 1834 tavern operated by John W. Brown on Baltimore-Washington Turnpike (US Route 1) which was later converted to office for c. 1940 motor court
- Demolished in 2006; commemorative park remains
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2e, 2d
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66-004  **College Park Airport**
NR
1909 Cpl. Frank S. Scott Drive, College Park (M-NCPPC)
- Established in 1909 when Wilbur Wright trained the first Army pilots there; hangar footings remain from 1st Army Aviation School (1911-1913) as does the first airmail hangar building (substantially remodeled)
- New museum on site, airport in continuous operation since 1909

66-014  **Lakeland Community High School**
ES
8108 54th Avenue, Lakeland
- 1928 Neoclassical brick Rosenwald school with a 1940s addition
- One of the first high schools for blacks in the county; built to serve the communities of Bladensburg, Brentwood, North Brentwood, Lakeland, Ammendale, Muirkirk and Laurel
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

66-015  **Buck-Singleton House**
4908 Hollywood Road, College Park
- c. 1915, vernacular 2½ story Queen Anne dwelling with pyramidal roof
- George N. Buck built the house and sold it to Ada M. and Henry E. Claus, passing to the Singletons who owned it until 1983
- Criteria 1d, 2a

66-018  **Lake House (Presbyterian Parsonage)**
ES
8524 Potomac Avenue, College Park
- 1894, only Victorian style dwelling with Queen Anne decorative detail surviving from early subdivision of Central Heights (now Berwyn)
- Built for Annie and Wilmot Lake across street from Berwyn railroad station; served as parsonage for Berwyn Presbyterian Church from 1919 to late 1950s
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

66-027-24  **Baker-Holliday House**
5005 Huron Street, College Park
- 1907, 2½ story frame Colonial Revival Foursquare dwelling with projecting bay and Tuscan-columned porch
- Built for Baker family, one of the earliest dwellings built in the subdivision of Daniels Park
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

66-027-25  **LaValle House**
5013 Huron Street, College Park
- 1910 1½ story cross-gabled frame dwelling with bracketed porches and Victorian decorative detail
- Built for the family of George H. LaValle, operators of locally well-known florist business; has an adjoining greenhouse
- Criteria 1d, 2a

66-027-28  **Bowers-Sargent House**
9312 Rhode Island Avenue, College Park
- 1909 1½ story frame hip-roof dwelling of the cottage type, with four large gable dormers and novelty shingle siding
- One of the early dwellings built in the Daniels Park subdivision; representative example of early 20th-century suburban housing
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e
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66-029-05  **Bloomfield (Deakins House)**
6404 Queens Chapel Road, Hyattsville
• c. 1830, 1923, two-story frame house with Neoclassical style portico
• Originally a plain farmhouse built by William F. Deakins; pivoted and remodeled 1923 by J. Frank Rushe, developer of University Park
• Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2e

66-035-02  **Rossborough Inn**
NR, University of Maryland, College Park (State of Maryland)
• c. 1803, 2½ story brick (Flemish bond) tavern with rare Coade stone Silenus-head plaque over fanlight; lower flanking wings added 1938
• Main block was built by Richard Ross for use as a tavern; tract later deeded to Maryland Agricultural College; served as University of Maryland Faculty and Alumni Club until 2007
• Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

66-035-06  **Morrill Hall**
University of Maryland, College Park
• 1892, 3 story, 7-bay-wide, 6-bay-deep educational building designed in the Second Empire style
• The building is named after Justin Smith Morrill, a Vermont politician who wrote the first Land Grant Act
• Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a

66-035-07  **Calvert Hall**
University of Maryland, College Park
• 1913, an excellent example of early 20th-century eclectic architecture designed by the Washington, D.C., architecture firm of Flournoy and Flournoy
• The residence hall was named after Charles B. Calvert, who helped establish the Maryland Agricultural Act and was a prime mover in the founding of the Maryland Agricultural College (now University of Maryland)
• Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a

66-036  **National Archives Archeological Site**
NR, College Park
• c. 3500-1000 B.C., Late Archaic Period stone tool manufacturing site and staging point for hunting and foraging
• Potential to yield important information on the prehistoric themes of settlement, technology, and environmental adaptation
• Criteria 1a, 1d

66-042-08  **Cory House**
4710 College Avenue, College Park
• 1891, two-story frame suburban residence with T-shape plan and Queen Anne-style decorative detail
• One of the first houses in 1889 subdivision of College Park; home of entomologist Ernest Cory for much of 20th century; includes noted private garden
• Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e
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66-042-09  **College Park Woman's Club**  
4711 Knox Road, College Park  
- c. 1817, 1912, 1957, multiperiod 1-story gable-roof brick structure with buttresses  
- Farm building on the Calverts' Riversdale estate; this structure subsequently served as a church in the later 19th-century subdivisions of College Lawn and College Park  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2e

66-042-10  **McDonnell House**  
7400 Dartmouth Avenue, College Park  
- 1896, large 2½ story cross-gabled frame dwelling with wraparound porch and ornamental shingled gables; historic outbuildings  
- Built by Henry B. McDonnell, first Dean of Arts and Sciences, University of Maryland; representative example of simplified Queen Anne-style domestic architecture  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2d, 2e

66-042-30  **Taliaferro House**  
7406 Columbia Avenue, College Park  
- 1888, c. 1920, 2½ story front-gabled frame house with wraparound porch, semi-octagonal bays and decorative bracketing  
- Outstanding example of simplified Queen Anne-style, associated with the family of John Oliver Johnson, developer of College Park  
- Criteria 1a, 2a

66-042-31  **Holbrook House**  
4618 College Avenue, College Park  
- 1927, 2 story stucco-covered frame dwelling in the Mission style, with pyramidal roof and decorative shaped parapets  
- One of two known examples in the county of the Alhambra model of Sears, Roebuck and Company mail-order houses; (see also 69-024-22)  
- Criteria 1a, 2a

67-004-01  **Greenbelt Center School**  
15 Crescent Road, Greenbelt  
- 1937, 1968, the building features machine-like struts along front facade and bas relief sculpted panels depicting the Preamble to the Constitution carved by Lenore Thomas, a New Deal WPA artist living in Accokeek, Maryland  
- Outstanding example of streamlined Art Deco style; cultural center and visual landmark in early planned community; owned by the City of Greenbelt  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

67-005  **Sportland**  
5933 Natasha Drive, Berwyn Heights  
- Late 18th century and c. 1850; 2½ story dwelling with Greek Revival detail, attached to smaller, older frame dwelling  
- Unique surviving early dwelling in heavily developed residential community block  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2d
67-006 **Beaverdam Creek Bridge**  
Maryland 201, Greenbelt  
- 1927, an excellent example of ornamental stone-clad concrete arch bridges in the state of Maryland; detailing of the masonry work suggests an attempt by the builder to harmonize the bridge with its surroundings  
- Assumed to have been constructed by the federal government due to its location near the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, but no documentation has been uncovered to confirm this assumption  
- Criteria 1d, 2d

67-008 **Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) Lodge**  
302 Log Lodge Road, Beltsville  
- 1934-1937, 2½ story, 5-bay lodge is constructed of horizontal logs with vertical log supports; building is set on a solid foundation of uncoursed stone; the structure has a side gable roof with an extended west-facing slope  
- Significant for its architecture and method of construction; CCC log structures are common in state and national parks in the west and Midwest but are an unusual building form in the eastern U. S.  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a

67-022-01 **Kleindienst-Haker House**  
5607 Berwyn Road, Berwyn Heights  
- 1890, 2 story, 3-bay vernacular single-family dwelling with an L-shaped form and front gable with full-width front porch  
- Possibly constructed as a speculative venture by Lavinia and John H. Kleindienst, who was a carpenter, it was used as rental property until 1919 when it was purchased by Anton Haker, who worked at Harvey Dairy  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

67-022-07 **Berwyn Heights School**  
5814 Ruatan Street, Berwyn Heights  
- 1922, side-gabled 2-room frame schoolhouse with banks of windows in gable ends; rests on a high, molded concrete block foundation; converted to residence in the late 1970s  
- Built in railroad suburb of Berwyn Heights; county’s best surviving example of this substantial schoolhouse type  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

67-022-10 **Wetherald House**  
8411 58th Avenue, Berwyn Heights  
- c. 1891, 2½ story frame cross-gabled dwelling with three-part window and balcony on principal gable front  
- Good example of late Victorian suburban dwelling, one of early dwellings built in the suburb of Charlton Heights  
- Criteria 1a, 2a
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67-022-11 O’Dea House
5804 Ruatan Street, Berwyn Heights

NR

- 1888, 2 ½ story Queen Anne-style, side-gabled frame dwelling with 3-story octagonal tower; variety of ornamental surface coverings
- Built from house pattern distributed by R. W. Shoppell’s Cooperative Building Plan Association, one of the earliest houses built in the Victorian suburb of Charlton Heights; outstanding visual feature in the community
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

67-022-12 Stoner-Chlopicki House
5717 Ruatan Street, Berwyn Heights

- 1889, plain horizontal board, rectangular shingle frame dwelling; 3 story pyramidal roof tower, wraparound porch
- Built for Elizabeth Stoner using a pattern from R. W. Shoppell Cooperative Building Plan Association catalog; house has been in the Chlopicki family since 1928
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

67-022-13 Cross House
5805 Ruatan Street, Berwyn Heights

- 1889, 2½ story frame dwelling with 2-bay projecting gable; 1-story hip-roof wraparound porch
- Built by E. Cross, probably from a pattern book as an investment property; his family apparently never lived there; occupied by tenants for first 15 years
- Criteria 1a, 2a

67-022-14 McNitt-Gohr House
5712 Ruatan Street, Berwyn Heights

- 1889-90, 2½ story main block with a two-story, pedimented porch on the south elevation; a side-gable roof covered with pressed metal shingles caps the dwelling
- Constructed by the Charlton Heights Improvement Company; the McNitt family were the first owner-occupants of the dwelling; the Gohr family has owned the property since 1950 with one 4-year interruption
- Criteria 1d, 2a

67-022-15 Wolfe House
5617 Ruatan Street, Berwyn Heights

- c. 1889, 2½ story frame mansard-roof dwelling with Queen Anne and Second Empire stylistic elements
- Rare house form for Prince George’s County. One of the first dwellings built in the 1888 subdivision of Charlton Heights, and representative of late Victorian suburban development
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

67-022-16 Pickett House
8616 57th Avenue, Berwyn Heights

- 1890, 2½ story cross-gabled frame house, highlighted by Stick-style decorative elements and novelty shingling; probably constructed from pattern book design
- Good example of a modest late Victorian suburban dwelling
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e
67-022-17 **Kleiner House**  
5603 Ruatan Street, Berwyn Heights  
- 1888, Queen Anne/Shingle style frame dwelling with 3-story domed corner tower, octagonal projecting porch and fine interior detail  
- Built from R.W. Shoppell’s Cooperative Building Plan Association house pattern  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

67-022-18 **Cissel House**  
8911 57th Avenue, Berwyn Heights  
- 1888, 2½ story frame dwelling of Queen Anne-style with wraparound porch, panelled chimneys and ornamental molding  
- One of the first dwellings built in the subdivision of Charlton Heights, an outstanding example of Queen Anne-style domestic architecture  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

67-022-19 **Schniedman House**  
5713 Seminole Street, Berwyn Heights  
- 1888, Queen Anne, frame dwelling with wraparound porch; front gable 2-bay, second-story balcony at west elevation  
- Rental property from 1892–1948, probably from a mail-order pattern from R.W. Shoppell’s Cooperative Building Plan Association  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

67-022-21 **Elwood J. Taylor House**  
8516 58th Avenue, Berwyn Heights  
- 1909, 2½ story hip-roof frame house in Classic Box style, with projecting gable and Tuscan columned porch; historic outbuildings associated with poultry raising  
- Good example of this early 20th-century house form, the original building plans and specifications survive  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a

67-022-23 **Graves-Keleher House**  
8707 62nd Street, Berwyn Heights  
- 1891, 2½ story, 2-bay dwelling influenced by the Queen Anne style; front-gable main block with a 2-story, hip-roof projection reads as an oriel, square in form  
- Constructed by the Charlton Heights Improvement Company (CHIC) and was based on a pattern book design; after completion it was sold to Edward Graves, the original subdivider of Charlton Heights, who leased the property to Joseph Keleher, a member of CHIC  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

67-022-24 **Kleiner-Davidson White House**  
8529 58th Avenue, Berwyn Heights  
- 1927, 1 story, 3-bay, Craftsman-style bungalow was built in 1927 with plans and materials purchased from Sears, Roebuck and Company for the “Argyle” model  
- Only positively identified Sears mail-order kit house in Berwyn Heights; John Kleiner Jr., a real estate entrepreneur, oversaw construction of the house  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2d, 2e
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68-001  
**Ash Hill (Hitching Post Hill)**  
NR E  
3308 Rosemary Lane, Hyattsville  
- c. 1840, 2-story brick mansion with dentilled cornice, bracketed cupola and Greek Revival-style trim  
- Built by Robert Clark; in 1875 bought by General Edward F. Beale, who entertained Presidents Grant and Cleveland here; unique example of its type in Prince George's County

68-004-01  
**Harry Smith House**  
NR  
4707 Oliver Street, Riverdale Park  
- 1890, 2½ story frame dwelling of Queen Anne style with hip roof, domed corner tower and considerable variety in surface decoration  
- Most elaborate early dwelling in 1889 subdivision of Riverdale Park  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

68-004-02  
**Warren House**  
4716 Oliver Street, Riverdale Park  
- 1913, 2½ story frame dwelling with oriel window, dentilled cornice, projecting bays and wraparound porch; fine example of late Queen Anne-transitional style domestic architecture, and noticeable landmark in the railroad suburb of Riverdale Park  
- Built for Carrie Warren; one of two houses of this design in the county (see also 68-010-02)  
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e

68-004-03  
**Calvert Family Cemetery**  
6230 Rhode Island Avenue, Riverdale Park  
- 19th century, the Calvert Family Cemetery includes the graves of George & Rosalie Calvert, four infant children, Charles Benedict Calvert and his infant son; the Calvert family occupied Riversdale plantation from 1803 to 1887  
- Charles Benedict Calvert was a major figure in the establishment of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Maryland Agricultural College, now the University of Maryland.  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

68-004-05  
**Riversdale (Calvert Mansion)**  
NHL E  
4811 Riverdale Road, Riverdale Park  
- 1801-1807, 2-story hip-roof stuccoed brick, late Georgian mansion, with flanking hyphens and wings, and fine interior plaster detail; stuccoed brick dependency on immediate grounds, unique mansion patterned after Belgian chateau  
- Built for Henri Joseph Stier, finished by his daughter Rosalie and her husband George Calvert; home of Stiers and Calverts, including prominent agriculturist Charles Benedict Calvert, a founder of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Maryland Agricultural College (now University of Maryland)

68-004-67  
**Read House**  
4722 Riverdale Road, Riverdale Park  
- c. 1892, 2½ story frame dwelling of Queen Anne-style with hip roof, projecting bays and elaborately detailed wraparound porch  
- One of earliest dwellings built in the 1889 subdivision of Riverdale Park, a significant example of Queen Anne-style domestic architecture; purchased by George B. Read in 1903  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e
68-004-76  **Wernek House**  
4606 Queensbury Road, Riverdale Park  
- c. 1892, Queen Anne style frame dwelling with 3 story square tower  
- Early house erected near railroad station and streetcar line; first owned by Mary Weeks Jones  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

68-010-01  **Welsh House**  
4200 Farragut Street, Hyattsville  
- 1889-90, 2½ story frame cross-gabled dwelling with panelled, bracketed gables; fine example of a late Victorian house with Queen Anne-style decorative elements  
- Built for banker Charles H. Welsh who was instrumental in Hyattsville’s development  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a, 2e

68-010-02  **Lewis Holden House**  
4112 Gallatin Street, Hyattsville  
- 1897, 2½ story frame dwelling with oriel window, panelled gables, projecting bays and wraparound porch, fine example of late Queen Anne-style architecture  
- Built for Lewis J. Holden; one of two houses of this design in the county; see also 68-004-02  
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e

68-010-16  **McEwen House**  
4106 Gallatin Street, Hyattsville  
- 1887, 2½ story frame multigabled house, with Rockville bays, panelled gables, and windows with colored border lights; fine example of Queen Anne-style architecture  
- One of the early houses in the subdivision of Hyattsville, built for Clarence McEwen from a Shoppell pattern book plan  
- Criteria 2a, 2e, 2c

68-010-17  **Frederick Holden House**  
4110 Gallatin Street, Hyattsville  
- 1883, 2½ story frame house with especially fine detail, including sawtooth shingling and scissors trusses  
- Important example of Carpenter Gothic or Eastern Stick-style architecture, built by George N. Walker for Frederick A. Holden  
- Criteria 2a, 2e, 2c

68-010-25  **Harriet Ralston House**  
4206 Decatur Street, Hyattsville  
- 1880s Queen Anne style dwelling; 3 story veranda w/jigsawn brackets  
- Built for Harriet Ralston as a Victorian retreat cottage  
- Criteria 1d, 2c, 2e

68-010-31  **Wheelock House**  
4100 Crittenden Street, Hyattsville  
- 1905 frame, 2½ story gable front Queen Anne-style dwelling  
- Built by Charles C. Wheelock; owned by the Ketcham family 1911-1965  
- Criteria 2a, 2e
68-010-34 **Benjamin Smith House**  
5104 42nd Avenue, Hyattsville  
- 1884, c. 1888, wood frame Italianate style dwelling; two-2 story projecting bays on south elevation  
- Was begun possibly as a simple front gabled dwelling soon after 1883; addition 1887  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

68-010-35 **W. G. Lown House**  
4107 Gallatin Street, Hyattsville  
- 1891, 2½ story Queen Anne-style dwelling with steeply pitched cross-gable roof  
- Built for coffee and tea wholesaler William G. Lown; later owned by Smith W. Brookhart, U. S. Senator from Iowa, 1922-1933  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

68-010-62 **Marché House**  
4200 Crittenden Street, Hyattsville  
- 1932, Georgian Revival 2½ story concrete stucco dwelling with aggregate decoration and tile roof, main block flanked by 1½ story wings; unusual example of concrete construction techniques pioneered by John J. Earley Studios of Washington, D.C.  
- Designed by architect John Robie Kennedy, the Marché house was built on the site of an 1875 frame dwelling known as Melrose; the Marchés moved their florist business there in 1922; c. 1950, Kennedy designed the associated flower shop that fronts on Rhode Island Avenue  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2e

68-010-65 **Edgewood**  
4115 Hamilton Street, Hyattsville  
- 1888, 1903, 2½ story Queen Anne-style dwelling with cross-gable roof and wraparound porch  
- Built for Mary Tricon family; sold in 1901 to Matthew Halloran who added rear kitchen wing  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

68-010-73 **William Shepherd House**  
5108 42nd Avenue, Hyattsville  
- 1906, 2½ story gable-roof frame Queen Anne style dwelling with octagonal corner tower and wraparound porch with decorative detail  
- Built for William A. Shepherd; good example of a modest late Victorian suburban dwelling  
- Criterion 2a

68-010-74 **Fox’s Barn**  
5011 42nd Avenue, Hyattsville  
- 1892, 2½ story gambrel-roof frame dwelling with shingle siding, inset porch and hip dormers  
- Unusual county example of gambrel-roof cottage style dwelling, a landmark in the 1882 Wine and Johnson subdivision of Hyattsville; built for Gilbert and Marian Fox; home of T. Hammond Welsh  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c
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68-010-80  **Wilson-Ferrier-Windsor House**
4106 Crittenden Street, Hyattsville
- c. 1897, 2 story, 3-bay, Queen Anne-style dwelling enlarged c. 1900
- Printer Clarence Wilson purchased the property in 1897; members of the Wilson family owned and occupied the property until 1922; Joseph E. and Myra G. Ferrier, who purchased the property in 1922, lived in the house until 1953; the Sherman Windsors occupied the house until 1992
- Criteria 1d, 2a

68-013-02  **Prince George's Bank, Mount Rainier**
ES 3800A 34th Street, Mount Rainier
- 1922, Neoclassical Flemish bond brick bank building
- Designed by Washington, D. C., architect Frederick E. Hill. Prince George's Bank and its successor Suburban Trust Company operated from this building until 1949, after which the building became a real estate and insurance business owned by bank director Perry Boswell
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

68-013-08  **Charles M. Lightbown Building**
3842-3856 34th Street, Mount Rainier
- 1927, Colonial Revival-style mixed-use two-story building with sheet metal cornices and brick pilasters with concrete bases and capitals
- An excellent example of an intact early 20th-century, mixed-use building; the dual uses of first-story commercial and second-story residential remain today
- Criteria 1d, 2a

68-013-10  **Sanitary Grocery Company Building**
3401 Perry Street, Mount Rainier
- c. 1930, 1 story yellow brick commercial building with a rectangular plan and canted corner entrance bay; a flat roof with a Mission-style parapet caps the structure
- The building’s construction c. 1930 reflects the rapid expansion of Mount Rainier as a streetcar suburb during the first decades of the 20th century; notable for its architectural qualities as an established feature of the neighborhood
- Criteria 1d, 2a

68-013-36  **Mount Rainier United Methodist Church**
3501 Bunker Hill Road, Mount Rainier
- 1924, 2½ story, 3-bay masonry L-shaped church designed in the Classical Revival style with a front columned portico and a bell tower located in the crook of the L
- Designed by architect Rosell E. Mitchell, the church reflects the rapid expansion Mount Rainier experienced as a streetcar suburb during the first decades of the 20th century; the building is notable for its architectural details
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

68-013-39  **Gonzalez House**
3434 Rhode Island Avenue, Mount Rainier
- 1916, frame bungalow with narrow wood siding and novelty windows
- Built for James H. Babcock, Jr., and sold to restauranteur Louis Rosenfield who owned it from 1917 to 1956; Rosenfield operated the Log Cabin Nightclub in Bladensburg; then sold to Alexander and Virginia Gonzalez, who owned Alexander and Company, an interior decorating and furniture restoration firm
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e
Saint James Roman Catholic Church
3628 Rhode Island Avenue, Mount Rainier
• 1926, 1951, 1954, Romanesque Revival brick church with a steel skeleton and red clay tile roof
• Designed by prominent Washington, D. C., architectural firm Murphy & Olmstead
• Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a

Richards House
3806 30th Street, Mount Rainier
• 1904, Excellent example of a turn-of-the-20th-century dwelling with Victorian and Classical Revival stylistic elements such as wraparound porch, semi-octagonal bay and deeply overhanging cornice
• Built by carpenter and house builder Nicholas Herfurth
• Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

Bellman House
4012 33rd Street, Mount Rainier
• 1905, frame Queen Anne style dwelling with 3 story corner octagonal tower, wraparound porch
• Constructed for Bertha and Oscar Bellman, originally from Hagerstown; he founded Bellman Heating Co. of Washington, D. C.
• Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

Thomas W. Smith Farm House
3426 Newton Street, Mount Rainier
• c. 1901, 2½ story Victorian-vernacular cross-gabled frame farmhouse with wraparound porch; Eastlake-inspired interior woodwork
• Originally part of 10-acre farm owned by Thomas W. Smith, prominent Washington businessman and philanthropist; last remaining building representing presuburbanized, agricultural character of Mount Rainier
• Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a, 2e

Ziegler Cottage
3424 Newton Street, Mount Rainier
• c. 1932, 1 story frame Craftsman-style cottage
• Built by Ziegler family on lot subdivided from Smith farm tract and included in parcel containing Smith farmhouse; representative example of early 20th-century suburban residential design; Winona model, a Sears, Roebuck and Company mail-order house
• Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a, 2e

Dueling Grounds
37th Avenue, Colmar Manor (M-NCPPC)
• Grassy park area located on part of Chillum Castle Manor, patented to William Digges in 1763
• Scene of at least 26 recorded duels during first half of 19th century; most famous was the 1820 meeting between Commodores James Barron and Stephen Decatur, in which the latter was fatally wounded
• Criteria 1a, 1b, 1c

D.C. Boundary Marker NE 7
Fort Lincoln Cemetery, Colmar Manor
• 1792; one of 40 stone boundary markers surveyed by Andrew Ellicott and delineating the boundary of the District of Columbia in Maryland and Virginia
• Criteria 1a, 1d, 2d, 2e
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68-022 ERCO
6501 Lafayette Avenue, Riverdale Park
- 1939, the ERCO building (Engineering Research Corporation) is an imposing, 2 story industrial building with a large administrative block finished in the Moderne style and a larger rear assembly block with no decorative ornamentation
- Owned by Henry Berliner, the ERCO plant is representative of the significant developments in aviation that took place in the county; the factory produced the Ercoupe and was later adapted to meet defense needs during World War II
- Criteria 1a,1d, 2a, 2e

68-041-01 Professional Building
5200 Baltimore Avenue, Hyattsville
- 1905, 1930, Neoclassical cast concrete block commercial building clad in a granite veneer with a granite water table, and a flat roof with parapet; the façade (south elevation) and east (side) elevation are highly ornamented with a Neoclassical-style parapet and ornamental entablature; the entablature features an ogee-molded bead molding and paneled frieze
- Excellent example of a commercial building designed in the Neoclassical style; one of the oldest surviving commercial structures in downtown Hyattsville
- Criteria 1d, 2a

68-041-02 Prince George’s Bank, Hyattsville
5214 Baltimore Avenue, Hyattsville
- 1926, 1948-49, Neoclassical brick and limestone bank
- One of the bank’s directors, T. Howard Duckett, a local attorney and businessman, helped form the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission in 1918 and M-NCPPC in 1927
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

68-041-09 Hyattsville Armory
NR E 5340 Baltimore Avenue, Hyattsville
- 1918, 3 story fortress-like stone structure with turrets, parapets and buttresses, designed by state architect Robert Lawrence Harris during the administration of Governor Albert C. Ritchie
- Headquarters of Company F of First Maryland Infantry, later the 115th Infantry Regiment, 29th Division

68-041-40 Hyattsville Post Office
NR 4325 Gallatin Street, Hyattsville
- 1935, 1½ story Colonial Revival-style brick building with large round-arch windows, central cupola, and lower flanking wings; interior murals with agricultural theme
- Excellent example of Colonial Revival architecture; lobby is decorated with six important murals by painter Eugene Kingman

68-061-07 A. A. Randall House
4504 41st Avenue, North Brentwood
- c. 1895, vernacular single-family frame dwelling with a 2½ story front-gabled main block and 1-story, shed-roofed porch with turned and bracketed posts
- One of the oldest houses in North Brentwood; constructed for the family of Augustus A. Randall, son of Henry Randall, the first purchaser of lots in the area known as Randalltown, which would later become North Brentwood
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e
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68-061-11  North Brentwood AME Zion Church
4037 Webster Street, North Brentwood
- 1920, front-gabled Gothic Revival brick and stucco church with corner entry tower
- One of the 2 original places of worship in the historically black community of North Brentwood
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

68-061-19  Garland-Palmer House
4510 40th Street, North Brentwood
- c. 1917, vernacular single-family frame dwelling with a 2 story main block and a 1 story, 2-bay porch on the façade (see also 68-061-20, Sandy P. Baker House)
- Constructed for the Reverend James L. Jasper, a prominent Baptist minister who helped found the First Baptist Church of North Brentwood in 1912; property conveyed to Squire Garland in 1924; Garland served as Police Justice and Justice of the Peace in newly incorporated Town of North Brentwood
- Criteria 1a, 2c

68-061-20  Sandy P. Baker House
4512 40th Street, North Brentwood
- c. 1917, vernacular single-family dwelling with 2 story main block and a 1 story, 2-bay porch on the façade
- Constructed for the Reverend James L. Jasper, a prominent Baptist minister; later occupied by Sandy P. Baker, his son-in-law, who served as Mayor of North Brentwood from 1937 to 1943; Baker’s grandson, Sandy Johnson, a later owner, served as Mayor from 1989-1992
- Criteria 1a, 1c

68-061-22  Quander-Dock House
4033 Webster Street, North Brentwood
- c. 1926, vernacular single-family frame dwelling of Craftsman bungalow form with façade-wide front porch and large dormer
- Constructed by Richard Quander, the first African-American mail carrier in Prince George's County; Quander, a distinguished veteran, is buried at Arlington National Cemetery; property purchased in 1971 by Arthur J. Dock, a principal and teacher in local schools who also served as mayor of North Brentwood from 1993 to 1995
- Criteria 1a, 1c

68-061-37  Peter Randall House
4508 Rhode Island Avenue, North Brentwood
- 1893, 2½ story side-gabled frame dwelling covered in stucco
- Built by African American Peter Randall, who served in the town's early government and whose family was the first to settle in the community that became North Brentwood
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

68-076  Paxton House
6122 42nd Avenue, Hyattsville
- 1912, Victorian wood-frame dwelling with ornamental shingle decoration, façade-wide front porch
- Criteria 1d, 2a
68-077  **Dorr House**  
4525 Buchanan Street, Hyattsville  
- c. 1908, American Foursquare style dwelling constructed of a combination of brick and molded concrete block with quoin-like corner patterns  
- Built for family of William A. Dorr  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

68-079-01  **Poppleton-Roberts House**  
5104 Emerson Street, Edmonston  
- 1901, 1½ story, 5-bay single-family dwelling reflects the ornamentation and materials of the Queen Anne style; steep double-pitched roof and integral porch influenced by the French Colonial style; the roof is finished with deep, overhanging eaves that shelter an integrated porch on the south, east and west elevations  
- Constructed for A. D. Poppleton; in 1928, sold to James A. and Edna F. Roberts, whose family retained ownership for more than 75 years; one of the earliest dwellings constructed in Edmonston  
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e

68-096-20  **Rural Cottage at the Highlands**  
4203 Bunker Hill Road, Cottage City  
- c. 1867, 1½ story, 3-bay Second Empire-style wood-frame dwelling designed with an irregularly shaped plan; a straight-sided mansard roof with a slight flare, overhanging eaves, and ogee-molded cornice caps the dwelling  
- A rare surviving example of Second Empire-style architecture in Prince George's County  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

69-005-02  **George Washington House**  
NR E 4302 Baltimore Avenue, Bladensburg  
- c. 1760, 2½ story side-gabled brick structure with two-story porch, and rear wing of frame construction  
- Built originally as a store, part of commercial complex including tavern and blacksmith shop; served as tavern from mid-19th to mid-20th century

69-005-06  **Saint Paul's Baptist Church**  
4107 47th Street, Bladensburg  
- 1818, 1908, brick gable-roof church with later bell tower and lower gable-roof addition  
- Third Presbyterian church building in Bladensburg; sold to black Baptist congregation in 1874; sole surviving historic structure in industrial area  
- Criteria 1d, 2e, 2d

69-005-07  **William Hilleary-Magruder House**  
NR E 4703 Annapolis Road, Bladensburg  
- Mid-18th century 1½ story stucco-covered stone gambrel-roof house, restored as offices in the 1980s  
- Built for William Hilleary and visited by George Washington in 1787; one of four surviving pre-Revolutionary buildings in Bladensburg; owned or rented by a series of five doctors, including Dr. Archibald Magruder
69-005-08 **Market Master’s House**
NR
4006 48th Street, Bladensburg
• c. 1765, 1½ story side-gabled house built of nonlocal stone
• Built by Christopher Lowndes of Bostwick on lot overlooking adjoining market space; unique example of its type, one of four surviving pre-Revolutionary buildings in Bladensburg

69-005-09 **Bostwick**
NR E
3901 48th Street, Bladensburg
• 1746, 2½ story Georgian brick house, with high buttress at south gable end and kitchen wing at north; historic farm outbuildings
• Built for Christopher Lowndes, merchant and Town Commissioner; home of Lowndes’ son-in-law, Benjamin Stoddert, first Secretary of Navy; earliest surviving building in Bladensburg; owned by Town of Bladensburg

69-005-16 **Peace Cross**
Annapolis Road and Route 1, Bladensburg (M-NCPPC)
• 1919-1925, constructed of cast concrete with exposed aggregate, the cross is a tan color composed of chipped flint material; arms extend five feet from the center on each side and are supported by unadorned, arched concrete brackets; the arms also have arched brackets on top, suggesting the form of a Celtic cross
• Significant as a prominent public monument to county residents who lost their lives in the line of duty during World War I; the design of the Peace Cross is the work of master craftsman and contractor John J. Earley, developer of the Earley Process of concrete construction
• Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2b

69-012 **Riverdale Baptist Church**
6200 Riverdale Road, Riverdale Park
• c. 1928, 1½ story frame cross-gable church; corner tower added a decade after original structure has distinctive bell-cast roof
• Congregation formed by the Reverends B. Roberton and C. W. Ericson; known first as the Ericson Memorial Baptist Church
• Criteria 2a, 2e

69-019 **Browning-Baines House**
5601 57th Avenue, Riverdale Park
• 1896, 2½ story hip-roof frame dwelling with wraparound porch, projecting bay and ornamental shingle siding
• Outstanding example of late Victorian domestic architecture, the only surviving historic dwelling in its immediate neighborhood
• Criteria 1c, 2a, 2c

69-021 **Cherry Hill Cemetery**
6821 Ingraham Street, Riverdale (M-NCPPC)
• 1884-1940, graveyard with sandstone grave markers
• Part of Josiah Adams’ farm; a rare surviving example of 19th century burial ground for local free blacks
• Criteria 1a, 1d
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69-023-17  William Stanton Wormley House
7533 Arwick Ardmore Road, Landover Hills
• 1898, 1926, wood frame side-gabled dwelling with glassed-in porch and rubble-stone chimney
• Built for Hugh Browne; sold to William Stanton Wormley, Washington artist and educator; his grandfather, James Wormley, established the Wormley Hotel in Washington, D.C.; home of the Wormley family
• Criteria 1a, 1d

69-023-27  Thomas Hunster House
7523 Arwick Ardmore Road, Landover Hills
• c. 1920, 1½ story large wood frame bungalow with unique Craftsman-like detail
• Built by and for Thomas W. Hunster, a portrait and landscape painter of considerable prominence and head of the art department in Washington, D.C.’s African-American public schools
• Criteria, 1c, 1d, 2e

69-024-11  Mount Hope
NR E 1 Cheverly Circle, Cheverly
• 1839, 1860s, 2 story frame house with four brick chimneys and one-story kitchen wing added; late 18th-century stone outbuilding on grounds
• Built by Fielder Magruder, Jr.; probably the last remaining antebellum frame plantation house inside the Beltway in Prince George’s County; home of Cheverly’s founder Robert Marshall from 1919-1929

69-024-13  Magruder Spring
Cheverly Avenue, Cheverly
• The sole water source for the Mount Hope tobacco plantation; functioned in the 1920s as water source
• According to tradition, British soldiers stopped here on August 24, 1814
• Criteria 1d, 2e

69-024-14  Crawford’s Adventure Spring
3400 Belleview Avenue, Cheverly
• According to tradition, British soldiers stopped here on August 25, 1814, on retreat from Washington, D.C.
• Located in a small public park in the original street plan of Section 7 of the Town of Cheverly
• Criteria 1d, 2e

69-024-22  Raymond W. Bellamy House (Belmar)
ES 2819 Cheverly Avenue, Cheverly
• 1925, 2 story frame dwelling in the Spanish Mission style; rectangular in plan with a pyramidal hipped roof and decorative parapets; stands on extensively landscaped lots
• Alhambra model, one of 25 Sears, Roebuck and Company mail-order houses constructed in Cheverly, a planned garden suburb of Washington, D.C.
• Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a, 2e
Cheverly United Methodist Church
2801 Cheverly Avenue, Cheverly
- 1942, Gothic Revival stone church with compatibly-designed 1970 educational building wing; the stained glass windows were fabricated by the Baut Studios, a renowned firm specializing in high-quality windows and doors
- An excellent example of a mid-20th century Gothic-Revival style church and a centrally located landmark in the Cheverly community
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2b, 2e

Baltimore-Washington Parkway
from Anne Arundel County at Laurel southwest to Washington, D.C., boundary near Bladensburg
- 1942-1954, dual-lane parkway flanked by natural forest and parkland, with 18 bridges, major scenic artery within the park and parkway system of Washington, serving as formal entrance to the city
- Initially planned in the 1920s as a scenic boulevard between the two cities, WW II provided one of the justifications for its construction linking the capital to military installations Andrews Air Force Base and Fort Meade.

Publick Playhouse
5445 Landover Road, Cheverly
- Art Deco red-painted brick theater constructed in 1947
- Built as the Cheverly Movie Theater, one of the finest of the Sidney Lust chain of movie houses; ornate sky scenes in ceiling and plush seating for more than 900 and air conditioning; acquired by M-NCPPC in 1975 and converted into a theater for live performances
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

Franklin Pierce House
9301 Good Luck Road, Lanham
- c. 1907; frame dwelling with center gable and standard I-house form with porch; rear kitchen wing completes a T-shaped plan
- Built by Franklin Pierce, an African-American railroad worker from Virginia, to replace an older house which had been destroyed by fire; the property has never gone out of the Pierce family, and is still the home of one of Franklin Pierce’s children
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e

Larcombe House
9108 4th Street, Lanham
- c. 1890, vernacular wood frame dwelling with facade-wide porch with central projecting pediment
- Built as summer cottage for the family of Benjamin Larcombe, a builder who resided in Washington, D.C.; renovated by son John W. Larcombe in 1920s and converted to year-round residence; an unusual surviving example of a summer cottage
- Criteria 1d, 2e

Crandell-Cook House
9310 Crandall Road, Lanham
- Only a small portion of this rambling wood-frame structure remains; earliest component from the beginning of the 19th century and c. 1901 were destroyed by fires c. 1993
- Part of unusual early 20th-century suburban community of research scientists working for USDA; originally built for botanist Orator F. Cooke
- Criteria 1d, 2a
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70-017  **Site of Buena Vista**
ES  4811 Glenn Dale Road, Bowie
- Former site of an 1850s, 2½ story gable-roof frame farmhouse with Greek Revival-style detail and later Victorian wraparound porch; (see 70-081)
- Criteria 1d, 2d

70-020  **Marietta & Duvall Family Cemetery**
NR E  5626 Bell Station Road, Glenn Dale
- c. 1813, c. 1833, 2½ story, Federal-style brick plantation house; two extant historic outbuildings include unique 1½ story law office and root cellar/harness room
- Built for Gabriel Duvall, who held several local and national political offices, including Representative to the Third U.S. Congress from 1794-1796, Comptroller of the U.S. Treasury from 1802-1811, and Supreme Court Associate Justice from 1811-1835
- Several graves, including Gabriel Duvall’s, have been moved to Marietta from the nearby Duvall family cemetery
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a

70-021  **Arthur G. Bowie House**
6290 Hillmeade Road, Glenn Dale
- 1909, 2½ story hip-roof frame house with Classical Revival-style decorative elements
- A good example of rural domestic architecture of the early 20th century, built for a member of the locally prominent Bowie family
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e

70-024  **Augusta DuVal House**
6614 Bell Station Road, Glenn Dale
- c. 1894, 2 story late-Victorian frame dwelling with shallow central projecting cross gable and porch with bracketed posts
- Built for Augusta DuVal, great-granddaughter of Judge Gabriel Duvall, on part of his large landholdings; good example of late Victorian vernacular domestic architecture
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

70-025  **Prospect Hill & Outbuildings**
ES  11501 Old Prospect Hill Road, Glenn Dale
- Early 19th century and 1940, 2½ story brick dwelling, with small Palladian window in gable end, attached to earlier gambrel-roof dwelling
- 19th century home of George W. Duvall; present house rebuilt in 1940; important group of outbuildings including early barn and ice house are outside environmental setting
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

70-028  **Dorsey Chapel (Brookland Methodist Church)**
ES  10704 Brookland Road, Glenn Dale (M-NCPPC)
- 1900, 1 story frame meeting-house-style chapel with Gothic-arch windows, turned finial, and ornamental shingle covering its gable front
- A focal point in the rural black community of Brookland, this is the most highly ornamented of the county’s black Methodist chapels from the turn of the 20th century
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e
70-030  **Arthur Magruder House**  
5302 Ridgely Run Road, Glenn Dale  
- c. 1912, 2 story T-shaped frame cross-gabled dwelling with projecting bays  
- A landmark in the Glenn Dale area, this house embodies the characteristics of an early 20th century farm residence; building has been removed from its original site and awaits rehabilitation at a new location nearby.  
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e

70-031  **Maple Shade**  
12400 Sir Walter Drive, Glenn Dale  
- 18th century, 1860, c. 1890s, multi-period frame farmhouse with freestanding chimney of sandstone and brick, and adjacent one-story summer kitchen  
- Unusual form of expansion starting from small, functional building; represents six generations of Bowie/Addison family  
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2d, 2e

70-038  **Grigsby Station Log Cabin**  
12450 Sir Walter Drive, Glenn Dale  
- c. 1840, 1½ story gable-roof log structure, sheathed with board siding, Victorian trim; new brick chimney at south gable end  
- Log cabin from the farm of Amanda Best, scene of suffragette rally which led to the nomination of Belva Lockwood as a presidential candidate in 1884; one of very few surviving early log structures; moved from 7474 Landover Road, Landover, in March 1983  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a

70-039  **Boxlee**  
6106 Hillmeade Road, Glenn Dale  
- 1923, 2½ story side-gabled frame house with 1½ story wing, with flared eaves and Colonial Revival-style decorative elements  
- Fine example of home built by local carpenter Millard Schafer for the family of F. Bowie Addison, on part of the Maple Shade acreage of the Bowie family  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2b, 2e

70-049-33  **Thomas J. Calloway House**  
9949 Elm Street, Lincoln  
- 1910, American Foursquare with wraparound porch designed by architect Isaiah T. Hatton  
- Located in the African-American retreat community of Lincoln, subdivided in 1908. Thomas Junius Calloway was the manager of the Lincoln Land and Improvement Company and an important community leader  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a

70-052-26  **Van Horn House**  
10911 Prospect Hill Road, Glenn Dale  
- 1893, 2½ story frame cross-gabled house with projecting bay and bracketed Victorian porch  
- Single surviving Victorian residential building in the railroad community of Glenn Dale  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a, 2e
70-052-27  **Saint George’s Episcopal Chapel & Cemetery**  
7010 Glenn Dale Road, Glenn Dale  
  - 1892, restored frame gable-roof church building with ornamental shingle siding in gable front and stained glass altar window  
  - Erected as mission chapel of Holy Trinity parish; fine example of late Victorian Gothic ecclesiastical architecture with Queen Anne decorative features  
  - Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e

70-053-12  **Seabrook Cottage**  
9425 Dubarry Avenue, Seabrook  
  - c. 1880, 1½ story frame gable-roof Gothic Revival cottage built on a high brick basement; large central chimney; aluminum siding covers Victorian trim  
  - One of three identical cottages built by Thomas Seabrook, a Pennsylvania Railroad engineer, in the town of Seabrook laid out along the railroad line  
  - Criteria 1c, 2a, 2d

70-053-13  **Seabrook School**  
6116 Seabrook Road, Seabrook (M-NCPCC)  
  - 1896, 1 room, 1 story frame school house, with cross gables reflecting the style of the local cottages  
  - One of few 19th-century schoolhouses surviving in Prince George's County, unique in that it was designed to resemble the cottages in this retreat community  
  - Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e

70-053-14  **Kelly Cottage**  
9513 Dubarry Avenue, Seabrook  
  - c. 1880, 1½ story frame gable-roof Gothic Revival cottage built on high brick basement; large central chimney, and fine Victorian trim  
  - Best surviving example of the Gothic Revival-style cottages in the planned rural retreat town of Seabrook  
  - Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a, 2e

70-081  **Buena Vista at the Wixon Farm**  
ES 5710 Bell Station Road, Glenn Dale  
  - 1856, 2½ story gable-roof frame farmhouse with Greek Revival-style detail and later Victorian wraparound porch  
  - One-time home of Daniel B. Lloyd, official reporter for the U.S. Senate; moved from 4811 Glenn Dale Road in 2002 (see 70-017)  
  - Criteria 1d, 2d

70-091  **Western Star Lodge Site & Cemetery**  
Brookland Road, Glenn Dale  
  - c. 1889, lodge built to serve the African-American community of Brookland; worship services were held in the lodge until Dorsey Chapel was built in 1900; the lodge property then became a cemetery for the church  
  - Significant as the center of social life for the Brookland community in the late 19th and early 20th century  
  - Criteria 1d, 2e
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71A-002

**Albert Smith House**
9201 Old Laurel Bowie Road, Bowie
- 1910, 2½ story L-shaped frame house with pyramidal-roof corner tower and jigsawn tracery in gable ends
- Good example of late-Victorian residential construction by local carpenter-builder
- Criteria 2a, 2e

71A-003

**Ingersoll House**
9006 Old Laurel Bowie Road, Bowie
- c. 1880s, 1897, 2½ story frame house with tower, verandas, and fine jigsawn Victorian detail
- One of the best surviving examples of late-Victorian residential architecture in northern Prince George’s County
- Criteria 2a, 2e

71A-009a

**Holy Trinity Episcopal Church & Cemetery**
13106 Annapolis Road, Bowie
- 1836, gable-roof brick church with Victorian Gothic stained glass windows and bracketed wooden cornice; grounds include modern school building
- Built on site of early 18th-century Henderson’s Chapel, chapel-of-ease for northern Queen Anne Parish
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

71A-009b

**Holy Trinity Episcopal Church Rectory**
13106 Annapolis Road, Bowie
- 1829, 1890s, 2½ story gable-roof brick dwelling of side-hall and double-parlor plan with Tuscan-columned porch
- Fine example of early Greek Revival-style brick dwelling, built as Rectory for Holy Trinity; one of only three surviving examples of its type in Prince George’s County. East wing addition constructed in the 1890s and collapsed in 2010
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

71A-013

**Fairview & Cemetery**
ES 4600 Fairview Vista Drive, Bowie
- c. 1800, 2 story stuccoed brick plantation house with flush end chimneys and unique stepped gable; smokehouse and early 19th-century bank barn foundations remain
- Home of prominent Duckett and Bowie families to the present day; home of Oden Bowie, Governor of Maryland 1869-1872, who is buried in the family graveyard on the grounds
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

71A-019

**Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Church & Cemetery**
16301 Annapolis Road, Bowie
- 1741, 1855, 1876, gable-roof stone church with early semi-octagonal chancel or apse and later Victorian frame bell tower; grounds include early cemetery and Second Empire style rectory
- Sanctuary and sacristy survive from original church; rebuilt after fire in May 1853; Roman Catholic clergy meeting at White Marsh in April 1789 elected John Carroll, a native of Upper Marlboro, as the first American bishop
- Criteria, 1d, 2e
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71A-030  D. S. S. Goodloe House
NR E
9300 Laurel Bowie Road, Bowie
- 1916, 2½ story hip-roof brick and frame dwelling of Colonial Revival style; tall exterior chimneys and dormers with Palladian-style windows
- Built for first principal of Maryland Normal and Industrial School (now Bowie State University); prominent example of Colonial Revival-style architecture designed by John A. Moore; important African-American historic landmark
- Criteria 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2e

71A-034  Boyden House
6501 Hillmeade Road, Bowie
- 1917, 2½ story side-gabled frame house, covered with stucco, with 1 ½ story wing, Tuscan columned porch and Colonial Revival style detail; landscaped grounds
- One of three similar Colonial Revival-style homes built by local carpenter Millard Schafer; built for attorney J. Hanson Boyden on part of the Cedar Hill property
- Criteria 2a, 2b, 2e

71B-002-01  Straining House
13005 7th Street, Bowie
- c. 1870, 2 story front-gabled brick townhouse with round-arch windows and Italianate features
- One of very few surviving examples in Prince George’s County of a front gabled brick town dwelling in the Italianate style; one of the first houses constructed in the town of Huntington (now Bowie)
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

71B-002-03  Ryon House
13125 11th Street, Bowie
- 1903, Queen Anne style frame dwelling with oriel window and wraparound porch
- Home to three successive physicians who lived and worked in railroad community of Huntington (now part of Bowie)
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

71B-002-05  Saint James’ Episcopal Church
13010 8th Street, Bowie
- 1906, 1923, Gothic Revival style frame chapel with lateral 3 story bell tower and later parish hall addition
- Built as a mission chapel of Holy Trinity Church, Collington, by local builder Millard Schafer
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

71B-002-08  Harmon-Phelps House
8706 Maple Avenue, Bowie
- 1870s, c. 1915, shingle clad vernacular dwelling, two halves united by porch
- A modest dwelling by Joseph Snodgrass as an investment & rented to Fred Moulton, a young carpenter; expanded to twice the original size in 1915 by Clarence Phelps
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e
Chapter 16·Historic Sites

71B-002-09  **Bowie Railroad Buildings**
NR E
8614 Chestnut Avenue, Bowie
- 1920, c. 1930, 2 story square frame signal tower with pyramidal roof and second story cantilevered bay; one-story hip-roof frame freight shed and ticket office with hip roof; passenger waiting shed with turned post and support brackets
- Complex of three buildings relocated in July 1992 serves as museum facility; tower dismantled from original location; rare survivors from the heyday of railroad travel; owned by the City of Bowie
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

71B-002-23  **Knights of Saint John Meeting Hall**
13004 12th Street, Bowie
- c. 1907, front-gabled wood frame construction; one story and six bays long on a partial basement
- Built as the meeting place for the St. John’s Auxiliary, African-American members of the local Ascension Catholic Church
- Criteria 1d, 2d, 2e

71B-003  **Williams Plains**
NR
16200 White Marsh Park Drive, Bowie
- c. 1813, 1840s, 2 story brick house, laid in Flemish bond, with flush gable chimneys and Greek Revival-style interior trim
- Begun by John Johnson, Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of Prince George's County and Judge of the Maryland State Court of Appeals; finished a generation later as the home of the Basil Mullikin family; owned by City of Bowie

71B-004  **Belair Mansion & Cemetery**
NR E
12207 Tulip Grove Drive, Bowie
- c. 1745, early 20th-century wings, 2½ story Georgian brick mansion with hip-on-hip roof; Georgian and Federal-style interior detail
- Built for Samuel Ogle, provincial governor of Maryland; home of his son, Benjamin Ogle, governor of Maryland from 1798-1801; 20th-century William Woodward, Sr., family estate; owned by the City of Bowie

71B-005  **Belair Stable**
NR E
2835 Belair Drive, Bowie
- 1907, U-shaped stable with arched entry of local sandstone and brick shed-rows extending back at both ends
- Built by James T. Woodward and enlarged by nephew William Woodward, Sr.; Nashua bred here by William Woodward Jr., was the 1955 Horse of the Year; the building is significant for Belair estate’s association with fine thoroughbred race horses for more than two centuries; owned by the City of Bowie

71B-007  **Mitchellville Store Site & Storekeepers House**
2608 Mitchellville Road, Mitchellville
- Store 1870s (destroyed by fire in 1985), house 1906, store was multiperiod gable-roof frame structure; storekeeper’s dwelling is two-story side-gabled house with two-story veranda
- Dwelling is the last remaining vestige of the old Mitchellville community; now the Radio & Television Museum; owned by the City of Bowie
- Criteria 1d, 2e
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71B-015
Fair Running (Duvall Family Cemetery)
ES
7704 Laurel Bowie Road, Bowie
- 1727, 1802, 1½ story gambrel-roof stone building, obscured by 20th-century additions
- Rare surviving example of popular 18th-century domestic architectural style; now serves as golf clubhouse with restaurant addition
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

71B-016
Melford, Outbuildings & Duckett Family Cemetery
NR ES
17107 Melford Boulevard, Bowie
- 1840s and earlier; 2½ story brick and stone plantation house with unique two-story semi-circular projecting bay at gable end; grounds include early 19th century outbuildings and terraced gardens
- Home of Duckett and Hardisty families; semi-circular bay and chimney configuration make it unique in Prince George’s County

71B-019
Colbert Family Farm Site
ES
Race Track Road, Bowie
- 1860-1940, the archeological site contains intact cultural features that could shed light on the lives of an African-American family after the Civil War
- Archeological remains of the farm residence of the Calvert/Colbert family, who were free blacks, the Colberts worked for the railroad and were also farmers
- Criteria 1a, 1d

72-001
Wilson Station Railroad Tower
6900 Block of Old Landover Road, Cheverly
- Early 20th Century Railroad tower on the Washington spur line of the Pennsylvania Railroad; only remaining tower on line; built in same general location as Wilson Station, from which the National Equal Rights party marched in September 1884 when they nominated Belva Lockwood to be President of the U.S.
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2e

72-002
Beall’s Pleasure
NR
2900 Bealls Pleasure Lane, Landover
- Early 19th century, 2 story Federal-style side-gabled brick house with decorative brick cornice and original interior trim
- Built on land that had been owned by Benjamin Stoddert, first U.S. Secretary of Navy

72-004
Waring’s Grove
ES
900 Brightseat Road, Landover
- 19th-century rebuilding of 18th-century house; 1½ story frame house with Gothic Revival detail on porch and dormers; 19th century rear addition; historic outbuildings included corncrib, shed and barn
- Berry home for at least three generations; sold to John Beane in 1920; interesting example of early dwelling form with later Victorian trim
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e
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72-005  **Ridgely Methodist Episcopal Church & Cemetery**
NR 8900 Central Avenue, Landover
- 1921, 1 story frame gable-roof structure; pointed-arch windows with commemorative stained glass; graveyard with concrete and hand-carved stones
- Church serving black community at this location since 1871; present building replaces church founded by Lewis Ridgley in 1871 to serve local black Methodist community; moved a short distance back from the major highway and restored
- Criterion 1d

72-006  **Carmody House**
6808 Drylog Street, Capitol Heights
- 1895, early 20th-century additions, 2½ story cross-gabled frame dwelling which has undergone numerous additions
- Home of Francis Carmody, banker and developer of Seat Pleasant; one of few remaining examples of turn-of-the-century rural residential architecture in this area
- Criteria 1c, 2a

72-007-01  **Old Saint Margaret's Roman Catholic Church**
6020 Addison Road, Seat Pleasant
- 1908, 1 story, gable-roof frame church with corner bell tower
- Significant for its Gothic Revival architecture and for its connection with Francis S. Carmody, developer of Seat Pleasant
- Criteria 1c, 2a, 2e

72-008  **Addison Chapel & Cemetery**
NR E 5610 Addison Road, Seat Pleasant
- 1810 and 1905, simple rectangular gable-roof brick chapel with Stick-style gable decoration
- Built as upper chapel of St. John's Episcopal Church, Broad Creek, replacing earlier frame structure; many prominent individuals from the Bladensburg area are buried in the cemetery

72-009  **Fairmount Heights School**
E 737 61st Avenue, Fairmount Heights
- 1912, 2 story frame schoolhouse; a pyramidal roof cupola rises from the front plane of the hip roof and the original school bell is preserved inside
- Designed by noted black architect William Sidney Pittman of Washington, D.C.; it had the only facilities for industrial training of blacks in Prince George's County; served as school until 1934
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

72-009-15  **D.C. Boundary Marker NE 9**
900 bl. Eastern Avenue, Fairmount Heights
- 1792, one of 40 stone boundary markers surveyed by Andrew Ellicott and delineating the boundary of the District of Columbia in Maryland and Virginia
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2d, 2e
Chapter 16-Historic Sites

72-009-18 **William Sidney Pittman House**
105 Eastern Avenue, Fairmount Heights
- 1907, 3 x 3 bay, 2½ story dwelling with Colonial Revival features; the cross-gable roof has a steeply pitched side gable and a shallow front gable with overhanging eaves; full length one-story wraparound porch
- Designed by one of the area’s first and most prominent African-American architects, William Sidney Pittman, as his residence; his wife Portia Washington Pittman was the daughter of Booker T. Washington
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a

72-009-24 **James F. Armstrong House**
908 59th Avenue, Fairmount Heights
- 1905, frame Queen Anne style dwelling with projecting bays and well defined pediments; substantially renovated in 1994
- Built for J. F. Armstrong, graduate of Tuskegee Institute and Howard University Law School; first supervisor of Colored Schools for Prince George’s County
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

72-009-29 **Fairmount Heights World War II Monument**
Corner of 59th Avenue and 59th Place
- 1946, obelisk-like monument constructed of coursed gray granite and orange sandstone blocks set in random arrangement; the monument is an elongated pyramid rising from a square stone plinth
- Many of Fairmount Heights’ young men served their country during World War II; their dedication and sacrifices were commemorated by the residents of Fairmount Heights in 1946 with the construction of this memorial; the names of each soldier who served and died in the war were inscribed on bronze plaques that originally adorned the sides of the stone monument
- Criteria 1d, 2e

72-009-30 **Isaac Brown House**
715 59th Place, Fairmount Heights
- 1911, 2 story, wood frame front gabled shotgun dwelling with front porch
- Built for Isaac and Maria Brown who owned it as rental property; good example of a modest vernacular-style house in Fairmount Heights
- Criteria 1d, 2a

72-010 **Van Horn-Mitchell House**
4706 Mann Street, Capitol Heights
- c. 1803 with later alterations, 2½ story brick, Federal style gable-roof plantation house with a five-bay main facade
- Significant because of the early-nineteenth-century prominence of Archibald Van Horn, state legislator and U.S. Congressman, and for 20th century associations with the prominent African-American community leaders and civil rights activists Benjamin and Clara Mitchell, who hosted international figures including Portia Washington Pittman, Muhammad Ali, Elijah Muhammad, Malcolm X, and Anwar Sadat at the property
- Criteria 1c, 2a, 2e
**D.C. Boundary Marker NE 8**
4200 Andalusia Lane, Capitol Heights
- 1792, one of 40 stone boundary markers surveyed by Andrew Ellicott and delineating the boundary of the District of Columbia in Maryland and Virginia
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2d, 2e

**Webb-Brown House (Berry-McKeel House)**
7600 Willow Hill Drive, Landover
- c. 1870, two-part gable-roof frame house with bracketed cornice and porch posts
- Main block built by lawyer John Webb; prominent landmark in a developed residential area
- Criterion 2a

**Highland Park School**
6501 Lowland Drive, Highland Park
- 1928, 1994, Colonial Revival-style brick school; arched entrance surmounted by keystone and shaped parapet
- Early high school for black students; same design and year of construction as Lakeland School (66-014); prominent focal point in streetcar suburb of Highland Park, an emerging black community
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

**William and Mildred Ridgley Gray Residence**
8118 Central Avenue, Landover
- c. 1955, brick 1 story western ranch and French provincial-style house
- Built by African-American builder Robert Hill on land owned by the Ridgley family, who were prominent landowners, farmers, and educators in the area
- House style and siting represent a break from the traditional farm structures and houses previously on the property to those of the suburban, post-WWII professional class
- Criteria 1c, 2a, 2e

**Fairmont Heights High School**
1401 Nye Street, Capitol Heights
- 1950, c. 1980, c. 1990, a large, multipart, concrete-block and brick school building is the centerpiece of a 14.90-acre campus that includes athletic fields and related facilities
- Designed by prominent local architect Paul H. Kea, the school property is significant as the focus of important local efforts to desegregate the county’s public schools beginning in the 1950s and culminating in a landmark lawsuit, *Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George’s County* (1972)
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a, 2e

**Belvidere**
11401 Belvidere Road, Mitchellville
- c. 1825, 1856, 2 story frame hip-roof house attached to earlier 2 story gable-roof section; Greek Revival-style interior trim
- Main block built by George W. Duvall; significant surviving 19th-century farmstead in a rapidly developing suburban area
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a
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73-006  Newton White Mansion & Warington Cemetery
2708 Enterprise Road, Mitchellville (M-NCPPC)
- 1939, Regency Revival-style 2 story brick mansion designed by noted Richmond, Virginia architect William L. Bottomley
- Built for Captain Newton H. White, first commanding officer of the U.S.S. Enterprise and owner of model dairy farm; the land, known as Warington, was owned for over a century by the Waring family, members of which are buried in a small fenced cemetery near Captain White’s mansion
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

73-007  Cottage at Warington
3102 Lottsford Vista Road, Mitchellville (M-NCPPC)
- 1842, 1½ story frame house with unusual saltbox roof profile and two exterior chimneys of local sandstone
- House constructed by Washington Hilleary; this became one of the farms of Marsham Waring’s large Warington estate
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

73-009  Rose Mount Site
9600 Landover Road, Landover
- 1806, 1856, site of residence built for Governor Joseph Kent and mid-19th-century residence of Joseph Kent Roberts
- Kent died in 1837 and may be buried in an unmarked grave; Roberts house destroyed by fire in 1974; house foundation and formal garden area survive
- Criteria 1a, 1c

73-012  Northampton Slave Quarters and Archaeological Park
10900 block Lake Arbor Way, Mitchellville (M-NCPPC)
- 18th and 19th centuries, site includes foundations of one frame and one brick, 2-family slave quarters
- Archeological site of unique importance, particularly for the early 19th century brick quarter, one of only three known brick quarters in southern Maryland
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d

73-016  Mount Lubentia
NR 603 Largo Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1798 and earlier, 2½ story brick (Flemish bond) hip-roof house with fine Federal-style decorative detail and unique 18th-century octagonal dairy moved c. 1970 from related plantation (Graden, now destroyed)
- Excellent example of Federal-style plantation house, finished by Dennis Magruder of Harmony Hall; during British invasion of 1814, county records were stored here
- Criteria 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

73-018  Chelsea
601 Watkins Park Drive, Upper Marlboro (M-NCPPC)
- 1790s, c. 1830, 2 story hip roof frame house with bracketed cornice and combination of Federal and Victorian trim; historic outbuildings include corncrib and shed
- Home of the Berry family after 1799; a good example of an expanded and very fine country house
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a
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74A-002  **Locust Grove (Slingluff House)**
3005 Enterprise Road, Mitchellville
- c. 1880, 2½ story large frame house with three prominent decorated dormers and Gothic Revival detail
- Built by Truman C. Slingluff on plantation of his great-grandfather, Fielder Cross; prominent local landmark
- Criteria 1d, 2e

74A-004  **Holy Family Roman Catholic Church & Cemetery**
12010 Woodmore Road, Mitchellville
- 1890, 1½ story frame church with long, steeply pitched gable roof, Gothic arch windows and prominent belfry; grounds include Rectory and new Parish Hall
- Fine example of late Victorian ecclesiastical architecture with Gothic-and Stick-style decorative elements; originally served local black Roman Catholic community
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

74A-006  **Pleasant Prospect & Outbuildings**
NR E 12806 Woodmore Road, Mitchellville
- 1798, 2½ story brick plantation house, laid in Flemish bond; fine Federal style interior trim with some Victorian renovations
- Built for Dr. Isaac Duckett and later home of Contee and Walker families; important example of Federal-style plantation house

74A-008  **Mount Oak**
3005 Westbrook Lane, Bowie
- c. 1901, 2 story frame hip-and-gable-roof farmhouse with octagonal corner tower; 19th-century frame meat house on grounds
- Visible landmark in commanding location, long associated with Mullikin/Bowie families
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

74A-010  **Mullikin’s Delight & Cemetery**
2307 Church Road, Mitchellville
- 1698, 1750, 1800, two small square frame cottages connected by passage; retains some early 18th-century features
- Fine example of expansion and addition to very early dwelling; home of Mullikin family for six generations
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2d, 2e

74A-014  **Seton Belt Barn**
ES 1506 Church Road, Mitchellville
- c. 1880, multi-use livestock barn with Jerkinhead roof, returned cornice and decorated cupolas, adapted in this century for tobacco hanging
- Barn style unique in Prince George’s County; part of Oatland tract, home of Lees and Belts
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e
74A-015 **Partnership & Cemetery**
ES
13710 Central Avenue, Mitchellville
- 18th century, 1840s, 2 story brick (Flemish bond with glazed headers) plantation house with flared gable roof and Georgian plan
- May incorporate parts of early 18th-century Hall family home; many rebuildings, including interior renovation during Berry residence in mid-19th century
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 1a, 2c, 2e

74A-018 **Bowieville**
NR ES
601 Mary Bowie Parkway, Upper Marlboro
- 1819, stuccoed brick 2½ story house with hip roof and projecting central pavilion, and elegant interior detail; historic stable remains
- Built for Mary Bowie on land she inherited from her father, Governor Robert Bowie; later the home of the Berry family, Bowieville is the most sophisticated Federal-style plantation house in Prince George’s County.

74B-001 **Governors’ Bridge**
17800 block Governors Bridge Road, Bowie
- 1912, single-span steel Pratt truss bridge connecting Prince George’s and Anne Arundel Counties
- One of 3 surviving early truss bridges in Prince George’s County, built at site of important colonial crossing; see also 64-002
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

74B-006 **Carroll Methodist Chapel & Cemetery**
1811 Mitchellville Road, Mitchellville
- 1877, c. 1910 vernacular wood frame chapel
- The church is a simple frame chapel of meetinghouse style, representative of modest black country churches
- Criteria 1d, 2d, 2e

74B-007 **Hamilton House**
16810 Federal Hill Court, Mitchellville
- 1870s, 2½ story frame farm house, with clipped gables, bracketed cornice and fine Victorian interior detail; historic outbuildings include meat house and barn
- Built for prominent local farmer James Hamilton
- Criteria 1d, 2a

74B-009 **B. D. Mulliken House Site (Harwood Hall)**
1200 Crain Highway NE, Mitchellville
- c. 1870, site of important Victorian era dwelling destroyed by fire in August of 1991, with archeological potential for several generations of Harwood and Mullikin family occupation; surviving tenant house moved to the Smithsonian Institution.
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e
74B-010 Mount Nebo AME Church & Cemetery
17214 Queen Anne Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1925, 1 story frame gable-roof meeting-house with centered entry tower, built to replace 1877 chapel
- Exemplifies the long history of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in this rural area; with adjoining school became focal point for local black community
- Criterion 1d

74B-012 Site of Queen Anne Bridge
Queen Anne Bridge Road, Mitchellville
- c. 1890, only surviving example of Pratt through-truss built with Phoenix sections in Prince George's County.
- First bridge built at this location in 1755, replacing ferry; second bridge built in 1797 was swept away
- Criteria 1d, 2a

74B-013 Hazelwood
NR 18611 Queen Anne Road, Upper Marlboro (M-NCPCC)
- Late 18th century, 1800, 1860, large 3-part frame house: gambrel roof 1½ story south (oldest) section, ca. 1800 Federal-style 2½ story north section, and projecting three-story Victorian middle section; historic outbuildings include meat house, spring house and several barns
- Unique example of joining three period structures into one; home of Revolutionary War veteran Major Thomas Lancaster Lansdale
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2e

74B-014 Goodwood
ES 17200 Clagett Landing Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1790s, c. 1830, 2 story brick Federal-style building, with particularly fine entrance detail; surviving older wing of large Greek Revival-style mansion
- Originally built by George Calvert; later adapted as west wing of massive 3-part mansion of Charles H. Carter; central block and east wing destroyed by fire in 1934
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

74B-015 Clagett House at Cool Spring Manor & Cemeteries
ES 17610 Clagett Landing Road, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1830, frame Greek Revival dwelling; the 1 story house rests on an above-grade basement which contains the kitchen; a unique example of its form in the county; a plain but solid example of domestic architecture that departs drastically from the region's more traditional modest plantation houses of the period
- Constructed for William D. Clagett on the estate of his grandfather, Samuel White; replaced an earlier house; Clagett family sold after Civil War; owned by the Owens family from the 1870s to 1961
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e
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74B-016b  
**Elliott-Beall House**
1600 Alicia Drive, Upper Marlboro  
- 1840s, 2 story frame hip-roof dwelling with side-hall-and-double-parlor plan and Greek Revival style interior detail  
- Built for William Elliott on his Cool Spring Manor plantation; unique variant of a popular antebellum dwelling house plan  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

75A-001  
**Concord & Cemetery**
NR E  
8000 Walker Mill Road, Capitol Heights (M-NCPPC)  
- 1798, 2½ story gable-roof Federal-style Flemish bond brick plantation house with frame wing; associated outbuildings include several large barns, a stable, and a cornhouse  
- Owned by the prominent Berry family continuously from the time of its construction until c. 2000; good example of Federal-style country house

75A-006  
**Epiphany Episcopal Church & Cemetery**
3111 Ritchie Road, Forestville  
- 1867-1871, the wood-frame front-gable structure is clad in board-and-batten wood; the bell tower and rear addition were added later; the main block has stained-glass, lancet-arched windows  
- Initially designated as a chapel, the church building became the home of the independent parish of the Epiphany Church in 1871; it was expanded in the early 20th century as the congregation of Forestville grew; an excellent example of Gothic Revival-style ecclesiastical architecture  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

75A-008  
**Forestville Methodist Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery**
3111 Forestville Road, Forestville  
- 1840, the cemetery predates the concrete block church and contains approximately 75 individual grave markers that are a mixture of tablet headstones, block markers, obelisks, ground-level headstones, and Latin crosses  
- The cemetery, with interments dating from the 1840s, is representative of rural burial grounds of the mid- to late nineteenth century  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

75A-021  
**Suitland House**
ES  
4510 Silver Hill Road, Suitland  
- 1937-1938, brick Colonial Revival style house with variegated stone veneer consisting of a side-gabled main block with flanking wings  
- Built for the family of Lovell O. Minear, a pioneer in the design and management of memorial parks; land taken over by the Federal government only a few years later and converted into offices  
- Criteria 1a, 2a

75A-028  
**Ridgeley School**
8507 Central Avenue, Capitol Heights (M-NCPPC)  
- 1927, vernacular wood frame shingled school building with hipped roof  
- Built in 1927 as part of the Rosenwald program; most intact of the nine remaining of the original 28 Rosenwald Schools in the county; restored in 2010  
- Criteria 1a, 2a
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76A-001 **Ridgeway House Site**
3915 Summer Road, Suitland (M-NCPPC)
- c. 1830, ruins of 1½ story frame dwelling of hall-and-parlor plan, steep gabled roof and hand-hewn sill and joists; a remnant of early 19th century vernacular architecture in this area
  - Criteria 1d, 2a

76A-004 **Saint Barnabas Episcopal Church & Cemetery**
5203 Saint Barnabas Road, Temple Hills
- 1851, brick church with three-story entry tower, mitre-arched windows and corbelled cornice
- Built as chapel for St. John’s at Broad Creek to replace original 1830 mission chapel
  - Criteria 1c, 1d, 2d, 2e

76A-013 **Mount Welby**
NR 6411 Oxon Hill Road, Oxon Hill (National Park Service)
- c. 1800, 2 story brick house of Georgian plan with shed roof and corbelled cornice, rebuilt from gable roof; historic outbuildings include brick stable and other farm buildings
- Prominently located above the Potomac River on part of Oxon Hill Manor; since 1891, part of St. Elizabeth’s Hospital farm; owned by the U.S. Department of the Interior
  - Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

76A-014 **Butler House**
NR 6403 Oxon Hill Road, Oxon Hill
- c. 1851, 2 story frame house with one-story shed-roof kitchen attached, with formstone veneer
- Built by Henry A. Butler as house and post office; important example of the progress of free black families in mid-19th century
  - Criteria 1d, 2d

76A-022 **Suitland Parkway**
NR Suitland Parkway, Suitland
- 1937, 1943, 1944, 9-mile-long, dual lane parkway with concrete-arch bridges faced with stone; connects Joint Base Andrews (formerly AAFB) with Bolling Air Force Base in Washington, D. C.
- Planned before the outbreak of World War II, the project came to fruition with the entrance of the US into the war and the establishment of Andrews Air Force Base a few months later; significant for its association with the war and the base

76B-006 **Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic Church & Cemetery**
NR 2401 Brinkley Road, Fort Washington
- 1890-1891, Queen Anne-style church with centered entry tower, corner buttresses and fine ornamental shingle siding; oldest Roman Catholic church building in southwest county; fine example of Queen Anne-style ecclesiastical architecture

76B-007 **Kildare**
2505 Brinkley Road, Fort Washington
- c. 1850, c. 1900, 2-part gable-roof farmhouse; 3-story brick dwelling with two-story frame west section with brick veneer; several frame outbuildings
- Built by George S. Tolson before 1850; purchased in 1854 by Dr. Peter H. Heiskell; since 1945 owned by William Miller family, part of 420-acre estate before construction of Rosecroft Raceway
  - Criteria 1d, 2e
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76B-012  
**Terrett House (Bird Lawn Manor)**  
3402 Stonesboro Road, Fort Washington  
- c. 1910, 2 story frame hip-roof house in popular Colonial Revival style, rebuilt in 1940s with late Victorian decorative elements from Michigan mansion  
- Built by Terrett family on Bird Lawn farm; home in 1940s and 1950s of Michigan Congressman Frederick Crawford; unusual example of reuse of decorative materials  
- Criteria 2c, 2e

76B-016  
**Site of Mount Hope AME Church & Cemetery**  
7043 Allentown Road, Temple Hills  
- c. 1891, site of one of a small number of AME churches in the county, the building burned in the late 1960s; a school was established next to the church in 1902 and the churchyard was used as a playground; the cemetery associated with the church remains and contains several hand made concrete markers  
- This site marks the historic center of the African-American community of Camp Springs  
- Criteria 1d, 2e

76B-017  
**Old Bells Methodist Church & Cemetery**  
6016 Allentown Road, Suitland  
- 1910, Frame gable-roof church building with corner bell tower and decorative pressed metal ceiling; grounds include modern church/parish hall building  
- Built on site of antebellum Beall’s meetinghouse; good example of Gothic Revival-style church popular in the county early in this century  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

77-001  
**Forest Grove Methodist Episcopal Church (Chapel #2) & Cemetery**  
Fechet Avenue, Joint Base Andrews Naval Air Facility Washington  
- 1914, frame chapel with crenelated tower  
- Interior renovated after fire in 1985; third chapel on this site includes 1854 chapel in the no-longer-existing village of Centreville, 1880 chapel destroyed by windstorm in 1914  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

77-012  
**Saint Luke’s Methodist Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery**  
Corner of Dower House Road West and Leapley Road, Upper Marlboro  
- c. 1900, 47 marked graves date from 1903-2003; the markers vary by type and materials, and include concrete and slate tablets, granite headstones, marble tablets on concrete bases, concrete obelisks, concrete footstones and headstones; the cemetery grounds are grassy and generally flat, with a low-lying section to the west  
- St. Luke's Church, also known as Niles Chapel, was first constructed in 1868 as a Freedmen’s School on land donated by William Niles, a white landowner in the area; services were held in the schoolhouse until a chapel was built c. 1877; this log building was replaced in 1893 by a frame building, which was demolished in the 1970s  
- Criteria 1d, 2e
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77-014  **Belle Chance & Darcey Family Cemetery**
Joint Base Andrews Naval Air Facility Washington
- 1912, of concrete construction with Colonial Revival/Spanish styling; house and outbuildings employ modern fireproof technology
- Land was part of tract known as “Chance,” a 19th-century plantation of Edward Darcey; house burned to ground in 1910; replaced by Dr. William Stewart, converted to the commander’s residence of Joint Base Andrews (Andrews Air Force Base)
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2e

78-000-18  **The Cottage & Outbuildings**
NR 11904 Old Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro
- 1846, 1860, large two-story gable-roof frame plantation house, built in three sections; fine Greek Revival-style interior detail; important group of historic outbuildings, including: meat house, well house and ice house, and several tenant farm complexes
- Home of Charles Clagett and heirs since mid-19th century; fine example of architectural expansion by telescoping; owned by Chesapeake Bay Foundation
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

78-013  **Blythewood & Smith Family Cemetery**
ES 4210 Melwood Road, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1830, multisection frame farmhouse, the house and domestic outbuildings stand on high ground overlooking a complex of agricultural outbuildings
- Probably begun by William Ferguson Berry; after his death in 1873, his son Elisha E. Berry renamed the farm Blythewood, and built shed roof kitchen wing; portico constructed early 20th century
- Criteria 1a, 2a

78-015  **Melwood Park**
NR E 10908 Old Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1750, c. 1800, 2-story stuccoed brick building with unevenly pitched gable roof and fine interior panelling; both Colonial-and Federal-style interior detail
- Home of the William Digges family, this unique pre-Georgian house was visited by George Washington on several occasions; British troops camped near here during their march on Washington in 1814

78-017  **Charles Hill & Pumphrey Family Cemetery**
11700 Old Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro
- 1840s, 1890s, 2 story gable-roof frame house built in two sections, with Greek Revival-style trim; historic carriage house on property
- Home of Rector Pumphrey; members of his family are buried in a small graveyard on the grounds
- Criteria 1d, 2e

79-000-34  **Oakland (Good Luck)**
12502 Brooke Lane, Upper Marlboro
- 1820s, 1840s, 2 story, gable-roof frame house in three sections; fine Greek Revival-style interior detail 1840s, earlier wing, 1820s, a 3-part dwelling arranged in telescope form
- Home of Robert Clagett; one of six frame Victorian dwellings provided by Thomas Clagett VI of Weston for his children
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2d, 2e
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79-002  Montpelier of Moore’s Plains
1714 Crain Highway SE, Upper Marlboro
• Mid-19th century, rebuilt 1940s, 2 story hip-roof frame plantation house with 20th century brick veneer, kitchen wing and portico
• Built originally for Stephen Belt, and rebuilt by Keene Bowie in 1940
• Criteria 1c, 2e

79-004  Mount Pleasant & Cemetery
NR
3401 Mount Pleasant Road, Upper Marlboro
• 1770, 1½ story brick dwelling with gambrel roof and flush chimneys
• Home of John Waring and his descendants, only the western section of original house survives; rare surviving gambrel-roof structure

79-019-01  Thomas J. Turner House
14500 Elm Street, Upper Marlboro
• 1850-1855, 2½ story 3 bay frame gable-roof house, enlarged in several stages;
• Handsome vernacular dwelling which contributes to one of the few 19th century streetscapes remaining in Upper Marlboro
• Built by local carpenter Reuben W. Bunnell for Thomas J. Turner, publisher of the local newspaper, The Planters' Advocate
• Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

79-019-02  Jarboe-Bowie House
14504 Elm Street, Upper Marlboro
• c. 1852, 2 story frame dwelling with small second story windows and a steep wood-shingle gable roof and interior gable end chimneys
• Important component of one of the few 19th-century streetscapes left in Upper Marlboro; home of William A. Jarboe, Clerk of the County Court and Register of Wills
• Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

79-019-13  Kingston
NR E
5415 Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro
• c. 1750, remodeled 1859, 1½ story frame gable-roof dwelling with four exterior chimneys and Gothic Revival trim, including board-and-batten siding and highly decorated vergeboards; historic meat house on grounds
• Built by the Craufurd family; a good example of pre-Georgian domestic architecture renovated in Gothic Cottage style for Sasscer and Clagett families

79-019-14  Church Street House (Talbott House)
14505 Church Street, Upper Marlboro
• 1840s, simple two-story side-gabled frame dwelling of stairhall-and-single-parlor plan, with later cross-gabled wing
• Small antebellum dwelling enlarged after Civil War; built by local carpenter, and home of a series of craftspeople; last survivor in a 19th-century streetscape of working class residences
• Criteria 1a, 1d, 2e
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79-019-15  **Trinity Episcopal Church & Cemetery**
14519 Church Street, Upper Marlboro
- 1846, brick church with steep gable roof and gothic-arch stained glass windows; four-story crenelated tower added in 1896
- Designed by Baltimore architect Robert Cary Long; stands on site of Episcopal church organized in 1810 by Bishop Thomas John Claggett
- Criteria 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

79-019-16  **Content**
NR ES 14518 Church Street, Upper Marlboro
- 1787 and early 19th century, large two-story frame gable-roof dwelling in two sections; two freestanding brick chimneys with pent; two-story veranda
- One of the oldest remaining buildings in Upper Marlboro, the home of the Craufurd, Beanes, Lee, Magruder and Bowling families

79-019-17  **Trelawn**
14519 Elm Street, Upper Marlboro
- 1850s, 2½ story gable-roof frame house with bracketed cornice, interior chimneys and unusual entry hall plan; enlarged in the 1870s; historic dove cote on grounds
- Home of prominent attorney Joseph Kent Roberts, Jr.; fine example of town dwelling expanded in telescope form
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2d, 2e

79-019-18  **Digges-Sasscer House**
14507 Elm Street, Upper Marlboro
- Main block 1845 and 1880s, earlier wing to rear two-story five-bay side gabled main block reflecting two periods of construction, with Greek Revival and later Victorian style trim; south wing incorporates earlier small dwelling; historic outbuildings include stable, wood house and meat house
- Important town dwelling, occupied continuously by prominent citizens: Daniel C. Digges (Delegate), William A. Jarboe (Register of Wills), Frederick Sasscer, Jr. (publisher), and Lansdale G. Sasscer (Maryland Senator and U.S. Congressman) and Lansdale G. Sasscer, Jr., (Maryland Delegate)
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

79-019-20  **Union (Memorial) Methodist Church**
14418 Old Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro
- 1916, frame gable-roof church with pointed-arch windows and three-story entry tower
- Visible symbol of local black Methodist community, continuing the tradition of the Civil War period Union Chapel
- Criteria 1d, 2e

79-019-21  **Old Mill Place (Traband House)**
NR 14204 Old Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro
- 1894-1897, 2½ story frame late Victorian house with fishscale shingles, Rockville bays and Queen Anne detail
- Designed by architect Arthur Nicholson of Laurel and built by John H. Traband, Jr., adjoining his family’s grist mill; best example of late Victorian architecture in Upper Marlboro
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e
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79-019-22  
**Dr. William & Sarah Beanes Cemetery**  
14554 Elm Street, Upper Marlboro  
- 1822-1828, 2 box tombs (marble slabs on stretcher brick) of the Beanes and two plaques  
- Doctor William Beanes was a prominent physician and planter in Prince George's County; the Beanes Cemetery in Upper Marlboro serves as a memorial to the doctor known best for his passive role in Francis Scott Key's penning of the "Star Spangled Banner" in 1814  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 2e

79-019-23  
**Magruder's Law Office**  
14708 Elm Street, Upper Marlboro  
- 1860, Greek Revival-style frame buildings with louvered lunette  
- Built as a law office and has served that purpose since 1860; built for the firm of Caleb Clarke Magruder, his son C. C. Magruder, Jr., joined the practice in 1864 as did grandson C. C. Magruder III; one of the few examples of the Greek Revival style remaining in the county  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

79-019-25  
**Saint Mary's Beneficial Society Hall**  
NR  
14825 Pratt Street, Upper Marlboro  
- c. 1892, 1 story, front-gabled frame structure with entrance, porch and small box office at west gable front  
- For nearly a century the center of social, religious, and charitable activities of local black Catholic community; last remaining building of a group of stores and houses on Pratt Street dating from 1850 to 1930; restored as a law office in the 1980s  
- Criterion 1d

79-019-27  
**Crandell-Rothstein House**  
14920 Main Street, Upper Marlboro  
- 1840s, 2 story, frame saltbox-and gable-roof dwelling built in several stages, with small bakery attached; remains of historic brick ovens in rear yard  
- Rare surviving example of a multisection building which served both residential and commercial purposes  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

79-019-28  
**Darnall's Chance House Museum & Burial Vault**  
NR  
14800 Governor Oden Bowie Drive, Upper Marlboro (M-NCPHC)  
- c. 1742, 1 1/2 story hip-on-gambrel-roof brick dwelling built by Scottish merchant James Wardrop; largest known 18th century underground brick burial vault in Maryland  
- Home of Dr. Adam Thomson, inventor of the American Method of Smallpox Inoculation  
- House renovated in 1858 in the Italianate style by E.G.W. Hall  
- Reconstructed to original appearance in 1988

79-019-45  
**A. T. Brooke House**  
5600 Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro  
- c. 1870, 1893, 2-part, 2 story, gable-roof dwelling, with traditional I-house plan and cross-gabled addition; built by Augustine T. Brooke, clerk of Prince George's County Court; enlarged in 1893 to serve as Trinity Church rectory; landmark on west entrance to Upper Marlboro  
- Criteria 1d, 2e
Old Marlboro Primary School
14554 Elm Street, Upper Marlboro
• 1896, 1921, 1 story wood frame structure with central gabled entrance bay
• Built by Benjamin Cranford; the 1896 school was a replacement building for an earlier public school for girls built in 1867; the building was converted to a residence in 1921; highly visible small-scale landmark in Upper Marlboro
• Criteria 1d, 2e

Old Marlboro High School
14524 Elm Street, Upper Marlboro
• 1921, 1934, mission-style masonry school with neoclassical auditorium added on the front in 1934
• Designed by Thomas H. Marsden/Hollyday & Stahl and a highly visible landmark in Upper Marlboro
• Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

Bunnell-Anderson House
14509 Church Street, Upper Marlboro
• 1830, vernacular 2 story, 3-bay single-family dwelling enlarged in 3 phases spanning 160 years; originally I-house form it is now composed of a two-story main block that faces eastward
• A dwelling, owned by John Duckett, was sited on this lot as early as 1817; possibly it was incorporated into the present main block; in 1843, the property was transferred to Reuben Bunnell, a carpenter; the house reflects 4 different periods of building construction and is significant as an example of the progression of a rural, 19th-century house
• Criteria 1d, 2a

Upper Marlboro Post Office
14730 Main Street, Upper Marlboro
• 1936, Colonial Revival post office, square wooden cupola with wrought iron weather vane
• Converted to library in 1995; 1938 WPA mural “Tobacco Cutters” by Mitchell Jamieson prominently displayed over front desk
• Criteria 1a, 2a, 2c, 2e

Crain Highway Monument
Old Crain Highway at Main Street, Upper Marlboro
• 1922, bottle-shaped sandstone and concrete rusticated stone monument
• Designed by architect Howard Sill and built to mark the beginning of construction of the Robert Crain Highway between Baltimore and southern Maryland
• Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

Site of Overseer’s House
5611 Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro
• 1745, house moved to 6601 S. Osborne Road, Upper Marlboro in April 1993 and restored; (see 82A-044)
• Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e
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79-038  **Pentland Hills Site**
Danenhower Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1830s and later, the now demolished house consisted of two sections (parallel design but not same period) joined by a perpendicular stair passage
- South wing built as home of Benjamin Hodges; second wing and passage added later, forming squared-C footprint with courtyard; house form was unique in the county owned by Hodges family
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

79-046  **Union Methodist Episcopal Chapel Site & Cemetery**
Valley Lane, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1865, there are approximately 38 grave markers that stand close to the road; 71 marked graves and an unknown number of unmarked graves lie in a largely open, grassy area; the grave markers are of various designs and materials and span nearly a century; with few exceptions, the grave markers are small and bear minimal inscription, most appear handmade
- In 1865, Frederick Sasscer and his wife sold five acres of land "near the village of Upper Marlborough" to three trustees of the Colored Methodist Church to be used for a church and burying ground; the chapel was abandoned in 1916 and disappeared around 1983; (see also 79-019-20)
- Criteria 1d, 2e

79-057  **Woodlawn and Murdock Tenant House Site**
1141 Largo Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1858, ornate 3 story frame Greek Revival-style house with shallow hip roof; underwent extensive renovation in 1936 and 1974
- Built by Washington J. Beall; one of the few surviving large Greek Revival style plantation houses in the county
- Site of a ca. 1732-1793 tenant house complex owned by William and Addison Murdock
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a

79-058  **Perrywood**
810 Manor House Drive, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1840, 1941, 2 story frame house with hip-on-hip roof, Georgian plan and 20th-century hyphens and wings
- Five part country house built for Samuel Brooke, site of Brooke family home for five generations; renovated for William H. Tuck in 1941
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2c, 2e

79-059  **Saint Barnabas’ Episcopal Church & Cemetery**
14705 Oak Grove Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1774, 2 story brick structure, laid in Flemish bond, with hip-on-hip roof; third church on site, restored in 1974
- Built during the rectorship of ardent Tory Jonathan Boucher; General Washington and Governor Eden attended services in earlier building on this site; English marble font and silver communion service (1718) and painting of “The Last Supper” by Gustavus Hesselius (1721) are among furnishings
- Criteria 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

---

1 Map of Environmental Setting included at end of Chapter 16.
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79-060 Beechwood
ES
15919 Leeland Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1913, frame hip-roof dwelling of Neo-Classical style with two-story portico and Colonial Revival-style interior detail
- Built on site of George Hilleary’s 18th-century plantation house; home of prominent county genealogist, Effie Gwynn Bowie
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2e

79-063-05 Bowling Heights
NR
3610 Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro
- 1870s, 2½ story, 3 part Victorian Gothic mansion with outstanding Eastlake details and chapel wing; important group of historic outbuildings includes dairy, meat house and barns
- Largest house of this style in Prince George’s County; built by John D. Bowling, Jr., nearly identical to Villa de Sales (87B-036-13) built by Bowling’s sister in Aquasco

79-063-06 Bleak Hill
4103 Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro
- 1852, large, two-story, gable-roof frame house, with cornice brackets, lunette windows and Greek Revival-style decorative detail; historic outbuildings include springhouse and tobacco barn
- Built for Richard Smith Hill on land of his ancestors, the Hills of Compton Bassett; significant for its size and siting
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2e

79-063-07 Bowling-Buck House Site & Outbuildings
- c. 1896, 1906 and later additions, site of multi-part and multi-period frame farmhouse built by John D. Bowling and later altered by Bruce Buck and others
- Main house destroyed by fire in January 2006, but landscape features and agricultural outbuildings in vicinity of house remain
- Criteria 1a, 2a

79-063-10 Compton Bassett, Dependencies & Cemetery
NR
16508 Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro (M-NCPPC)
- 1780s, 2 story, hip-roof Georgian stuccoed brick house with fine interior detail; two brick dependencies and unique surviving brick chapel
- Part of William B. Hill’s Woodland plantation, home of his descendants to the present day; significant for Federal detail and important outbuildings

79-063-11 Ashland
NR
16109 Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro
- 1867, 2 story, hip-roof frame farmhouse with bracketed cornices and projecting bays; historic outbuildings include smokehouse, stable and barn
- Built for William Murdock Hill on part of his father’s large Woodland estate; fine example of period home of wealthy planter
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e
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79-063-12  **Gregor Hall**
4004 Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1926, 2½ story, 3-bay Flemish bond brick dwelling in the Colonial Revival Style with three gabled dormers on both sides and exterior end chimneys
- Substantial dwelling built for M. Hampton Magruder, a socially and politically prominent lawyer from a well-known county family
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

79-063-14  **John Henry Quander House**
3708 Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1870s, vernacular 1½ story, I-house with square plan and full width, one-story, fully enclosed porch with a shed roof
- John Henry Quander had been one of the large enslaved force of Mordecai Plummer; Quander purchased the land from Henry W. Clagett; rare early example of Reconstruction-era dwelling built by a newly freed African-American
- Criteria 1d, 1c, 2a

79-063-50  **Wyvill House (Linden Hill)**
4102 Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro
- 1889, 2½ story gable-roof frame dwelling with projecting central cross gable, and novelty shingles and perforated vergeboards at gable ends; historic outbuildings include meat house and barn
- Built for a member of the Hill family on part of the Woodland acreage; one of several fine dwellings in the Marlboro area designed by locally prominent carpenter John C. Wyvill
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 1b, 2e

80-001  **Oxon Hill Manor**
NR E 6901 Oxon Hill Road, Oxon Hill (M-NCPPC)
- 1929, large two-story neo-Georgian brick mansion with hip roof, flanking wings, and fine decorative detail
- Outstanding example of 20th-century estate-era architecture, designed by Jules Henri de Sibour for career diplomat Sumner Welles; built near the site of 18th-century Oxon Hill Manor which was destroyed by fire in 1895

80-002  **Salubria Site**
ES 6900 Oxon Hill Road, Oxon Hill
- c. 1830, farmhouse built by Dr. John H. Bayne; destroyed by fire in early 1980s
- Built by prominent local physician and agriculturist; home of five generations of Bayne family
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d

80-005  **Admirathoria (Upper Notley Hall)**
8409 Clay Drive, Fort Washington
- 18th century, altered c. 1870, 2½ story late Georgian brick house (Flemish bond) with asymmetrical floor plan and later mansard roof
- Home of the Rozer family for six generations; significant Georgian structure and unique example of its type in Prince George’s County
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2d

---

2 Preservation in place that incorporates into any construction any significant features—identified through required studies—is allowed if the significant site features with appropriate interpretive elements are not relocated to a more publicly accessible site.
Chapter 16·Historic Sites

80-006  Fort Foote
NR 8900 block of Fort Foote Road, Fort Washington (National Park Service)
• 1863, remains of Civil War fort, including earthworks, 10 gun mounts, 2 Rodman guns, and concrete magazine
• Southernmost of 68 forts erected during Civil War to defend Washington; now part of national park system
• Criteria 1a, 1b, 1d, 2d, 2e

80-016  Fort Washington (includes Site of Washburton Manor, 80-015)
NR 13551 Fort Washington Road, Fort Washington (National Park Service)
• 1814-1824, enclosed brick-upon-stone fortification with drawbridge
• Erected (after first fort was destroyed by American commander in 1814) to protect the capital city; designed by Pierre L'Enfant and completed by W.K. Armistead; it is now operated by the National Park Service as a museum and park; property also includes archeological remains of Warburton Manor, Colonial-era seat of Digges family

80-021  Friendly School
10115 Old Fort Road, Fort Washington
• 1890s and 1920s, small 1½ story frame front-gabled structure, converted from one-room schoolhouse to residence
• A schoolhouse has stood at this location since before the Civil War; one of few schoolhouses in the county surviving from the 19th century
• Criteria, 1d, 2e

80-022  Riverview Pavillion
12325 Hatton Point Road, Fort Washington
• 1885, 1921 Victorian wood frame pavilion, surrounded by porches on four sides
• Part of River View Park, which operated from 1885 to 1918; after park closed it was converted to residence for family of Colonel James Gillespie
• Criteria 1a, 2a

80-024-07  Saint John’s Episcopal Church & Cemetery
NR 9801 Livingston Road, Fort Washington
• 1766, rectangular brick church, Flemish bond, with flared hip roof; rebuilding of 1722 church structure
• Fourth church built on this site in Piscataway (King George’s) Parish; one of the oldest church sites in Prince George’s County

80-024-09  Piscataway House
E 10307 Livingston Road, Fort Washington
• Mid-18th century, rebuilt 1932, 1½ story frame house with four freestanding brick chimneys and pent, dormers decorated with fluted pilasters and returned cornice
• Fine example of Tidewater Colonial domestic architecture; moved to present location from village of Piscataway and rebuilt in 1932 by Charles Collins of Harmony Hall
• Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c
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80-024-10  **Want Water Ruins**
NR  
10511 Livingston Road, Fort Washington (National Park Service)  
- c. 1710, the gambrel-roof brick end walls of Want Water stand near water’s edge  
- Probably built for Thomas Addison; home for several generations to Magruder and Lyles families  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

80-024-11  **Harmony Hall (Battersea)**
NR  
10511 Livingston Road, Fort Washington (National Park Service)  
- 1760s, 2½ story side-gabled brick mansion with fine interior detail  
- Closely related homes of Tyler, Magruder, and Lyles families; significant for pre-Georgian and Georgian architectural detail, and spectacular location on the Potomac at Broad Creek  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

80-048  **Tulip Hill Farm on the Potomac**
12001 Riverview Road, Fort Washington  
- 1939, building fronted by a large pedimented portico on the west; the house consists of an amalgamation of parts of many older buildings  
- Criteria 2c, 2e

80-050  **Addison Family Cemetery**
National Avenue, Oxon Hill  
- 18th and 19th century, the cemetery is sited approximately 28 feet above the surrounding grade and is enclosed by a chain link fence; archeological investigations in 1985 identified 15 burials and suggested that 15 to 25 additional burials may be present  
- Once part of Oxon Hill Manor plantation established by Thomas Addison in the early 18th century; occupied by members of the Addison family until 1812, when property was purchased by Zachariah Berry; members of the Berry family and their tenants occupied the mansion until it burned in 1895  
- Criteria 1a, 1c

80-051  **Riverview Road Archeological Site**
Riverview Road, Fort Washington (M-NCPPC)  
- 6000 B.C. to A.D. 1300, nomadic people lived intermittently at the site from the prehistoric Archaic period to Woodland period.  
- Archeological investigations revealed prehistoric stone tools, ceramics, and hearths & historic artifacts  
- Criteria 1a, 1d

81A-001  **Poplar Hill on His Lordship’s Kindness**
7606 Woodyard Road, Clinton  
- 1784-1787, 5-part brick Georgian mansion (Flemish bond) with 2½ story hip-roof central block, hyphens and wings, and elegant decorative detail; rare surviving group of historic outbuildings includes smokehouse, wash house, privy, slave hospital and pigeon cote; cemetery on property  
- Home of Darnall, Sewall and Daingerfield families; outstanding example of elegant and carefully detailed Georgian plantation house

---

3 The cemetery is now located within the Beltway Parcel of the National Harbor development and is described as Parcel 3, comprising .054 acres. National Harbor is designated as a Metropolitan Center in the approved General Plan and the comprehensive Master Plan/SMA; the requirements for the preservation and protection of the cemetery and development adjacent to the cemetery shall be as set forth in the approved Conceptual Site Plan (SP-98012); Detailed Site Plan (DSP-07073) and a Memorandum of Agreement dated August 2, 2000 with the Maryland Historical Trust and Maryland Department of the Environment.
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81A-007 Mary Surratt House
9110 Brandywine Road, Clinton (M-NCPPC)
- 1852, 2 story, side-gabled frame dwelling, with post office and tavern room and attached kitchen wing
- Home of Mary Surratt, implicated by her acquaintance with John Wilkes Booth, and hanged for conspiracy in the Lincoln assassination; the Surratt family dwelling served also as tavern, post office, and polling place; now operates as a popular museum

81A-008 James Gardiner House
9408 Juliette Drive, Clinton
- 1922, 2½ story, 5-bay Colonial Revival style single family dwelling
- Built for James St. Clair Gardiner and his wife Catherine; he served on the Board of Directors of Clinton Bank, farm subdivided in 1956 by John M. and Elizabeth Pryde
- Criteria 2a, 2e

81A-027 Christ Episcopal Church & Cemetery
8710 Old Branch Avenue, Clinton
- 1928, Flemish-bond brick-veneer church composed of a rectangular-plan nave with a square tower at its southwest corner and a hyphen at its northwest corner connecting a 2 story addition; decorative bargeboard with a collar beam is sited within the upper gable end of the façade
- Built to serve the rural community of Clinton; the building expanded during the late 20th century as the congregation grew; excellent example of an early- to mid-20th-century Gothic Revival-style church
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

81B-001 Steed Family Cemetery
3308 Tinkers Branch Way, Fort Washington
- The only remaining feature of Belleview Plantation, 1792-1830, built for Lowe family; main house destroyed by fire October 1996; outbuildings demolished
- Resting place of more than 20 members of Steed family and presumably Lowe family members as well; cemetery is evocative of 19th century burial practices
- Criteria 1d, 2d, 2e

81B-003 Thrift Schoolhouse
11110 Thrift Road, Clinton (M-NCPPC)
- 1884, 1 story, 3-bay wood-frame schoolhouse w/side-gabled roof
- Constructed for white students in the county, the school served several communities until a new, more convenient site for a school was chosen in 1909; significant as one of the oldest extant schoolhouses in the county and an excellent example of vernacular school architecture from the late 19th century
- Criteria 1d, 2a

81B-004 Wyoming & Cemetery
NR
- c. 1760, c. 1800, c. 1850, 1½ story gambrel-roof frame house with exterior brick chimneys and pent, and attached wings in telescope form; historic outbuildings include barns and corncrib
- Marbury home until 1973; outstanding example of telescoping; significant also for fine Federal-style interior trim
81B-007  **William H. Townshend House**  
12804 Windbrook Drive, Clinton  
- 1870s, vernacular wood frame dwelling with center gable  
- Built by William Henry Townshend and still owned by his family  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

81B-011  **Providence Methodist Episcopal Church & Cemetery**  
10610 Old Fort Road, Fort Washington  
- 1903, Colonial Revival style church; a 1-story, 1-bay front-gabled portico shelters the main entry in the steeple; the portico is supported by wood posts; fenestration consists of 9/9 windows with multi-light lunette transoms  
- Built to serve a small congregation in rural Fort Washington, the building expanded as the congregation did, and is now a landmark along Old Fort Road that stands out for its architectural details  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

82A-000-07  **Weston & Clagett Family Cemetery**  
ES 6601 Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro  
- Early 19th century, 2½ story, gable-roof brick house (Flemish bond) with fine interior detail; expanded and rebuilt, possibly incorporating earlier Clagett family dwelling; historic outbuildings include meat house, stables and barns  
- Fine Federal-style home built on the site of eleventh-generation seat of Clagett family; family graveyard on grounds  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

82A-000-37  **Beacon Hill**  
5905 Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro  
- 1898, wood frame Colonial Revival dwelling, 1-story hip-roof wraparound porch  
- Built by Alexander Marshall Marbury of “Wyoming” (81B-004) on part of the old David Craufurd farm, Kingston; he wanted a house similar to Ellerslie (82A-034)  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

82A-002  **Pleasant Hills**  
NR 7001 Croom Station Road, Upper Marlboro  
- 1830s, two-story gable-roof brick plantation house of side-hall-and-double parlor plan, and earlier attached wing; elegant fanlight and interior grained doors  
- Home of the Sasscer and Hill families; excellent example of transitional Federal/Greek Revival style plantation house with outstanding period trim  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a

82A-004  **Trinity Episcopal Church Rectory**  
6112 Ivy Ridge Court, Upper Marlboro  
- c. 1865, c. 1901, 3 part vernacular frame house includes additions and a rear wing that create a T-shaped plan  
- Land purchased from Dr. Frederick Sasscer in 1865; served as rectory until 1892, then sold to James I. Coffren who added rear wing; purchased by Anthony Wyvill, whose family lived there until 1992  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

---

4 Map of Environmental Setting included at end of Chapter 16.
James Christmas House
7201 Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1897, 2½ story, 3-bay Queen Anne-style dwelling with a 1 story wraparound porch that extends the width of the façade and three-quarters of the east elevation; roof is flat-on-hipped style
- James Miller Christmas established himself in the county as a successful businessman who owned a sawmill and lumber company in Croom; the house represents the economic prosperity Prince George's County experienced at the turn of the 20th century
  - Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c

Site of Sasscer’s Green
7108 Crain Highway SE, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1820 and earlier; 1½ story gable-roof frame house with exterior brick chimneys and fine early 19th-century decorative detail; destroyed by fire in December 2004
- Home of the Sasscer family; was a good example of small southern Maryland plantation house with elegant interior trim
  - Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

Trumps Hill
8103 Trumps Hill Road, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1854, 3-part frame house; mid-19th-century 2-story pyramidal-roof plantation house with Greek Revival-style trim, joined to earlier one-story side-gabled structure
- Good and nearly intact example of popular side-hall-and-double-parlor plan house, built for B.F. Duvall, prominent in county politics and society
  - Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a

Woodstock
8706 Crain Highway SE, Upper Marlboro
- Main block ca. 1850, earlier wing 2½ story gable-roof frame house, with earlier 1 ½ story kitchen section; exterior brick chimneys
- Home of locally prominent Belt family; good example of rural Greek Revival style plantation house; a local landmark
  - Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

Holy Rosary Roman Catholic Church & Cemetery
9961 Rosaryville Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1928, frame gable-roof church with gothic-arch windows and two-story square corner bell tower
- Built to replace the original Catholic church of 1859, continuing tradition of early 18th-century rural Boone’s Chapel; prominent local landmark
  - Criteria 1d, 2e

Mount Airy
8714 Rosaryville Road, Upper Marlboro (State of Maryland)
- c. 1740 and late 18th century, complex 3-part brick structure, incorporating early 18th-century gambrel-roof dwelling; rebuilt after 1931 fire, and recently renovated as a country inn; historic outbuildings include stable and greenhouse
- Home of Calvert family during Provincial period, later frequently visited by George Washington; in this century, home of Mathilda R. Duvall and Eleanor “Cissy” Patterson
  - Criteria 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e
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82A-017  **Joshua Turner House**  
8801 Frank Tippett Road, Upper Marlboro  
- 1880s, 2½ story frame cross-gabled dwelling, with panelled gables and 20th-century stucco covering; elegant Victorian interior trim  
- Built for Baltimore entrepreneur Joshua J. Turner, this late Victorian country house has particularly fine Queen Anne style detail  
- Criterion 2a

82A-019  **Boys’ Village of Maryland Cemetery**  
Frank Tippett Road & Surratt’s Road, Cheltenham  
- 1870 and onward, concrete and granite grave markers laid out in 3 sections; cemetery currently located within Cheltenham Veterans’ Cemetery adjacent to Boys’ Village Property  
- Boys’ Village of Maryland was one of the earliest and largest juvenile detention and reformation centers established as the “House of Reformation and Instruction for Colored Boys;” Enoch Pratt of Baltimore was the main benefactor of the institution  
- Criteria 1a, 1d

82A-023  **Furgang Farm**  
ES 10700 Furgang Road, Upper Marlboro  
- 1897, 2½ story T-shaped farmhouse with gable ends ornamented with fishscale shingles; complex of farm buildings; historic outbuildings include summer kitchen, dairy and carriage house  
- Excellent example of late Victorian farm complex in its original setting of domestic and agricultural buildings  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

82A-026  **Bellefields & Sim Family Cemetery**  
NR E 13104 Duley Station Road, Upper Marlboro  
- 18th century, 20th-century wings; 2 story brick Georgian plantation house (Flemish bond) with exterior chimneys and flanking wings  
- Home of Sim family, including Colonel Joseph Sim, Revolutionary leader; from this site, American leaders observed the approach of British troops in August 1814

82A-027  **Duvall Tobacco Barns**  
North of Marlton Avenue within Rosaryville State Park  
- Late 19th, early 20th century; complex consists of two barns, a silo, two hay pens, and a shed  
- Constructed for George T. Duvall; property later deeded to the State of Maryland Department of Natural Resources for Rosaryville State Park; barns exhibit different traditional agricultural forms and materials; excellent examples of late-19th- and early-20th-century agricultural structures  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

82A-034  **Site of Ellerslie**  
ES 6700 Green Grove Place, Upper Marlboro  
- 1895, 2½ story frame gable-roof dwelling of Colonial Revival style destroyed by fire in 2008  
- Built by prominent Upper Marlboro Judge Richard B. B. Chew on site of his father’s early 19th-century plantation house, which was also destroyed by fire in 1894  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a
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82A-035 **Chew’s Bridge**
6900b Van Wagner Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1898, 90-foot-long wood and iron bridge supported by upright posts constructed of iron Phoenix sections
- Built to span the tracks of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad, and connect two parts of Judge Chew’s Ellerslie farm; only known bridge surviving from the early years of this railroad line; owned by Consolidated Rail Corporation
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a

82A-038 **Solitude**
6705 South Osborne Road, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1840, 2 story frame gable-roof house in two sections, with pedimented entrance with fanlight; immediate grounds of the dwelling include a multiperiod range of small agricultural outbuildings adapted for a variety of uses.
- Representative of Prince George’s County frame farmhouse of early to mid 1800s, renovated in 20th century
- Criteria 1d, 2a

82A-039 **Mount Clare**
6606 Woodyard Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1859, 2½ story frame farmhouse with central cross gable and fine Italianate decorative elements
- Built by Richard O. Mullikin, and for nearly a century the Binger farm; fine example of mid-19th-century cottage-style farm dwelling
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

82A-041 **Woodyard Site**
NR
Woodyard Circle, Upper Marlboro
- Location of Henry Darnall’s early 18th-century mansion and merchant Stephen West’s Revolutionary War supply factory; temporary headquarters of American troops during British invasion in 1814; important historical archeological site

82A-042-21 **Cheltenham Methodist Church & Cemetery**
11111 Crain Highway, SW, Cheltenham
- 1879, board-and-batten gable-roof church building with projecting three story entry bell tower
- Good example of late 19th-century rural church architecture, unusual for its board-and-batten siding
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

82A-044 **Bacon Hall**
6601 South Osborne Road, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1745, 1800, 1900, vernacular frame and post and beam dwelling with modern additions to the side and rear
- Built on Craufurd family’s Bacon Hall plantation; enlarged c. 1800 and 1 story wing added c. 1900, also used as tenant house; possibly the oldest frame building in Prince George’s County; relocated from Old Crain Highway in April 1993 and restored and enlarged
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a
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82B-000-13 Brookfield United Methodist Church & Cemetery
12806 Croom Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1909, Gothic Revival, wood frame church with 2 story bell tower
- Excellent example of a 20th century Gothic Revival church
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

82B-002 Marlboro Hunt Club
5902 Green Landing Road, Upper Marlboro
- c. 1855, 1880 and 1920s, 2 story board-and-batten structure expanded from original central three-bay section to nine bays in length; 19th-century French hunt-scene wallpaper
- Originally a small domestic structure at mid-19th-century steamboat landing on Patuxent River; became hunt club in 1880s, visited by Theodore Roosevelt and other prominent “gentlemen hunters”
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2d, 2e

82B-003 Billingsley
6900 Green Landing Road, Upper Marlboro (State of Maryland)
- Mid-18th century, remodeled in 1931, 1½ story side-gabled brick house (Flemish bond with glazed headers) with steep gable roof and steeply pitched 20th-century cross gables
- Built for Weems family; remodeled in mid-19th century and in 1931; spectacular riverfront location
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

82B-004 Mount Calvert
16800 Mount Calvert Road, Upper Marlboro (M-NCPPC)
- Late 18th century, 2½ story gable-roof brick house with exterior chimneys and pent, and fine Federal-style interior detail; only historic structure remaining at site of Charles Town, first seat of Prince George’s County government; scenic location overlooking confluence of Western Branch and Patuxent River
- Criteria 1a, 1b, 1d, 2a, 2c

82B-006 Sansbury-Griffith House
8000 Croom Station Road, Upper Marlboro
- 1875, 1915, 2 story, 3-bay dwelling rests on a poured concrete foundation; weatherboard siding clads the wood-frame structure; a 1-story, 3-bay porch is located on the façade and a 2-story, 1-bay addition with flanking 1-story porches has been added to the dwelling
- The farmhouse represents the shift from large plantations to smaller farms which occurred in the county during the late 19th century
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

82B-007 William W. Duley House
8100 Croom Road, Upper Marlboro
- Early 19th century, 1870s, two-story frame Victorian dwelling with flared gable roof, attached to earlier small 1-1/2 -story dwelling
- Built by Judson Scott and William Duley, associated with early commercial ventures in this area; prominent local landmark
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a
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82B-009  Waverly
NR
8901 Duvall Road, Upper Marlboro
• 1855, two-story board-and-batten frame house with hip roof and fine Italianate decorative detail; two original domestic outbuildings in same style
• Built by John W. Burroughs on part of Mount Calvert Manor; one of few surviving examples of Italianate board-and-batten construction; fine original interior detail
• Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

82B-025  Nottingham Archeological Site
NR
Nottingham Road, Upper Marlboro
• 500 B.C.-1600 A.D., middle and late Woodland village site
• Possibly the site of Native American village indicated on John Smith’s 1608 map

82B-035-16  Nottingham Schoolhouse
17410 Nottingham Road, Nottingham (M-NCPPC)
• 1911, 1 story, 3 bay vernacular building with a front-gable roof and overhanging eaves and German siding; a 1 story, projecting front-gabled entry wing on façade
• Built on the site of a previous school, reusing materials from that building
• Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

82B-035-17  Turton-Smith House
17414 Nottingham Road, Upper Marlboro
• c. 1850, 1857, vernacular wood frame dwelling with salt-box roof
• Built for Richard Turton in 1850s, this is the only surviving structure in Nottingham from the 19th century
• Criteria 1a, 2a

82B-035-20  Plater House
17415 Watershed Drive, Upper Marlboro
• 1901, large 2½ story multisection frame house with attached two-story water tower, in prominent location overlooking the Patuxent River
• Built by Plater family on site of earlier dwelling destroyed by fire; greatly altered and enlarged in the late 20th century
• Criteria 1d, 2e

82B-036  Ashland Hay Barn
E
5519 Green Landing Road, Upper Marlboro
• c. 1830, c. 1855, large gable-roof multipurpose barn with long roof planes sloping away from a central peak; incorporates horse stalls, hay storage and corncribs
• Enlarged by William B. Hill of Compton Bassett c. 1855 and given to son William M. Hill after Civil War
• Criteria 1d, 2a

82B-038  Site of Columbia Air Center
Croom Airport Road, Upper Marlboro (M-NCPPC)
• 1941-1956; served as the first licensed African-American-owned and -operated airport in the country; established by John Greene, and primarily used by former Tuskegee Airmen
• Located near the Patuxent River; interpretive signage tells the story of the historic airfield and the role it played in the aviation history of the county, state, and nation
• Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d
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83-002

**Accokeek Creek Archeological Site**
Bryan Point Road, Accokeek
- Site occupied between 3000 B.C. and c. 1600 A.D.; important source of information about local Piscataway Indians before 1200 A.D.

83-006

**Strawberry Hill**
14300 John Clagett Drive, Accokeek
- 1785, wood-frame structure clad in wide weatherboard siding; double exterior-end corbelled brick chimneys are located on the north and south elevations of the rectangular plan
- Originally built in Charles County, Strawberry Hill was relocated in 1965; the building is an excellent example of a late 18th-century vernacular plantation house with double chimneys; Strawberry Hill was constructed for Richard Clagett and has been associated with various branches of the Clagett family for almost two hundred years
- Criteria 2a, 2e

83-008

**Christ Episcopal Church & Cemetery**
600 Farmington Road West, Accokeek
- 1748, 1857, 1 story gable-roof brick church (Flemish bond) with bracketed cornice and hood moldings over round-arch windows
- Lower chapel for St. John’s, Broad Creek; burned in 1856, rebuilt on original walls
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

83-009

**Dr. William G. Hardy House (Kuehn House/Ellerbrook Farm)**
16100 Old Marshall Hall Road, Accokeek
- 1855, 2 story, 5-bay Greek Revival-style farmhouse was built around a 1-story, 2-room log structure; at the southeast corner of the interior, log-cabin framing is visible, including large, rough-hewn logs filled with wattle and daub; a large portico is supported by paired wood Tuscan columns
- Excellent example of the Greek Revival style; the architecture of the farmhouse is unique in Prince George’s County
- Criteria 2a, 2c

83-012

**Archeological Site (Piscataway Park)**
3400 block Bryan Point Road, Accokeek
- Prehistoric to present, the site lies within 4,000 acres of parkland in both Prince George’s and Charles Counties, including Accokeek Creek Site and National Colonial Farm
- Principally significant for its role in maintaining the historic vista across the Potomac River from Mount Vernon

84-001

**Saint James Hill**
14200 Livingston Road, Clinton
- 1830s, 2½ story gable-roof brick house (Flemish bond) attached to early 1½ story gable-roof frame building, renovated and expanded in the 20th century
- Home of Dr. Benedict J. Semmes (U.S. Congressman); unique joining of architectural elements; prominent local landmark
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2d, 2e
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84-020</td>
<td><strong>Bellevue</strong></td>
<td>200 Manning Road East, Accokeek</td>
<td>c. 1840</td>
<td>2½ story Greek Revival-style frame plantation house of side-hall-and-double-parlor plan with exterior chimneys, pent, and attached kitchen wing. One of several surviving examples in Prince George’s County of popular mid-19th-century house style; typical of successful small plantations of the period</td>
<td>1a, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-023-03</td>
<td><strong>Piscataway Tavern</strong></td>
<td>2204 Floral Park Road, Clinton</td>
<td>c. 1750; c. 1810</td>
<td>2½ story gable-roof frame house, attached to older 1 ½ story section. Operated as tavern and store by Thomas Clagett; important element in 18th-century town of Piscataway</td>
<td>1d, 2a, 2d, 2e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-023-05</td>
<td><strong>Hardy’s Tavern</strong></td>
<td>2305 Floral Park Road, Clinton</td>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>2½ story gable-roof brick building (Flemish bond). Operated as tavern by the Hardy family from 1790s to 1840s; residence since Civil War period; important element in town of Piscataway</td>
<td>1d, 2d, 2e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-023-06</td>
<td><strong>Edelen House</strong></td>
<td>8401 Floral Park Road, Brandywine</td>
<td>1830s, 1930</td>
<td>3 part 2½ story side-gabled frame dwelling with 1930s brick veneer and flanking hyphens and wings. Main block built for Dr. Horace Edelen, significant as an altered and enlarged plantation house</td>
<td>1d, 2a, 2e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-023-08</td>
<td><strong>Dr. Edgar Hurtt House</strong></td>
<td>2308 Floral Park Road, Clinton</td>
<td>18th and early 19th centuries and 1912</td>
<td>Two-part frame dwelling with two-story, side-gabled main block and one-story wing. A local landmark, the residence and office of one of Piscataway’s best-known citizens, Dr. Edgar Dewitt Hurtt; represents three centuries of construction</td>
<td>1c, 1d, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-023-10</td>
<td><strong>Saint Mary’s Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>13401 Piscataway Road, Clinton</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Gothic revival brick church, 2 story projecting pyramidal roof entry bell tower and buttresses. Built by Wyvill brothers of Upper Marlboro who had built St. Mary’s Church in Upper Marlboro in 1899</td>
<td>1d, 2a, 2e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
85A-013  **Gwynn Park**  
ES  
8118 Grayden Lane, Brandywine  
- 1857, 2 story gable roof brick house with Georgian plan and highly decorative cornice composed of courses of molded bricks  
- Home of William H. Gwynn, built to replace earlier house destroyed by fire; local landmark significant for unusual cornice treatment  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

85A-032-09  **William W. Early House**  
NR  
13907 Cherry Tree Crossing Road, Brandywine  
- 1907, 2½ story Queen Anne-style frame dwelling, with octagonal corner tower and fine jigsawn and shingle detail  
- Built for one of the members of the Early family, prominent in the railroad village of Brandywine; one of the best examples of its type still standing in the county  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a, 2e

85A-032-10  **William Berry Early House**  
13904 Cherry Tree Crossing Road, Brandywine  
- 1896 and c. 1910, 2½ story frame house reflective of the popular Queen Anne style, with 2 story bay with turret and wraparound porch  
- Constructed by William Berry Early in preparation for his marriage to Angela D. Petty; their growing family resulted in the significant enlargement of the originally modest I-house and the application of Queen Anne-style details  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

85A-032-11  **William H. Early Store**  
14134 Brandywine Road, Brandywine  
- 1872, 2½ story building constructed in the Colonial Revival mode to function as a general store; the wood-frame structure is 2 bays deep and 5 bays wide with a centered entry in the side-gabled south facade; 1-story, wraparound porch fronts the structure  
- Excellent example of late 19th-century commercial growth tied to the 1870s expansion of the railroad to Brandywine  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a

85A-032-27  **Chapel of the Incarnation**  
NR E  
14070 Brandywine Road, Brandywine  
- 1916, L-shaped Mission-style church constructed of poured-in-form concrete covered with coarse pebble-filled stucco to resemble adobe; church built as mission chapel of St. Thomas Episcopal Church of Croom  
- Land given by Herman Badenhoop, one of the founders of the Bank of Brandywine; designed by Washington architect William J. Palmer  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

85A-032-30  **Old Bank of Brandywine**  
14110 Brandywine Road, Brandywine  
- 1912, stucco covered molded concrete block building with gable roof entry porch supported by slim Tuscan posts  
- Built by the Southern Maryland German-American Bank; taken over by Citizen’s Bank and Trust Company in 1963, it was replaced and converted to a residence; now used for storage. Only building of its type surviving in Prince George’s County  
- Criteria 1d, 2e
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85A-033-14  **Marlow-Huntt Store**  
ES  
13700 Old Brandywine Road, T. B.  
- 1867, 1 ½ story frame front-gabled commercial building; cornice embellished with jigsawn brackets  
- Originally constructed as a general store and operated by T. B.’s most prominent citizen, J. Eli Huntt; property also includes a much-altered casket shop, c. 1878  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

85B-007  **Cedarville Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) Cottages**  
Cedarville State Forest Road, Cedarville  
- 1940s, 1½ story, two-bay frame cottages with brick chimneys and exposed rafter tails under roof eaves  
- Excellent example of CCC construction; the modest vernacular utilitarian buildings are significant for their CCC association within the Cedarville State Forest  
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2d

85B-008  **Cedarville Charcoal Kiln**  
Cedarville State Forest Road, Cedarville  
- 1940s, cinder block kiln with dirt floor  
- The structure is significant for its association with the Civilian Conservation Corps and its unique form and function in Prince George’s County and the State of Maryland  
- Criteria 1a, 2a, 2d

86A-000-18  **Brookfield at Naylor**  
12607 Croom Road, Upper Marlboro  
- Main block 1856, with earlier wing; 2-story frame dwelling covered with brick veneer, attached to older brick wing; extensively altered in 1968  
- Incorporates early 19th-century home of prominent merchant Michael Carroll; home of the Duvall family from 1856 through 1985  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2e

86A-004  **Brookewood & Cemetery**  
ES  
12807 Duley Station Road, Upper Marlboro  
- c. 1858, Greek Revival-style frame plantation house of unusual asymmetrical plan, with two-story center block and one-story flanking wings and 20th century brick veneer;  
- Home for nearly a century of the Wood family; fine Victorian trim, and interior plan unique in Prince George’s County  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a

86A-005  **West End Farm**  
10709 Croom Road, Upper Marlboro  
- c. 1855, 2 story gable-roof frame house of popular side-hall-and-double parlor plan; small two-story addition; historic corncrib on grounds  
- Home of prominent Marlboro attorney C.C. Magruder; good example of country home of successful professional man  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a
86A-012  **Saint Simon’s Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery**  
Saint Thomas Church Road, Croom  
- c. 1929; 70 marked graves and an unknown number of unmarked graves; the grave markers vary in design and material and include concrete and marble tablets, bronze and granite flush plaques, and 13 concrete crosses  
- Saint Simon’s Chapel was a frame building constructed c. 1894 on the grounds of St. Thomas’ Episcopal Church Rectory (86A-027-08); the chapel was a mission chapel for African-American communicants of St. Thomas’ Church and was moved across St. Thomas Church Road to the present site in 1902; the church was closed in 1964 and demolished in 1974  
- Criteria 1d, 2e

86A-013  **Saint Mary’s Methodist Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery (Myers Cemetery)**  
South side of Croom Airport Road, east of Route 382, Croom  
- c. 1918; 43 marked graves and an unknown number of unmarked graves; markers include marble and concrete tablets, concrete and wooden crosses, granite headstones, granite flush markers, slate pieces, and metal funeral home signs  
- The African-American congregation of St. Mary’s began meeting in 1905 in an old log building on this site; they constructed a frame church c. 1911; under the leadership of the Rev. Frederick D. Myers, St. Mary’s church was renovated in 1947; the church was destroyed by fire in 1965  
- Criteria 1d, 2e

86A-015  **Mattaponi & Cemetery**  
ES 11000 Mattaponi Road, Upper Marlboro  
- 18th century, rebuilt c. 1820, 2 story hip-roof brick house (Flemish bond) with flanking wings; fine interior detail of transitional Federal/Greek Revival period; several barns on property; significantly altered in the 1950s  
- Country home of Governor Robert Bowie, rebuilt in then-current style after his death in 1818  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2d, 2e

86A-020  **Brookefield of the Berrys**  
NR 12510 Molly Berry Road, Upper Marlboro  
- c. 1810 and 1840, 2 story side-gabled frame house with exterior brick chimneys and two-story veranda; one-story kitchen wing attached; historic outbuildings include meat house, corncrib and granary  
- Good example of plantation house and outbuildings, owned by Berry family since 1839; incorporates elements of both Federal and Greek Revival styles  
- Criteria 1d, 2a

86A-022  **Benjamin Mackall House & Cemetery**  
12518 Plantation Drive, Brandywine  
- c. 1790, 1910, 1½ story gable-roof frame house with steeply pitched gable roof and outstanding Federal-style interior trim; later two-story, front-gabled addition  
- Owned continuously by the Mackall family for two centuries; good example of modest dwelling house with particularly fine early interior trim  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 2a
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86A-027-06  **Dr. William Gibbons House**  
10205 Croom Road, Upper Marlboro  
- 1893, 2½ story cross-gable frame house; one-story bracketed porch across main facade; historic meat house on grounds  
- Home and office of Dr. William H. Gibbons; representative modest late Victorian house and important element in historic village of Croom  
- Criteria 1c, 2a

86A-027-07  **Saint Thomas Episcopal Church & Cemetery**  
14300 Saint Thomas Church Road, Upper Marlboro  
- 1742-45, cruciform, brick church with Gothic Revival stained glass windows; apse added in 1859, and three-story entry tower added in 1888  
- Built as chapel-of-ease for northern St. Paul's Parish; home church of Thomas John Claggett, first Episcopal Bishop consecrated in United States; focal point of Croom community  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2e

86A-027-08  **Saint Thomas Episcopal Church Rectory**  
10108 Croom Road, Croom  
- 1853, 1887, 1919, cross-gabled frame dwelling of cruciform plan unique in county; the Sexton's House (tenant house) built 1887 is a 2 story frame side gable house clad with wood shingles and rests on a brick pier foundation  
- Built for Samuel R. Gordon who served as rector of Saint Thomas from 1853-1882; sold by the church in 1964 for use as a private residence  
- Criteria 1a, 2a

86A-027-09  **Croom Schoolhouse**  
10100 Croom Road, Croom  
- 1907-1908, wood frame, pebble-dash-stuccoed schoolhouse with projecting front gable entrance, rear hip porch  
- Built to replace an earlier school that had been located on the property since 1866; converted to residence in 1934; the only surviving school of this type and period in Prince George's County  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

86A-027-10  **Coffren House**  
10007 Croom Road, Croom  
- c. 1860, 2½ story frame dwelling of side-hall-and double-parlor plan; historic outbuildings include corncrib, hogpen, stables and barn  
- Fine example of Greek Revival-style home of successful merchant/postmaster; focal point in 19th century village of Croom  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

86A-027-11  **Coffren Store**  
10007 Croom Road, Croom  
- c. 1853, 1860, 2 story frame store building with catslide roof retains original interior elements of store and post office;  
- Built for John Coffren, who served as postmaster and storekeeper in third quarter of 19th century  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e
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86A-027-25  **Blanche Ogle House**  
9912 Croom Road, Upper Marlboro  
- c. 1890, two-part, 2 story side-gabled frame farmhouse with bracketed porch and several farm outbuildings  
- Representative rural vernacular architecture, an important component of the historic Croom landscape  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

86A-027-45  **Tayman Tobacco Barn**  
14201 Saint Thomas Church Road, Croom  
- c. 1941, frame tobacco barn located within a 4.6 acre parcel at the corner of Croom Road and Saint Thomas Church Road; recently restored with grant funds from Preservation Maryland and the National Trust for Historic Preservation  
- Representative and highly visible example of a mid-twentieth century tobacco barn with internal stripping room  
- Criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, 2e

86B-001  **Gibbons Methodist Episcopal Church Site, Education Building & Cemetery**  
Gibbons Church Road, Brandywine  
- 1920s, 1 story front-gabled frame building; cemetery c. 1900 onward  
- Founded by a group of formerly enslaved African Americans in 1884 who constructed a frame church building in 1889; it was demolished in 1967; congregations like this helped build a sense of community and self-determination among members in an era when political, social, and economic opportunities were limited by the failure of Reconstruction-era reforms and the strictures of government-sponsored segregation  
- Criteria 1a, 1d

86B-002  **Rosemount (Skinner-Martin House)**  
13201 Martin Road, Brandywine  
- Main block 1835, 18th-century wing, two-story gable-roof frame I-house attached to earlier 1½ story kitchen wing; fine transitional Federal/Greek Revival style interior trim  
- Built for Benjamin Skinner and attached to earlier structure; excellent example of early 19th century planter’s house  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

86B-004  **Skinner Family Cemetery**  
Cheswicke Lane, Upper Marlboro  
- 19th century, only surviving feature of large Skinner family plantation  
- Replica metal fence surrounds cemetery plots  
- Criteria 1c, 1d

86B-005  **Nottingham-Myers Methodist Church & Cemetery**  
15601 Brooks Church Road, Upper Marlboro  
- 1939, 1983, vernacular wood frame and wood clapboard sided church; connecting wing and hyphen constructed in 1983  
- Focal point for the black population in the Croom-Nottingham region; strong historical connections to the Mansfield plantation and to the work of the Freedmen’s Bureau  
- Criteria 1a, 2d
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86B-006 Turner House
15905 Tanyard Road, Upper Marlboro
- Late 18th century, 1½ story, two-room frame tenant dwelling with center chimney
- Only known example of 18th century center-chimney frame dwelling in Prince George’s County; 18th century brick vaulted burial tomb on adjoining property (HR 86B-042)
- Criteria 1a, 2a

86B-008 Waring Tenant House
16400 River Airport Road, Brandywine
- c. 1861-1878, vernacular wood frame dwelling with semi-octagonal bays, trefoil tracery circular window
- Built on Waring property called Bald Eagle; John Henry Waring was a wealthy planter with southern sympathies
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

86B-009 Kalmia (Kalaird)
15110 Nelson Perrie Road, Brandywine
- 1840s, 1927, 2½ story, gable-roof frame house with exterior brick chimneys, house extensively renovated and expanded in 20th century; several barns on property
- Local landmark because of size, age, and visibility; home of Baden and Perrie families
- Criteria 1d, 2d, 2e

86B-010 Black Walnut Thicket
15508 Letcher Road East, Brandywine
- 1856, c. 1930s, attached to earlier small dwelling, three-part frame plantation house consisting of 2½ story main block, kitchen building and connecting hyphen; extensively altered in 1930s
- Unusual building complex; main block begun by merchant Michael B. Carroll; later the home of R. W. G. Baden family
- Criteria 1d, 2a

86B-014 Saint Paul’s Episcopal Church & Cemetery
NR
13500 Baden Westwood Road, Brandywine
- 1735, 1794, cruciform brick gable-roof church (Flemish bond), with round-arch windows and unique sundial over entrance
- Built as church of St. Paul’s Parish; in continuous use since its construction; in 1780, Thomas John Claggett became rector of St. Paul’s Church

86B-018 Immanuel United Methodist Church & Cemetery
17400 Horsehead Road, Brandywine
- 1896, Gothic Revival vernacular frame front-gable church with lancet windows
- One of the oldest Methodist congregations, founded as Smith’s Meeting House in 1794; Francis Asbury preached here in March 1813
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

86B-019 Horsehead Tavern
17505 Aquasco Road, Brandywine
- Early 19th century, 1870s, 2 story gable-roof frame building constructed in two stages, may incorporate an 18th century structure, significantly altered
- An “ordinary” or tavern on this site since 1739; private residence since c. 1900
- Criteria 1d, 2d
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86B-037  **Wilmer’s Park**
15710 Brandywine Road, Brandywine
- 1947-1970; 80-acre parcel containing the ruins of a dance hall, motel, ranch house, covered stage, baseball and football fields
- As a major stop on the Chitlin Circuit, Wilmer’s Park opened its doors to African-American musicians, entertainers, athletes and fans from the early 1950s through the late 1960s; the bandstand at Wilmer’s Park showcased everyone from Duke Ellington and Otis Redding to the Temptations, Patti La Belle, and a young Stevie Wonder
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 2d

86B-038  **Sasscer Tobacco Barn**
13400 Molly Berry Road, Brandywine
- c. 1917, a large 1 story wood-frame tobacco barn with a rectangular form, solid concrete foundation and a gambrel roof; the interior is remarkably intact, and the lattice of tier poles on which the tobacco was hung are still present
- Located on land originally associated with the c. 1894 Sasscer House (86B-003) known as Keys Quarters; the barn is now located on a subdivided lot that includes a new house
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

87A-009  **Connick’s Folly & Cemetery**
18807 Aquasco Road, Brandywine
- 1857, brick, common bond, 5 bay, 2½ story Federal-style dwelling and outbuildings
- Built for Clement R. Connick; a rare late example of a mid-19th-century Federal-style farmhouse; Connick’s Folly received its name as a result of the building material chosen by Connick; in the mid-19th century, a brick house in lower Prince George’s County was virtually unknown
- Criteria 1d, 2a

87A-010  **Saint Thomas Methodist Church & Cemetery**
ES 18810 Aquasco Road, Brandywine
- 1911, frame meeting-house style rural chapel; gothic-arch windows with tracery
- Built to replace the Reconstruction-era school/church building; focal point of local black community and best surviving example of its type
- Criteria 1d, 2a

87A-011  **Green Hill (Poplar Hill)**
19404 Aquasco Road, Aquasco
- c. 1830, 1941, 2 story gable-roof frame house with one-story wing; extensively altered in 20th century; 19th-century tobacco barn in ruins on property
- Typical frame farmhouse of this period, built by George W. Marriott
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

87A-012  **Poplar Hill School**
19104 Croom Road, Brandywine
- 1936, side-gabled frame schoolhouse
- Significant for its role in the history of public education for African Americans in Prince George’s County during the era of government-sanctioned segregation; the second school for “colored” students in the area, replacing a small one-room schoolhouse located approximately 600 feet to the northwest
- Criteria 1a, 1d
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87A-018 Black Swamp Farm
16815 Milltown Landing Road, Brandywine
- 1915, 2½ story, 4-bay vernacular style farmhouse
- Owned by the Rawlings family from 1877 to 1970; the main dwelling, which was built to replace the original residence, is a representative example of a rural vernacular dwelling; barn ruins, property includes chicken coop, barn, trailer, corn crib, two sheds, and well head
- Criteria 1d, 2a

87A-022 H. B. Trueman House
20218 Aquasco Road, Aquasco
- c. 1850, 2½ story multisection frame dwelling which incorporates a small mid-19th-century plantation house; surviving outbuildings include blacksmith/wheelwright shop
- This modest dwelling retains some Greek Revival-style detail; together with outbuildings, exemplifies agricultural and industrial heritage of the county
- Criterion 1d

87A-057 Black Swamp School
E 19011 Croom Road, Brandywine
- 1899, wood frame 3-bay side-gabled schoolhouse with gabled vestibule
- Officially “Colored School No. 2, District 8,” Black Swamp School served as a replacement for the Freedmen’s School in Horsehead, the new school gained its colorful appellation from its proximity to Black Swamp Creek; it was converted to a residence in the 1930s
- Criteria 1a, 1d

87B-028 Trueman Point Landing
18610 Trueman Point Road, Aquasco
- 1817, 1932, Steamboat landing 1860-1930; remains of pilings still visible; warehouse no longer survives
- Served as river port for Woodville (Aquasco) farmers throughout 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries; bought in 1817 by Captain George Weems who established riverboat landing
- Criteria 1a, 1d

87B-033 John Wesley Methodist Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery
22919 Christ Church Road, Aquasco
- 1873, 1906, 1961, original church founded by James Gray, a freedman, in 1866; graveyard extends to the west and northwest of the church and contains approximately 120 marked graves, the oldest dating to 1915 and the most recent to 2005
- Significant as one of the earliest churches established by freedmen in Prince George’s County after the Civil War
- Criteria 1d, 2e

87B-034 Woodville School
21500 Aquasco Road, Aquasco
- 1934, 1 story frame schoolhouse with three classrooms built to serve black children in the Woodville/Aquasco area.
- The school house was sold by auction in 1956 to the Knights of St. John’s Commandery #373 for use as its headquarters
- Criteria 1d, 2e, 2a
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87B-036-05  **J.E. Turner House**  
16410 Saint Marys Church Road, Aquasco  
- c. 1857, 2½ story gable-roof frame house, with freestanding brick chimneys and bracketed cornice; historic outbuildings include slave quarter and smokehouse  
- Significant for the decorative pattern of cornice brackets and for surviving outbuildings including frame slave quarter  
- Criteria 1d, 2e, 2a, 2c

87B-036-08a  **Saint Mary’s Rectory**  
NR 16305 Saint Marys Church Road, Aquasco  
- 1848, 1856, 2½ story Greek Revival/Italianate front-gabled frame rectory; unusual entry hall plan and fine interior detail  
- Built as rectory for both St. Paul’s and St. Mary’s Parish and served as such for more than a century; floor plan and detail representative of popular mid-19th-century house style  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

87B-036-08b  **Saint Mary’s Episcopal Church & Cemetery**  
22200 Aquasco Road, Aquasco  
- 1920, a front-gabled, stucco-covered, Tudor-inspired frame church that replaced a 1848 church on the site  
- Built and still serves as a mission chapel of St. Paul’s Episcopal Church in Baden  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

87B-036-12  **Saint Phillip’s Episcopal Chapel Site & Cemetery**  
16205 St. Phillips Road, Aquasco  
- 1878; approximately 108 marked graves and an unknown number of unmarked graves on the 1½ acre property; grave markers are of varying designs and materials  
- First of two Episcopal chapels built for African Americans; frame chapel constructed on the site c. 1880 was destroyed by fire in 1976; at the southwestern corner of the parking area stands the bell cote and bell which survived the 1976 fire  
- Criteria 1d, 2e

87B-036-13  **Villa de Sales**  
NR 22410 Aquasco Road, Aquasco  
- 1877, large frame 2½ story Victorian Gothic mansion with outstanding Eastlake decorative detail; unique stable building of exceptional design; historic outbuildings include also a meat house, chicken house and barn  
- Built for Fanny Bowling Forbes; important collection of Victorian outbuildings; nearly identical to larger version, Bowling Heights (79-063-05), built near Upper Marlboro by Mrs. Forbes’ brother  
- Criteria 1c, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e

87B-036-14  **William R. Barker House**  
22600 Aquasco Road, Aquasco  
- c. 1830, c. 1877, large 2½ story gable-on-hip-roof frame house with elegant Victorian decorative detail; historic outbuildings include meat house, shed, and barn; now-vanished 2-story servants wing stood to the south  
- Built for Maryland Delegate William R. Barker, and later embellished with fine Victorian trim; unique example of this type of architecture  
- Criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2c, 2e
**Wood House**
22606 Aquasco Road, Aquasco
- Early 19th century, 1½ story gable-roof frame house with façade-wide porch across front, and attached kitchen wing; extensively renovated in 1950s
- Home of two important local families, the Woods and the Selbys; significant visual feature in Village of Aquasco
- Criteria 1d, 1a, 2e

**Grimes House**
22609 Aquasco Road, Aquasco
- c. 1800, c. 1850, 1½ story gable-roof frame house built in two sections, with rooflines of varying pitch; bracketed Victorian porch ties two sections together; grounds include a complex of farm outbuildings in bad repair
- Interesting example of expansion of modest dwelling; significant visual feature in Village of Aquasco
- Criteria 1d, 2d, 2e

**James A. Cochrane Store**
22609 Aquasco Road, Aquasco
- c. 1850, 1½ story, 3-bay vernacular building has a rectangular form; set on a solid concrete-block foundation, this wood-frame building is covered in horizontal sheets of metal with a pattern suggesting American-bond brickwork; a porch supported by large brackets is located on the front
- Rare example of a mid-19th-century rural front-gable commercial building in the county; notable also for its ghost signage on the front
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

**Adams-Bowen House**
16002 Doctor Bowen Road, Aquasco
- 1890, 2 story hip-roof-frame house with interior end chimneys and central bay entrance, original Victorian decorative elements such as jig-sawn balusters and dormers have been removed to achieve a Colonial Revival appearance; ice house, two poultry houses, meat house, and stable/barn on grounds
- Designed for Catherine P. Adams by architect William H. H. Kesler of Washington, D.C.; home from 1897 to 1964 of Dr. H.M. Bowen family
- Criteria 2a, 2e, 2c

**P. A. Bowen Farmstead (Maplewood Farm)**
15701 Doctor Bowen Road, Brandywine
- c. 1870, 2½ story gable-roof frame dwelling house with fine Italianate trim and unusual parapet roof treatment; outbuildings include smoke house, and 19th century tobacco barn; 20th century additions to side and rear
- Dwelling house and outbuildings constitute physical representation of a 19th century farmstead
- Criteria 1d, 1a, 2e
87B-036-21  **Sunnyside (Stone House)**  
NR  
16005 Doctor Bowen Road, Aquasco  
- 1844, 2 story gable roof frame house, one room deep, enlarged and connected to 18th-century kitchen building; 19th-century meat house and corncrib on the property  
- Fine example of mid-19th-century southern Prince George’s County farmhouse and agricultural outbuildings  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e

87B-036-35  **Keech House**  
22700 Aquasco Road, Aquasco  
- 1900, 1½ story, 3-bay, vernacular dwelling with a bungalow form, hip roof and full-width porch  
- Unusual rural form from first quarter of 20th century displaying Victorian architectural details; three barns from the 1930s are adjacent to the house  
- Criteria 1d, 2a, 2e
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Old Town College Park Historic District (66-042)

The Old Town College Park Historic District, designated by District Council action on January 28, 2008, is located east of US 1, south of the University of Maryland campus, west of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad/Amtrak right-of-way, and north of the Calvert Hills subdivision within the City of College Park. The historic district includes 216 properties with a total of 295 primary and secondary resources. A total of 211 of the resources contribute to the historic context of the district, while 84 resources are identified as noncontributing. There are 154 contributing primary resources, and 61 noncontributing secondary resources. There are 57 contributing secondary resources, and 23 noncontributing secondary resources.

The Old Town College Park Historic District was designated on the basis of three criteria from Subtitle 29-104: Criterion (A)(1)(iv); Criterion (A)(2)(i); Criterion (A)(2)(iv). The primary period of significance for the Old Town College Park Historic District extends from 1889 to 1950. The University of Maryland has made a distinct contribution to the historic context of the neighborhood; as a result, a second period of significance for the university-related properties extends from 1935 to 1965.

Old Town College Park is a representative example of the many residential subdivisions that emerged as the suburbs of Washington, D.C., which expanded with the advent of the streetcar and automobile at the end of the nineteenth century and in the early- to mid-twentieth century. Washington-based real estate developers John O. Johnson and Samuel Curriden submitted the original plat for “College Park” in 1889 on property historically associated with the Stier and Calvert families. The 125-acre community was laid out specifically to attract middle- and upper-middle-income residents, persons associated with the nearby Maryland Agricultural College (now the University of Maryland), and, later, with the College Park Airport. The development of the area, which began slowly, was spurred by the growth of neighboring suburbs, the university, and the transportation resources such as the Washington and Baltimore Turnpike, the streetcar, and Baltimore & Ohio (B&O) Railroad that traversed the community. The second such suburb planned near the college (the failed College Lawn which had been platted in 1872), College Park, was one of the first successful commuter suburbs located along the railroad and turnpike in Prince George’s County.

The greatest period of residential development began in the 1920s and subsided with the end of World War II. The buildings constructed in Old Town College Park illustrate the popular and fashionable styles, forms, and materials of the period. The variety of architectural styles included Queen Anne and Colonial Revival as well as later designs and forms such as the American Foursquare, Cape Cod, Bungalow, and Craftsman. Fraternities, sororities, and modestly sized apartment complexes were constructed in Old Town College Park in the mid-twentieth century to meet the needs of the growing university. These buildings, generally occupying large lots with landscaped yards, illustrate many of the architectural styles presented by their single-family residential neighbors on a grander scale. Today, well-landscaped streets and well-built, freestanding, single-family dwellings, garden apartments, and university housing define the community.

Broad Creek Historic District (80-024)

The Broad Creek Historic District, designated by District Council action on July 30, 1985, is located on both sides of Livingston Road, west of Indian Head Highway (MD 210), south of Old Fort Road, and north of Fort Washington Road. The historic district includes approximately 460 acres, much of which is within the Henson Creek Stream Valley Park. The Broad Creek Historic District includes approximately 50 properties and 28 standing structures. The district includes four eighteenth-century structures that are individually designated county historic sites. The remaining structures date from the 1920s through the middle of the twentieth century, and two dwellings were completed in the 1990s.

The Broad Creek Historic District was designated on the basis of five criteria from Subtitle 29-104: Criterion 1(A)(i); Criterion (1)(A)(iii); Criterion (1)(A)(iv); Criterion (2)(A)(i); and Criterion (2)(A)(iv).
Old Town College Park County Historic District (66-042)
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The Broad Creek Historic District is a rural district in southern Prince George’s County near the Potomac River estuary known as Broad Creek. The district derives its significance from the collection of four early-to mid-eighteenth-century landmarks that are the remnants of the eighteenth-century port town of Aire. The three extant structures represent a range of eighteenth-century building types, including an early mid-Atlantic planter’s house, a high-style Georgian-plan riverfront mansion, and a church. A fourth structure, a long-standing ruin and archeological site, is an additional example of an early Tidewater dwelling. Taken together, these structures provide an important perspective on the early architectural development of southern Prince George’s County. The historic district presents an important opportunity to interpret the architecture and lifeways of the later half of the eighteenth century and the vanished Town of Aire, established by an Act of the Maryland Assembly in 1706.

St. John’s Church, 9801 Livingston Road, is a one-story brick church of simple rectangular form with Flemish bond masonry, a hip roof, and large, evenly spaced, multipaned windows. The present church constructed in 1766, replaced two frame structures built in 1695, which were replaced by a brick church in 1722. The early eighteenth-century church was destroyed by fire and replaced by the present structure, which is surrounded by an ancient and still used graveyard shaded by mature trees.

Both Harmony Hall, located at 10511 Livingston Road, and its associated Want Water Ruins are owned by the National Park Service and are listed in the National Register. The finely detailed house from the 1760s displays the full-Georgian plan, Flemish bond masonry and symmetrical organization typical of a house of the period for a prominent local family. The house was possibly built for Thomas Addison and was subsequently inhabited by generations of both the Magruder and Lyles families. The Want Water Ruins is likely the earliest remnant of the vanished Town of Aire and may date to c. 1710. All that remains of this frame and brick house, which was extensively restored in the early 20th century, are portions of two masonry chimneys and end walls.

Piscataway House, 10307 Livingston Road, is a one-and-one-half-story frame dwelling with a steeply pitched roof, covered porches on the front and rear (west and east), and flanking hyphens and wings on the north and south. The house, constructed c. 1750, was moved from its original location in the town of Piscataway in the 1930s to avoid demolition and was restored. At the time of the restoration, the once separate brick kitchen to the north was attached to the main house with a hyphen. In 1980, a compatible hyphen and wing were added to the south of the main block.

The area around Broad Creek was surrounded by large tobacco plantations, housing numerous enslaved laborers. After the Civil War, many formerly enslaved African-American families remained in the Broad Creek area and worked on tenant farms or were able to purchase their own farms, such as members of the Humphries, Shorter, and Warrick families. Henry and Chloe Hemsley settled on a tract in the northern part of the Broad Creek community near St. John’s Church, which is where the parish hall now sits.

Limited archeological testing by the National Park Service from 1985 to 1987 revealed clues to Broad Creek’s long history. Excavations confirmed Native American occupation of the area prior to the end of the seventeenth century. Evidence of an earlier earthfast structure came to light to the east of the eighteenth century Harmony Hall plantation house. Additional archeological investigations could provide evidence of the early port town of Aire.
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Broad Creek County Historic District (80-024)
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Legend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Historic Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Historic Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHD</td>
<td>National Register Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHL</td>
<td>National Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>Historic District (County designated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Easement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Environmental Setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property titles in **bold** type indicate county-designated historic sites or county-designated historic districts. Property titles in regular type indicate historic resources.

Individual listings in the National Register of Historic Places are identified by NR; National Register historic districts are identified by NRHD; National Historic Landmarks are identified by NHL.

Properties subject to an easement are identified by E, and county-designated historic sites with revised environmental settings are identified by ES.

Contributing resources within National Register Historic Districts and county-designated historic districts are not listed in the inventory unless they are individually designated as historic sites, historic resources, or individually listed in the National Register.

This inventory is organized by planning areas; the subregion associated with each planning area is also indicated. All of the properties in the inventory of historic resources are listed or illustrated on the large-format maps that accompany the plan.
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PA 60 NORTHWESTERN—SUBREGION 1

**HS NR ES 60-004**  Ammendale Normal Institute Site
**HS NR 60-007**  Saint Joseph’s Roman Catholic Chapel & Cemetery
**HR 60-009**  Washington, Berwyn, & Laurel Railway Culvert

PA 61 FAIRLAND-BELTSVILLE—SUBREGION 1

**HS 61-002**  Orme-Shaw House
**HS 61-007**  Dr. Charles Fox House (Coffin House)
**HS 61-009**  Saint John’s Episcopal Church & Cemetery
**HS 61-011**  McLeod-Forrester House
**HS ES 61-012**  Sellman House (USDA)
**HS 61-013**  Gallant House

PA 62 SOUTH LAUREL-MONTPELIER—SUBREGION 1

**HS E ES 62-003**  Oaklands & Cemetery
**HS NR 62-004**  Snow Hill
**HS NHL 62-006**  Montpelier & Cemetery
**HS 62-008**  Muirkirk Furnace Site
**HS 62-010**  Briarley Academy (Old Hotel)
**HR 62-012**  Edward M. Ulle House
**HS 62-013**  Walnut Grange
**HR 62-014**  Beltsville Agricultural Research Center
**HS 62-016**  Edward Gross House Site
**HC 62-023**  Rossville Historic Community
**HS NR E 62-023-07**  Abraham Hall
**HS 62-023-17**  Thomas Matthews House
**HR 62-023-20**  Muirkirk School
**HS 62-023-21**  Queen’s Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery

PA 64 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER—SUBREGION 1

**HS 64-001**  Snowden Hall
**HS 64-002**  Duvall Bridge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>64-004</td>
<td>Hayden Farm (USDA) Farmhouse #3 Bldg. 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>64-005</td>
<td>Perkins Methodist Chapel &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NHL</td>
<td>64-006</td>
<td>GSFC Magnetic Test Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>64-007</td>
<td>Holst Cabin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA 65 TAKOMA PARK and LANGLEY PARK—SUBREGION 2 (West)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>65-001</td>
<td>Powder Mill Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>65-004</td>
<td>William Forney House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>65-005</td>
<td>Cool Spring Farm (Miller’s House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>65-006</td>
<td>Adelphi Mill &amp; Storehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>65-007</td>
<td>McCormick-Goodhart Mansion (Langley Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>65-008</td>
<td>Green Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>65-010</td>
<td>D.C. Boundary Marker NE 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>65-011</td>
<td>D.C. Boundary Marker NE 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>65-013</td>
<td>Green Hill Overseer’s House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>65-015</td>
<td>Rizzo House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA 66 COLLEGE PARK, BERWYN HEIGHTS and VICINITY—SUBREGION 2 (West)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>66-000</td>
<td>Lakeland Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>66-001</td>
<td>Brown’s Tavern Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>66-004</td>
<td>College Park Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-014</td>
<td>Lakeland Community High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-015</td>
<td>Buck-Singleton House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>66-018</td>
<td>Lake House (Presbyterian Parsonage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>66-027</td>
<td>Daniel’s Park Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-027-24</td>
<td>Baker-Holliday House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-027-25</td>
<td>LaValle House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-027-28</td>
<td>Bowers-Sargent House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHD</td>
<td>66-029</td>
<td>University Park National Register Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-029-05</td>
<td>Bloomfield (Deakins House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>66-030</td>
<td>College Heights Estates Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>66-035</td>
<td>University of Maryland at College Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HS</th>
<th>66-035-02</th>
<th>Rossborough Inn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-035-06</td>
<td>Morrill Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-035-07</td>
<td>Calvert Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>66-036</td>
<td>National Archives Archeological Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHD</td>
<td>66-037</td>
<td>Calvert Hills National Register Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>66-042</td>
<td>Old Town College Park Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-042-08</td>
<td>Cory House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-042-09</td>
<td>College Park Woman's Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-042-10</td>
<td>McDonnell House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>66-042-11</td>
<td>Harrison Store &amp; Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS E</td>
<td>66-042-30</td>
<td>Taliaferro House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>66-042-31</td>
<td>Holbrook House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 67 GREENBELT and VICINITY—SUBREGION 2 (East)

| HR   | 67-001 | William Shea House (USDA) Farmhouse #1 |
| NHL  | 67-004 | Greenbelt, Maryland National Historic Landmark |
| HS NHL E | 67-004-01 | Greenbelt Center School |
| HR   | 67-004-03a | Greenbelt Cemeteries, Walker |
| HR   | 67-004-03b | Greenbelt Cemeteries, Turner |
| HR   | 67-004-03c | Greenbelt Cemeteries, Hamilton |
| HS   | 67-005 | Sportland |
| HS   | 67-006 | Beaverdam Creek Bridge |
| HS   | 67-008 | Civilian Conservation Corps Lodge |
| HC   | 67-022 | Berwyn Heights Historic Community |
| HS   | 67-022-01 | Kleindienst-Haker House |
| HR   | 67-022-03 | Willard-Ryan House #1 |
| HS   | 67-022-07 | Berwyn Heights School |
| HS   | 67-022-10 | Wetherald House |
| HS NR| 67-022-11 | O'Dea House |
| HS   | 67-022-12 | Stoner-Chlopicki House |
| HS   | 67-022-13 | Cross House |
| HS   | 67-022-14 | McNitt-Gohr House |
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| HS | 67-022-15 | Wolfe House |
| HS | 67-022-16 | Pickett House |
| HS | 67-022-17 | Kleiner House |
| HS ES | 67-022-18 | Cissel House |
| HS | 67-022-19 | Schniedman House |
| HS | 67-022-21 | Elwood J. Taylor House |
| HS | 67-022-23 | Graves-Keleher House |
| HS | 67-022-24 | Kleiner-Davidson White House |

### PA 68 HYATTSVILLE and VICINITY—SUBREGION 2 (West)

| HC | 68-000 | Avondale Historic Community |
| HS NR E | 68-001 | Ash Hill (Hitching Post Hill) |
| HR | 68-002 | Walker-Mowatt Mill Site |
| NRHD | 68-004 | Riverdale Park National Register Historic District |
| HS NR | 68-004-01 | Harry Smith House |
| HS | 68-004-02 | Warren House |
| HS | 68-004-03 | Calvert Family Cemetery |
| HS NHL E | 68-004-05 | Riversdale (Calvert Mansion) |
| HS | 68-004-67 | Read House |
| HS | 68-004-76 | Wernek House |
| HR | 68-008 | B&O Switching Tower/Alexandria Junction Site |
| NRHD | 68-010 | Hyattsville Residential Area |
| HS | 68-010-01 | Welsh House |
| HS | 68-010-02 | Lewis Holden House |
| HS E | 68-010-16 | McEwen House |
| HS | 68-010-17 | Frederick Holden House |
| HS | 68-010-25 | Harriet Ralston House |
| HS | 68-010-31 | Wheelock House |
| HS | 68-010-34 | Benjamin Smith House |
| HS | 68-010-35 | W. G. Lown House |
| HS | 68-010-62 | Marché House |
| HS | 68-010-65 | Edgewood |
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HS  68-010-73  William Shepherd House
HS  68-010-74  Fox's Barn
HS  68-010-80  Wilson-Ferrier-Windsor House
HC  68-012  Brentwood Historic Community
NRHD  68-013  Mount Rainier National Register Historic District
HR  68-013-01  Star/Potts Hall
HS  68-013-02  Prince George's Bank, Mount Rainier
HS  68-013-08  Charles M. Lightbown Building
HS  68-013-10  Sanitary Grocery Company Building
HS  68-013-36  Mount Rainier United Methodist Church
HS  68-013-39  Gonzalez House
HS  68-013-43  Saint James Roman Catholic Church
HS  68-013-59  Richards House
HS  68-013-60  Bellman House
HS  68-013-71a  Thomas W. Smith Farm House
HS  68-013-71b  Ziegler Cottage
HS  68-014  Dueling Grounds
HR  68-015  Battery Jameson (Fort Lincoln Cemetery)
HS NR  68-019  D.C. Boundary Marker NE 7
HS  68-022  ERCO
NRHD  68-041  Hyattsville Commercial Area
HS  68-041-01  Professional Building
HS  68-041-02  Prince George's Bank, Hyattsville
HR  68-041-03  Marché Florist
HS NR E  68-041-09  Hyattsville Armory
HS NR  68-041-40  Hyattsville Post Office
NRHD  68-061  North Brentwood National Register Historic District
HR  68-061-02  Orr House
HR  68-061-03  William H. Thomas House
HR  68-061-05  Owings House #1
HS  68-061-07  A. A. Randall House
HR  68-061-08  Edith Mason House
HS  68-061-11  North Brentwood AME Zion Church
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HR  68-061-13  Foursquare #1
HR  68-061-15  Foursquare #2
HS  68-061-19  Garland-Palmer House
HS  68-061-20  Sandy P. Baker House
HS  68-061-22  Quander-Dock House
HS  68-061-37  Peter Randall House
HS  68-076   Paxton House
HS  68-077   Dorr House
HC  68-079  Edmonston Historic Community
HS  68-079-01  Poppleton-Roberts House
NRHD  68-093  West Riverdale National Register Historic District
HC  68-096  Cottage City Historic Community
HS  68-096-20  Rural Cottage at The Highlands
HC  68-102  Edmonston Terrace Historic Community
HC  68-103  Colmar Manor Historic Community

PA 69 DEFENSE HEIGHTS, BLADENSBURG and VICINITY—SUBREGION 2 (East)
HC  69-000  New Carrollton Historic Community
HR  69-001  Spa Spring Site
HC  69-005  Bladensburg Historic Community
HS NR E  69-005-02  George Washington House
HS  69-005-06  Saint Paul’s Baptist Church
HS NR E  69-005-07  William Hilleary-Magruder House
HS NR  69-005-08  Market Master’s House
HS NR E  69-005-09  Bostwick
HR  69-005-10  Evergreen Cemetery (Presbyterian Church Site)
HS  69-005-16  Peace Cross
HS  69-012  Riverdale Baptist Church
HS  69-019  Browning-Baines House
HS  69-021  Cherry Hill Cemetery
HC  69-023  Ardwick Historic Community
HS  69-023-17  William Stanton Wormley House
HS  69-023-27  Thomas Hunster House
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>69-024</td>
<td>Cheverly Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-024-11</td>
<td>Mount Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-024-13</td>
<td>Magruder Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-024-14</td>
<td>Crawford’s Adventure Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-024-22</td>
<td>Raymond W. Bellamy House (Belmar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>69-024-25</td>
<td>Mount Hope Slave Quarter Ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-024-26</td>
<td>Cheverly United Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-026</td>
<td>Baltimore-Washington Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-028</td>
<td>Publick Playhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>69-036</td>
<td>Hilltop Manor Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>69-037</td>
<td>North Decatur Heights Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>69-038</td>
<td>Washington Suburban Homes Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>69-042</td>
<td>Landover Hills Historic Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 70 GLENN DALE, SEABROOK, LANHAM and VICINITY—SUBREGION 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-001</td>
<td>Magnolia Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-004</td>
<td>Franklin Pierce House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-005</td>
<td>Larcombe House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-008</td>
<td>Whitfield Chapel Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-009</td>
<td>Bald Hill School Ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-010</td>
<td>Crandell-Cook House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-017</td>
<td>Site of Buena Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-020</td>
<td>Marietta &amp; Duvall Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-021</td>
<td>Arthur G. Bowie House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-022</td>
<td>Duvall Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-024</td>
<td>Augusta DuVal House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-025</td>
<td>Prospect Hill &amp; Outbuildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-028</td>
<td>Dorsey Chapel (Brookland Methodist Church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-030</td>
<td>Arthur Magruder House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-031</td>
<td>Maple Shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-037</td>
<td>Burke-Jackson House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-038</td>
<td>Grigsby Station Log Cabin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-039</td>
<td>Boxlee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-040</td>
<td>Flint House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>70-049</td>
<td>Lincoln Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-049-33</td>
<td><strong>Thomas J. Calloway House</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-050</td>
<td>Glenn Dale Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>70-052</td>
<td>Glenn Dale Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-052-26</td>
<td><strong>Van Horn House</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-052-27</td>
<td><strong>Saint George’s Episcopal Chapel &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>70-053</td>
<td>Seabrook Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-053-11</td>
<td>Thomas Seabrook House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-053-12</td>
<td><strong>Seabrook Cottage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-053-13</td>
<td><strong>Seabrook School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-053-14</td>
<td><strong>Kelly Cottage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>70-081</td>
<td><strong>Buena Vista at the Wixon Farm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-087</td>
<td>Good Luck School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-089</td>
<td>Spalding-Rigoli House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-091</td>
<td><strong>Western Star Lodge Site &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA 71A BOWIE VICINITY—SUBREGION 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71A-002</td>
<td><strong>Albert Smith House</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71A-003</td>
<td><strong>Ingersoll House</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>71A-006</td>
<td>Washington, Baltimore, &amp; Annapolis Electric Railway Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71A-009a</td>
<td><strong>Holy Trinity Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71A-009b</td>
<td><strong>Holy Trinity Episcopal Church Rectory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>71A-012</td>
<td>Magruder Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>71A-013</td>
<td><strong>Fairview &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71A-019</td>
<td><strong>Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>71A-022</td>
<td>Fletchertown Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>71A-022-04</td>
<td>Noble Strother House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>71A-030</td>
<td><strong>D. S. S. Goodloe House</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71A-034</td>
<td><strong>Boyden House</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA 71B CITY OF BOWIE—SUBREGION 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>71B-002</td>
<td>Huntington/Bowie Historic Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71B-002-01</td>
<td>Straining House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71B-002-03</td>
<td>Ryon House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71B-002-05</td>
<td>Saint James’ Episcopal Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71B-002-08</td>
<td>Harmon-Phelps House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>71B-002-09</td>
<td>Bowie Railroad Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71B-002-23</td>
<td>Knights of Saint John Meeting Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>71B-003</td>
<td>Williams Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>71B-004</td>
<td>Belair Mansion &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>71B-005</td>
<td>Belair Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>71B-006</td>
<td>Lansdale Grave (Enfield Chase Site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71B-007</td>
<td>Mitchellville Store Site &amp; Storekeepers House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>71B-008</td>
<td>Mitchell Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>71B-015</td>
<td>Fair Running (Duvall Family Cemetery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR ES</td>
<td>71B-016</td>
<td>Melford, Outbuildings &amp; Duckett Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>71B-019</td>
<td>Colbert Family Farm Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 72 LANDOVER AREA—SUBREGION 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>72-001</td>
<td>Wilson Station Railroad Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>72-002</td>
<td>Beall’s Pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>72-004</td>
<td>Waring’s Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>72-005</td>
<td>Ridgely Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>72-006</td>
<td>Carmody House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>72-007</td>
<td>Seat Pleasant Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>72-007-01</td>
<td>Old Saint Margaret’s Roman Catholic Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>72-008</td>
<td>Addison Chapel &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>72-009</td>
<td>Fairmount Heights Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS E</td>
<td>72-009-09</td>
<td>Fairmount Heights School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS1</td>
<td>72-009-15</td>
<td>D.C. Boundary Marker NE 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-17</td>
<td>Samuel Hargrove House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS E</td>
<td>72-009-18</td>
<td>William Sidney Pittman House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>72-009-24</td>
<td>James F. Armstrong House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-25</td>
<td>Fairmount Heights (Grace) Methodist Episcopal Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-26</td>
<td>Trammell-Taylor House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR E</td>
<td>72-009-27</td>
<td>Towles-Brooks House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-28</td>
<td>Louis Brown House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>72-009-29</td>
<td><strong>Fairmount Heights World War II Monument</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS E</td>
<td>72-009-30</td>
<td><strong>Isaac Brown House</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-31</td>
<td>William B. Coles House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-32</td>
<td>John S. Johnson House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-33</td>
<td>Henry Pinckney House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-35</td>
<td>Cornelius Fonville House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-36</td>
<td>Doswell Brooks House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-39</td>
<td>Robert S. Nichols House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-009-43</td>
<td>Prince Albert Washington House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>72-010</td>
<td>Van Horn-Mitchell House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>72-014</td>
<td>D.C. Boundary Marker NE 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>72-016</td>
<td>Webb-Brown House (Berry-McKeel House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>72-021</td>
<td>Highland Park School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>72-026</td>
<td>Glenarden Historic Community (See also 73-026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-045</td>
<td>Harmony Memorial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>72-061</td>
<td>William &amp; Mildred Ridgley Gray Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>72-064</td>
<td>Fairmont Heights High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA 73 LARGO-LOTTSFORD—SUBREGION 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-005</td>
<td>Belvidere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>73-006</td>
<td>Newton White Mansion &amp; Warington Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-007</td>
<td>Cottage at Warington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-009</td>
<td>Rose Mount Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-012</td>
<td>Northampton Slave Quarters &amp; Archaeological Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>73-016</td>
<td>Mount Lubentia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-018</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>73-026</td>
<td>Glenarden Historic Community (See also 72-026)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA 74A MITCHELLVILLE and VICINITY—SUBREGION 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-002</td>
<td>Locust Grove (Slingluff House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-004</td>
<td>Holy Family Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-006</td>
<td>Pleasant Prospect &amp; Outbuildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-008</td>
<td>Mount Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-010</td>
<td>Mullikin's Delight &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-014</td>
<td>Seton Belt Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-015</td>
<td>Partnership &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-018</td>
<td>Bowieville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA 74B COLLINGTON and VICINITY—SUBREGION 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-001</td>
<td>Governors Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-006</td>
<td>Carroll Methodist Chapel &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-007</td>
<td>Hamilton House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-009</td>
<td>B. D. Mulliken House Site (Harwood Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-010</td>
<td>Mount Nebo AME Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>74B-011</td>
<td>Hopkins House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-012</td>
<td>Site of Queen Anne Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-013</td>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-014</td>
<td>Goodwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-015</td>
<td>Clagett House at Cool Spring Manor &amp; Cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>74B-016a</td>
<td>William Wells House Site at Cool Spring Manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-016b</td>
<td>Elliott-Beall House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>71B-030</td>
<td>Duvall-Hopkins Store at Hall Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA 75A SUITLAND, DISTRICT HEIGHTS and VICINITY—SUBREGION 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>75A-001</td>
<td>Concord &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>75A-006</td>
<td>Epiphany Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>75A-007</td>
<td>Forestville School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>75A-008</td>
<td>Forestville Methodist Episcopal Church Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>75A-021</td>
<td>Suitland House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>75A-028</td>
<td>Ridgeley School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>75A-030</td>
<td>Lincoln Memorial Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>75A-055</td>
<td>Heinemann-Payton House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chapter 18: Inventory of Historic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>75A-056</td>
<td>Greater Capitol Heights Historic Community (See also 75B-005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>75A-057</td>
<td>District Heights Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>75A-058</td>
<td>Boulevard Heights &amp; Bradbury Heights Historic Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 75B TOWN OF CAPITOL HEIGHTS—SUBREGION 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>75B-005</td>
<td>Capitol Heights Historic Community (See also 75A-056)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 76A THE HEIGHTS—SUBREGION 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76A-001</td>
<td>Ridgeway House Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76A-004</td>
<td>Saint Barnabas Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>76A-013</td>
<td>Mount Welby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>76A-014</td>
<td>Butler House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>76A-022</td>
<td>Suitland Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>76A-036</td>
<td>Forest Heights Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>76A-039</td>
<td>Morningside Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>76A-044</td>
<td>Hillcrest Heights Historic Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 76B HENSON CREEK—SUBREGION 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>76B-000</td>
<td>Camp Springs Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>76B-006</td>
<td>Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76B-007</td>
<td>Kildare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>76B-008</td>
<td>Saint Paul’s United Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>76B-009</td>
<td>Mattingly House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>76B-011</td>
<td>Bayne Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76B-012</td>
<td>Terrett House (Bird Lawn Manor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>76B-016</td>
<td>Site of Mount Hope AME Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>76B-017</td>
<td>Old Bells Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 77 MELWOOD—SUBREGION 6 (North)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>77-001</td>
<td>Forest Grove Methodist Episcopal Church (Chapel #2) &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>77-012</td>
<td>Saint Luke’s Methodist Episcopal Church Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>77-014</td>
<td>Belle Chance &amp; Darcey Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PA 78 WESTPHALIA and VICINITY—SUBREGION 6 (North)

HC  78-000  Clagett Agricultural Area (See also 79-000, 82A-000)

HS NR  78-000-18  The Cottage & Outbuildings

HR  78-008  Osborn-Talburtt Cemetery

HR  78-009  Talburtt Tobacco Barn (Westphalia Barn)

HR  78-010  Dunblane Site & Magruder-McGregor Family Cemetery

HS ES  78-013  Blythewood & Smith Family Cemetery

HS NR E  78-015  Melwood Park

HS  78-017  Charles Hill & Pumphrey Family Cemetery

HC  78-039  Little Washington Historic Community

PA 79 UPPER MARLBORO and VICINITY—SUBREGION 6 (North)

HC  79-000  Clagett Agricultural Area (See also 78-000, 82A-000)

HS  79-000-34  Oakland (Good Luck)

HR  79-000-36  Navajo Tenant House Site

HS  79-002  Montpelier of Moore’s Plains

HR  79-003  Buck-Nicholson House (Swanson Road Farm)

HS NR  79-004  Mount Pleasant & Cemetery

HC  79-019  Upper Marlboro Historic Community

HS  79-019-01  Thomas J. Turner House

HS  79-019-02  Jarboe-Bowie House

HS NR E  79-019-13  Kingston

HS  79-019-14  Church Street House (Talbott House)

HS  79-019-15  Trinity Episcopal Church & Cemetery

HS NR ES  79-019-16  Content

HS  79-019-17  Trelawn

HS  79-019-18  Digges-Sasscer House

HS  79-019-20  Union (Memorial) Methodist Church

HS NR  79-019-21  Old Mill Place (Traband House)

HS  79-019-22  Dr. William & Sarah Beanes Cemetery

HS  79-019-23  Magruder’s Law Office

HS NR  79-019-25  Saint Mary’s Beneficial Society Hall
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-019-27</td>
<td>Crandell-Rothstein House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>79-019-28</td>
<td>Darnall's Chance House Museum &amp; Burial Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-019-45</td>
<td>A. T. Brooke House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-019-51</td>
<td>Old Marlboro Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-019-52</td>
<td>Old Marlboro High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-019-54</td>
<td>Bunnell-Anderson House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-019-61</td>
<td>Upper Marlboro Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-019-64</td>
<td>Crain Highway Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-029</td>
<td>Site of Overseer’s House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>79-030</td>
<td>Mount Carmel Roman Catholic Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>79-038</td>
<td>Pentland Hills Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-046</td>
<td>Union Methodist Episcopal Chapel Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>79-057</td>
<td>Woodlawn &amp; Murdock Tenant House Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-058</td>
<td>Perrywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-059</td>
<td>Saint Barnabas’ Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>79-060</td>
<td>Beechwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>79-063</td>
<td>Woodland Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>79-063-05</td>
<td>Bowling Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-063-06</td>
<td>Bleak Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-063-07</td>
<td>Bowling-Buck House Site &amp; Outbuildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>79-063-10</td>
<td>Compton Bassett, Dependencies &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>79-063-11</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-063-12</td>
<td>Gregor Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-063-14</td>
<td>John Henry Quander House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-063-50</td>
<td>Wyvill House (Linden Hill)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA 80 SOUTH POTOMAC—SUBREGION 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>80-001</td>
<td>Oxon Hill Manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>80-002</td>
<td>Salubria Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-005</td>
<td>Admirathoria (Upper Notley Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>80-006</td>
<td>Fort Foote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>80-016</td>
<td>Fort Washington (includes Site of Warburton Manor, 80-015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>80-017</td>
<td>Hatton Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 18·Inventory of Historic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>80-018</td>
<td>Chapel Hill Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>80-018-01</td>
<td>Grace Methodist Episcopal Church Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>80-018-05</td>
<td>Lancaster House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-021</td>
<td>Friendly School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-022</td>
<td>Riverview Pavilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>80-024</td>
<td>Broad Creek Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>80-024-07</td>
<td>Saint John’s Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS E</td>
<td>80-024-09</td>
<td>Piscataway House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>80-024-10</td>
<td>Want Water Ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>80-024-11</td>
<td>Harmony Hall (Battersea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-048</td>
<td>Tulip Hill Farm on the Potomac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>80-049</td>
<td>Silesia Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-050</td>
<td>Addison Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-051</td>
<td>Riverview Road Archeological Site¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 81A CLINTON and VICINITY — SUBREGION 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS NHL</td>
<td>81A-001</td>
<td>Poplar Hill on His Lordship’s Kindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>81A-002</td>
<td>Marshall’s Mill Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>81A-006</td>
<td>Joseph Stephenson House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>81A-007</td>
<td>Mary Surratt House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81A-008</td>
<td>James Gardiner House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>81A-017</td>
<td>Berger Estate Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81A-027</td>
<td>Christ Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 81B TIPPETT and VICINITY — SUBREGION 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81B-001</td>
<td>Steed Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81B-003</td>
<td>Thrift Schoolhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>81B-004</td>
<td>Wyoming &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81B-007</td>
<td>William H. Townshend House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>81B-008</td>
<td>Gwynn-Parker Farmhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81B-011</td>
<td>Providence Methodist Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This property was the former site of the Lyles Family Cemetery, previously identified as 80-014. The Lyles Family Cemetery was legally relocated to the St. John’s Episcopal Church Cemetery in the Broad Creek Historic District.
### PA 82A ROSARYVILLE—SUBREGION 6 (North)

| Code | Number  | Name                                                                 |
|------|---------|                                                                     |
| HC   | 82A-000 | Clagett Agricultural Area (See also 78-000, 79-000)                  |
| HS ES| 82A-000-07 | **Weston & Clagett Family Cemetery**                                      |
| HS   | 82A-000-37 | **Beacon Hill**                                                      |
| HS NR| 82A-002 | **Pleasant Hills**                                                    |
| HS   | 82A-004 | **Trinity Episcopal Church Rectory**                                   |
| HS   | 82A-008 | **James Christmas House**                                              |
| HS   | 82A-009 | **Site of Sasscer’s Green**                                            |
| HS   | 82A-012 | **Trumps Hill**                                                       |
| HS NR| 82A-013 | **Woodstock**                                                         |
| HS   | 82A-015 | **Holy Rosary Roman Catholic Church & Cemetery**                       |
| HS E | 82A-016 | **Mount Airy**                                                        |
| HS   | 82A-017 | **Joshua Turner House**                                                |
| HS   | 82A-019 | **Boys’ Village of Maryland Cemetery**                                 |
| HS ES| 82A-023 | **Furgang Farm**                                                      |
| HS NR E| 82A-026 | **Bellefields & Sim Family Cemetery**                                   |
| HS   | 82A-027 | **Duvall Tobacco Barns**                                               |
| HS ES| 82A-034 | **Site of Ellerslie**                                                  |
| HS   | 82A-035 | **Chew’s Bridge**                                                     |
| HS   | 82A-038 | **Solitude**                                                          |
| HS   | 82A-039 | **Mount Clare**                                                        |
| HS NR | 82A-041 | **Woodyard Site**                                                      |
| HC   | 82A-042 | Cheltenham Historic Community                                          |
| HR   | 82A-042-18 | Old Cheltenham Dwelling                                          |
| HS   | 82A-042-21 | **Cheltenham Methodist Church & Cemetery**                           |
| HS   | 82A-044 | **Bacon Hall**                                                        |

### PA 82B MOUNT CALVERT-NOTTINGHAM—SUBREGION 6 (North)

| Code | Number  | Name                                                                 |
|------|---------|                                                                     |
| HC   | 82B-000 | Naylor Historic Community (See also 86A-000)                         |
| HS   | 82B-000-13 | **Brookfield United Methodist Church & Cemetery**                    |
| HR   | 82B-000-32a | William Burns Wilson House                                     |
| HR   | 82B-000-32b | Burns Wilson Shop                                                   |
| HR   | 82B-001 | House at Hill’s Landing Site                                        |
### Chapter 18: Inventory of Historic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-002</td>
<td>Marlboro Hunt Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-003</td>
<td>Billingsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-004</td>
<td>Mount Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-005</td>
<td>Chesapeake Beach Railway Bridge Ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-006</td>
<td>Sansbury-Griffith House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-007</td>
<td>William W. Duley House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>82B-009</td>
<td>Waverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-012</td>
<td>Ghiselin Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-015</td>
<td>Martha Roundell House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-021</td>
<td>Chesapeake Beach Railway Waiting Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-024</td>
<td>Archeological Site #168 (Mattaponi Site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>82B-025</td>
<td>Nottingham Archeological Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-026</td>
<td>Archeological Site #126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-027</td>
<td>Archeological Site #128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>82B-035</td>
<td>Nottingham Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-035-16</td>
<td>Nottingham Schoolhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-035-17</td>
<td>Turton-Smith House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-035-18</td>
<td>Stamp’s Store &amp; Post Office Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-035-20</td>
<td>Plater House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS E</td>
<td>82B-036</td>
<td>Ashland Hay Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-038</td>
<td>Site of Columbia Air Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 83 ACCOKEEK—SUBREGION 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>83-001</td>
<td>Bryan’s Point/Colonial Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NHL</td>
<td>83-002</td>
<td>Accokeek Creek Archeological Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>83-006</td>
<td>Strawberry Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>83-008</td>
<td>Christ Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>83-009</td>
<td>Dr. William G. Hardy House (Kuehn House; Ellerbrook Farm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>83-011</td>
<td>Accokeek Creek Site (Moyaone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>83-012</td>
<td>Archeological Site (Piscataway Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>83-013</td>
<td>Archeological Site #148, Farmington Landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>83-014</td>
<td>Archeological Site #149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>83-015</td>
<td>Archeological Site #151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PA 84 PISCATAWAY and VICINITY — SUBREGION 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>84-001</td>
<td>Saint James Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>84-012</td>
<td>Frederick Coe House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>84-014</td>
<td>Asbury Methodist Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>84-020</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>84-023</td>
<td>Piscataway Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>84-023-03</td>
<td>Piscataway Tavern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>84-023-04</td>
<td>Stanton-Blandford House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>84-023-05</td>
<td>Hardy's Tavern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>84-023-06</td>
<td>Edelen House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>84-023-08</td>
<td>Dr. Edgar Hurtt House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>84-023-09</td>
<td>Miller House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>84-023-10</td>
<td>Saint Mary's Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 85A BRANDYWINE and VICINITY — SUBREGION 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85A-005</td>
<td>John Townshend Grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>85A-013</td>
<td>Gwynn Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85A-018</td>
<td>Union Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85A-020</td>
<td>McKendree Methodist Church Site &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>85A-032</td>
<td>Brandywine Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>85A-032-09</td>
<td>William W. Early House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>85A-032-10</td>
<td>William Berry Early House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>85A-032-11</td>
<td>William H. Early Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>85A-032-27</td>
<td>Chapel of the Incarnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85A-032-28</td>
<td>Marian Early Bean House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>85A-032-30</td>
<td>Old Bank of Brandywine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>85A-033</td>
<td>T. B. Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>85A-033-14</td>
<td>Marlow-Huntt Store</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 85B CEDARVILLE and VICINITY — SUBREGION 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85B-004</td>
<td>Grace Methodist Episcopal Church North &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85B-006</td>
<td>Site of Cedarville Farmhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>85B-007</td>
<td>Cedarville Civilian Conservation Corps Cottages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>85B-008</td>
<td>Cedarville Charcoal Kiln</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PA 86A CROOM- NAYLOR—SUBREGION 6 (North)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>86A-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-000-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>86A-000-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>86A-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>86A-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>86A-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>86A-015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>86A-020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>86A-021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>86A-027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-027-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>86A-027-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-027-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-027-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>86A-027-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>86A-027-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>86A-027-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-027-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-027-45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA 86B BADEN AREA—SUBREGION 6 (South)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86B-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>86B-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86B-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS ES</td>
<td>86B-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86B-006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>86B-007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86B-008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| HS     | 86B-009     | Kalmia (Kalaird)          |
| HS     | 86B-010     | Black Walnut Thicket      |
| HS NR  | 86B-014     | Saint Paul’s Episcopal Church & Cemetery |
| HR     | 86B-016     | Orme-Carr House           |
| HR     | 86B-017     | Garner-Hyde House         |
| HS     | 86B-018     | Immanuel United Methodist Church & Cemetery |
| HS     | 86B-019     | Horsehead Tavern          |
| HR     | 86B-020     | Brooke-Bowie Family Cemetery |
| HS     | 86B-037     | Wilmer’s Park             |
| HS     | 86B-038     | Sasscer Tobacco Barn      |
| HR     | 86B-042     | Erickson-Roundell Tomb    |

### PA 87A WESTWOOD AREA—SUBREGION 6 (South)

| HR     | 87A-001     | Taylorton Boundary Marker |
| HR     | 87A-004     | Westwood Store & Post Office Site |
| HS     | 87A-009     | Connick’s Folly & Cemetery |
| HS ES  | 87A-010     | Saint Thomas Methodist Church & Cemetery |
| HS     | 87A-011     | Green Hill (Poplar Hill)   |
| HS     | 87A-012     | Poplar Hill School         |
| HR     | 87A-014     | Catherine Gardiner House   |
| HR     | 87A-016     | House at Magruder’s Ferry Landing Site |
| HR     | 87A-017     | Turner Family Cemetery (Anchovie Hills Site) |
| HS     | 87A-018     | Black Swamp Farm           |
| HR     | 87A-020a    | Milltown Landing Site      |
| HR     | 87A-020b    | Milltown Landing Tenant House |
| HR     | 87A-021     | Canter House (Covington Farm) |
| HS     | 87A-022     | H. B. B. Trueman House    |
| HR     | 87A-024     | Young House at Woodborough |
| HS E   | 87A-057     | Black Swamp School         |
| HR     | 87A-058     | Woodborough Boundary Stone |
PA 87B AQUASCO—SUBREGION 6 (South)
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HR 87B-001  Spring Hill
HR 87B-003  Eastview Site & Wood Family Cemetery
HR 87B-026  Scott House on Neck Road
HS 87B-028  Trueman Point Landing
HR 87B-032  Archeological Site #186
HS 87B-033  John Wesley Methodist Episcopal Church Site & Cemetery
HS 87B-034  Woodville School
HC 87B-036  Woodville/Aquasco Historic Community
HR 87B-036-02  Somerville-Turner Barn
HS 87B-036-05  J. E. Turner House
HR 87B-036-07  Thomas House
HS NR 87B-036-08a  Saint Mary’s Rectory
HS 87B-036-08b  Saint Mary’s Episcopal Church & Cemetery
HR 87B-036-09  Hall’s Store
HR 87B-036-10  Miss Sarah Hall House
HR 87B-036-11  Scott Farmhouse
HS 87B-036-12  Saint Phillip’s Episcopal Chapel Site & Cemetery
HS NR 87B-036-13  Villa de Sales
HS 87B-036-14  William R. Barker House
HS 87B-036-15  Wood House
HS 87B-036-16  Grimes House
HS 87B-036-17  James A. Cochrane Store
HR 87B-036-18  Mary C. B. Cochrane House
HS 87B-036-19  Adams-Bowen House
HS ES 87B-036-20  P. A. Bowen Farmstead (Maplewood Farm)
HS NR 87B-036-21  Sunnyside (Stone House)
HR 87B-036-22  Selby Tobacco Barn Site
HR 87B-036-23  Scott Family Cemetery
HS 87B-036-35  Keech House
HC 87B-038  Eagle Harbor Historic Community
HC 87B-039  Cedar Haven Historic Community
Part Four
APPENDICES
History

The land that we know today as Prince George’s County was occupied for thousands of years before the first Europeans sailed to these shores. There is considerable evidence of Native American settlements along both the Patuxent and Potomac Rivers; hundreds of prehistoric sites indicate the presence of many villages and temporary camps in the centuries before the arrival of European colonists.

The first recorded visit to Prince George’s County by a European was in the summer of 1608, when Captain John Smith sailed up the Potomac River, probably as far as Great Falls, Virginia. Two peoples inhabited the county in Smith’s time: the peaceable Piscataways, whose villages ranged from the Anacostia River southward into Charles and St. Mary’s Counties and who were acknowledged to be the dominant tribe of the Western Shore; and the warlike Susquehannocks, who roamed and hunted in the northern part of the county, constantly pressing the Piscataways for more and more land.

John Smith’s visit in 1608 was an exploratory expedition only; no settlement was intended. Over the next 25 years, English traders paid frequent calls upon the natives here, sometimes to trade, sometimes to do battle. The most significant early contact came in 1634, just days after the first Maryland colonists landed near the mouth of the Potomac River. Advised by an English trader to meet with the Piscataways before establishing a settlement there, Governor Leonard Calvert sailed up the Potomac to the tribe’s principal town, located on Piscataway Creek in the southern part of what was to become Prince George’s County. Governor Calvert established good relations with the Piscataways, and after consultation, he returned downriver to found St. Mary’s City, Maryland’s first settlement.

Establishment of the County

The Maryland colony flourished at St. Mary’s City and enjoyed peaceful relations with the neighboring tribes. Settlers soon left the confines of the original settlement. New counties were created, and within 30 years, farms and plantations lined both the Patuxent and Potomac Rivers well into the land that is Prince George’s County today. In the mid-seventeenth century, all of this land was included in Calvert and Charles Counties, which were established in 1654 and 1658, respectively. The land along the Patuxent was part of Calvert, while that along the Potomac was part of Charles. By 1695, 1,600–1,700 colonists lived in this area, a number sufficient in the opinion of Governor Francis Nicholson to deserve the right of self-government. The General Assembly agreed, and on St. George’s Day, April 23, 1696, a new county was established, named for Prince George of Denmark, husband of Princess Anne, heir to the throne of England. The first county seat was at Charles Town on the Patuxent, one of the port towns established in 1683 by the General Assembly. The new Prince George’s County extended from the Charles County line on the south all the way to the Pennsylvania border and marked Maryland’s western frontier. It remained the frontier county until 1748 when the westernmost regions were granted their own government and Prince George’s County’s northern boundary became basically the line it is today.

In 1692, four years before the establishment of Prince George’s County, the Church of England became the established church of the Maryland colony through an Act of the General Assembly. By this time, ten counties had been established in the colony, and those counties were divided into 30 parishes. When Prince George’s County came into being in 1696, two parishes had already been established within its boundaries: St. Paul’s Parish in the area that had been part of Calvert County and Piscataway (or King George’s) Parish in the area that had been part of Charles. At this time, there was already a church at Charles Town, the busy port town on the Patuxent that was to be Prince George’s County’s first county seat. This small church building was used as a meeting place for the new county court until a new courthouse was completed in 1698. St. Paul’s Parish also had a rural chapel for residents...

1 This history is based on “Prince George’s County: A History” prepared for the 1981 Historic Sites and Districts Plan by Alan Virta, a member of the 1980-81 Citizens Advisory Committee for the plan; it was revised, expanded, and updated by Historic Preservation Section staff in 1992 and again in 2009.
of the more remote regions, about 12 miles south of Charles Town. In Piscataway Parish, the first church was built in 1696 at the site of present-day St. John's Church, Broad Creek.

The political divisions of the new county, known as “hundreds,” were totally distinct from the parish divisions and served the purposes of taxation as well as judicial, legal, and military administration. In 1696, the new county was divided into six hundreds, and over the years, as the population increased, the six original hundreds were divided to create geographically smaller administrative units. (A century after its establishment, Prince George’s County was made up of 21 hundreds, superseded in the nineteenth century by Election Districts.)

**Eighteenth Century**

During the 1700s, the land of Prince George’s County was gradually settled. Men and women from all parts of the British Isles, as well as other countries of Europe, arrived to make homes here. Some came as free men, others as indentured servants. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, landowners had turned to slave labor for the operation of their plantations, and large numbers of Africans were brought here to work as slaves. In 1706, the General Assembly of the Maryland colony passed an Act for the Advancement of Trade. This act reestablished Charles Town and also established five more port towns: Queen Anne, Nottingham and Mill Town on the Patuxent, Marlborough on the Western Branch of the Patuxent, and Aire at Broad Creek on the Patowmac. The following year, a supplementary act established the Town of Piscataway, at the head of the Piscataway Creek. These trading centers grew—merchants built stores and sold everything from yard goods and shoe buckles to grubbing hoes, sugar, and salt; lawyers and doctors established practices; innkeepers acquired licenses to sell liquor and opened their doors to travelers and residents alike.

The town that had been established on the Western Branch (soon called “Upper” Marlborough in order to distinguish it from “Lower” Marlborough in Calvert County) developed more rapidly than the other towns established in 1706 and 1707. By 1718, Upper Marlborough had become such an active center that its inhabitants petitioned to have the court proceedings moved there from Charles Town. The General Assembly consented to the move, and the county court met for the first time in Upper Marlborough in 1721. From this time until early in the twentieth century, Upper Marlboro (as it is now spelled) was the commercial, political, and social center of Prince George’s County, and it has remained the county seat to this day.

In 1742, Bladensburg was established on the Eastern Branch, supplanting an earlier settlement known as Beall Town one-half mile upstream on the Northwest Branch. Bladensburg together with Upper Marlborough, Nottingham, Aire at Broad Creek, Queen Anne, and Piscataway became an official tobacco inspection station in 1747 by act of the General Assembly.

Some iron was mined and worked in the Upper Patuxent region, and water-powered mills were constructed on the abundant water courses. Despite this growth, Prince George’s County remained predominantly agricultural. Agriculture was the basis of the economy and directly or indirectly provided the livelihood for every resident. The crop at the heart of this agricultural economy was tobacco.

Tobacco created wealth for Prince George’s County, wealth that built fine plantation houses, like Compton Bassett and His Lordship’s Kindness; educated the children of leading families; supported the work of our religious faiths; and fostered the arts, such as theater, dance, and music, that flourished in Upper Marlboro and other places. That wealth also provided the means to enjoy leisure time in activities such as fox hunting and horse racing and enabled planters to devote such care to their horses and their breeding that Prince George’s County became a cradle of American thoroughbred racing. By and large, the lifestyles of the county’s wealthy planters were the product of indentured labor from Europe and, later, of enslaved labor from Africa. Tobacco also provided modest livelihoods for small, non-slave-holding farmers and even served as legal tender for debts. Tobacco created a prosperous, sophisticated society, which traded its staple with English and Scottish merchants for goods from all over the world.

The earliest arteries of transportation had been the waterways, and they remained important avenues of commerce between port towns; but a network of roads had developed by the beginning of the eighteenth century, establishing overland connections between the several port towns and between the towns and the parish churches. As the population increased, as the political hundreds and the church parishes were divided for more efficient management, and as new plantations were established, more roads were cleared to allow easier communication.
between population centers. Land and court records show the construction of new roadways. In 1739 a survey ordered by the justices of the county court described a network of more than 50 roads connecting the towns of Upper Marlborough, Piscataway, Queen Anne, Nottingham, Mill Town, Aire, and Beall Town as well as the parish churches and their several rural chapels. Road building increased during the middle years of the eighteenth century, and in 1762 another road survey indicated a significant increase in the miles of roadways. At strategic points along the major roads, and especially in the principal towns and river crossings, taverns were established; they catered to the needs of travelers and provided gathering places for the exchange of news and opinions.

Prince George’s County was not untouched by the great tide of national events during the revolutionary period. When the Revolution came, Prince Georgians organized county committees to assist the Revolutionary effort here at home, and they sent many of their sons to fight gallantly for the cause of independence. One of their fellow citizens, John Rogers of Upper Marlborough, sat in the Continental Congress, which in July of 1776 voted to make the colonies free and independent states. In September 1787, Daniel Carroll, also of Upper Marlborough, was one of the 39 men who signed the newly framed Constitution for the United States. In April 1788, four distinguished Prince Georgians attended the Ratification Convention in Annapolis and voted unanimously in favor of ratifying the Constitution.

In 1790, when the Congress in Philadelphia decided to locate the new federal capital somewhere along the Potomac River, Prince George’s County ceded most of the land necessary to establish the District of Columbia. The ten-square-mile area was surveyed in 1791, and stone markers were erected during the following year at the four corners and at one-mile intervals along the lines. (Seventeen of these markers were located at the boundaries of Prince George’s County; sixteen of them survive.) Today, each of the great symbols of our three branches of government, the Capitol, the White House, and the Supreme Court building, stands on land that was once part of Prince George’s County. The development of the federal city was aided immeasurably by Benjamin Stoddert of Bladensburg, who acquired much of the land needed by the federal government from local landowners and later served as first Secretary of the Navy.

With the Declaration of Independence and the Maryland Declaration of Rights of 1776, the Church of England was no longer the official church, and for the first time, all Christians and Roman Catholics could freely practice their religions. Two Prince Georgians were chosen to assume leadership roles: Thomas John Claggett of Croom became the first Episcopal bishop and John Carroll of Upper Marlborough became the first Roman Catholic bishop and archbishop of the United States and was the founder of Georgetown University. Beginning in 1783, meeting at White Marsh, one of the oldest Catholic establishments in Maryland, the Roman Catholic Church in America formulated its first constitution.

Nineteenth Century

Prince George’s County had been spared extensive military action during the Revolutionary War, but such was not to be the case in the War of 1812. In August 1814, the British sailed up the Patuxent to Benedict (Charles County) and began a march through the county—through Nottingham, Upper Marlborough, and Long Old Fields (now Forestville)—all the way to Bladensburg, where they defeated an ill-prepared army of American defenders, with a number of African-Americans in their ranks, and marched on into Washington to burn the capital city. On their way back to their ships, they seized a Prince Georgean, Dr. William Beanes of Upper Marlborough, and took him with them to Baltimore. Francis Scott Key was on a mission to plead for Dr. Beanes’ release when he witnessed the bombardment of Fort McHenry and wrote the poem that became our national anthem, “The Star Spangled Banner.”

Those early years of the nineteenth century brought changes to the county. Although tobacco remained predominant, farmers throughout the county began to experiment with new crops on land worn out by the continuous cultivation of tobacco. In 1817, the first county agricultural society in Maryland was founded in Prince George’s County, and agriculturalists, such as Horace Capron, Dr. John Bayne, and Charles B. Calvert, attracted national attention with their agricultural experimentation. The efforts of Charles Calvert brought about the establishment of the nation’s first agricultural research college (now the University of Maryland at College Park) here in 1858, further indication of the leadership of Prince George’s County in that field.

New developments were not limited to agriculture. A new way of working, which involved great machines,
mass production, and hundreds of workers, had evolved in England and the northern United States during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The Industrial Revolution crept into Prince George’s County across its northern border with the establishment of cotton mills at Laurel in the 1820s and the establishment of the Muirkirk Ironworks, near Beltsville in the 1840s. In the early years of the century, the first turnpike was constructed, linking Washington and Baltimore; about 14 miles of the convenient, nearly straight roadway ran through Prince George’s County. The prominence of the turnpike was short-lived because in 1835 the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad line was completed between Baltimore and Washington. The railroad brought momentous change to the area, altering traditional methods of travel, transforming small crossroad communities into population centers and, eventually, potential sites for suburban expansion. The railroad provided the right-of-way on which Samuel F. B. Morse strung the country’s first telegraph line in 1844. The success of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad also stimulated the planters of southern Maryland to seek construction of another railroad through rural southeastern Prince George’s County to provide easy access to the Baltimore market. This goal was not realized, however, until after the Civil War.

In politics, two sons of Prince George’s County achieved national distinction in those early years of the nineteenth century. Gabriel Duvall of Marietta served for many years as Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and William Wirt, a Bladensburg native, served for 12 years as United States Attorney General. In the course of the nineteenth century, five distinguished Prince Georgians served as Governor of Maryland: Robert Bowie of Nottingham, Samuel Sprigg of Northampton, Joseph Kent of Rose Mount, Thomas G. Pratt of Upper Marlborough, and Oden Bowie of Fairview.

Prince George’s County then, as the nineteenth century passed its midpoint, was prosperous. Its agriculture was diversifying, some industry was developing, the fisheries of the Patuxent and Potomac yielded rich harvests, steamboats plied the Patuxent linking the county to Baltimore, trains ran regularly on the line between Baltimore and Washington, and, above all, the growth of the staple crop, tobacco, remained a profitable enterprise. In fact, more tobacco was grown here than in any other county in Maryland, and more slaves tilled the fields here than any other place in the state. The labor of the county’s black community helped guarantee that prosperity; 90 percent of the county’s African-American residents were enslaved in 1860. But the old tobacco society was to end because forces beyond the control of any Prince Georgian would soon plunge the nation into a bitter Civil War.

Prince George’s County, like the State of Maryland and the nation, was divided during the monumental struggle from 1861 to 1865. Although Maryland made no move to secede from the Union, there was great sympathy in the county for the southern cause. In 1860, the county had a plantation economy, and more than half of the population was enslaved. The prominent families of Prince George’s County were slave holders, very much southern-oriented, and many of their sons went south to fight for the Confederacy. When the institution of slavery was abolished in the District of Columbia in 1862, many of the slaves of Prince George’s County fled to freedom there. Emancipation took effect in Maryland in January 1865 and brought an end to the old plantation system. When the war ended three months later, the old Prince George’s County was gone, and the county began a second life.

After the Civil War

The Civil War brought significant changes to Prince George’s County; some were immediately noticeable such as the freeing of the slaves. Small communities of freedmen began to develop soon after the cessation of hostilities, such as Rossville near the Muirkirk Ironworks, Chapel Hill near Fort Washington, and communities near the towns of Woodville, Queen Anne, and Upper Marlborough. Each of these communities was centered on a place of worship, usually Methodist. The newly emancipated people proceeded to build their houses while supporting themselves working in the iron furnaces or in railroad construction but, principally, in farming. With the assistance of the Freedmen’s Bureau, these communities soon had schoolhouses and teachers, beginning the significant movement toward black education. A substantial number of African-Americans moved out of Prince George’s County during the generation after the Civil War, especially into the District of Columbia.

Agriculture remained the way of life, tobacco continued to be the most important crop, and the large plantations by no means vanished. There were also changes in the county’s economy. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, small farms growing tobacco and other crops played a larger role in the county’s economic life. Between
the end of the Civil War and the turn-of-the-century, the number of farms in Prince George’s County doubled, while the average farm size decreased dramatically. Many of these new smaller farms were operated by freed blacks, but many more were owned by newcomers to the county. As agriculture expanded, so did commercial life and the importance of local commerce in the overall economic picture. However, this second life for Prince George’s County, of small farms and local commerce, soon gave way to a force that would affect the county as profoundly as tobacco had in the past. That force was the growing federal government and its expanding capital city.

As Washington grew from a small town to a major capital, it began to spill over into the adjoining counties. A new phenomenon, the residential suburb, began to develop in order to accommodate the increasing number of federal employees and city workers. The new branch line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad had opened in 1872. It joined with the main line to southern Maryland at the Bowie junction and created a second rail link between Washington and Baltimore. Speculators were quick to see opportunities for new residential development. In the 1880s and 1890s, more and more residential communities were developed north of Washington along both of the railroad lines, offering federal employees the opportunity to live away from the city in healthful surroundings easily accessible by rail. In towns, such as Hyattsville, Riverdale, Charlton Heights (now Berwyn Heights), College Park, and Bowie, fine Victorian dwellings of the 1880s and 1890s still provide evidence of this booming period of suburban expansion. As the nineteenth century drew to a close, the county’s population was 30,000, which was 30 percent higher than it had been in 1860.

Twentieth Century

As the twentieth century began, the influence of the nation’s capital continued to expand into Prince George’s County. New modes of transportation, such as the streetcars and the Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad offered additional opportunities for residential development along the borders of the federal city. Towns, such as Mount Rainier, Colmar Manor, Cottage City, Brentwood, Capitol Heights, and Seat Pleasant, began to develop during the first decade of the new century. Several African-American communities, like Fairmount Heights, North Brentwood, and Lincoln, were established and attracted members of an increasing group of African-American professionals to the area.

The new science of aviation made history in Prince George’s County with the establishment of College Park Airport in 1909 and with military flight instruction there by Wilbur Wright. In 1941, John Greene established the Columbia Air Center, the first black-owned airport in the county, on a field near Croom. The county’s prominence in the field of aviation was reinforced by the construction of the ERCO airplane factory in Riverdale in 1939 and the construction of the new military airfield known today as Joint Base Andrews in 1942. A little known remnant of the Cold War can be found in the Nike missile site in Brandywine that was part of a network of 12 such sites encircling Washington, D.C. after World War II. Other large federal installations had moved into Prince George’s County during the first half of the century: Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, the large agricultural area of about 13,000 acres purchased by the U.S. government between 1910 and 1940; Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, established in 1936; and the Suitland Census Bureau complex established in 1942. Finally in the late 1950s, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) established its primary science center (Goddard Space Flight Center) in Greenbelt. These important government installations exerted a significant influence on the employment patterns of county residents.

In the years after World War II, the county’s African-American residents lived in stable, growing towns and neighborhoods that were substantially separate from the predominant white community. This segregated development pattern had been established in the years following the Civil War, allowing local African-American communities to flourish but in isolation. African-Americans focused their efforts on developing institutions, such as schools and churches, and providing the services required in their segregated communities. Enterprising individuals opened barber shops, beauty salons, and grocery stores, which limited the need to venture beyond the safe haven of these developing African-American towns. Eventually, these institutions that sustained local African-American communities provided the foundation for an emerging black political activism.

The nascent civil rights movement of the post World War II period did not escape Prince George’s County, and local efforts benefited from advances in towns and cities across
the nation. Locally, many individuals and institutions, such as churches and schools like Fairmont Heights High School, were the sites of events that resulted in significant changes for the county’s African-American residents. With the legal end of housing segregation nationally in the mid-1950s, African-Americans settled throughout the county, and institutions and businesses grew to meet the demands of new neighborhoods and communities.

Farming remained the way of life for many in the vast rural areas beyond these new towns, but year-by-year the percentage of the population earning their livelihood through agriculture declined as the denser suburban population close to Washington grew. New communities also began to appear as the increasing use of the automobile allowed for further residential development, in some cases at a distance from railroad and trolley lines; Cheverly, Greenbelt, District Heights, Morningside, New Carrollton and Glenarden are examples of this trend. Prince George’s had been a county of 30,000 in 1900; it became a county of 60,000 in 1930, and by 1950 had increased to almost 200,000. The expansion continued with increases to 350,000 in 1960, and more than 660,000 in 1970.

Several factors, including school busing and a sewer moratorium, combined to slow the population explosion during the 1970s so that the population increased only to 665,000 in 1980. This slowing trend was reversed during the 1980s with the active encouragement of development, advances in the educational system, and diversification of employment bringing the population to a figure well over 700,000 in 1990. By this time the county’s population was firmly engaged in a demographic shift from a majority white population to a majority African-American population. In the decade between 1980 and 1990, for the first time in the twentieth century, the county’s population reflected a slight majority (50.7 percent) of African-American residents. In addition, during this period there were substantial increases in the numbers of local residents from Southeast Asia and Central and South America. The 2000 U.S. Census identified more than 801,000 county residents. By 2007, the county’s population was more than 828,000. In this vast group, 65.6 percent of residents are African-American, and the entire population reflected more than 80 countries of origin.

The witness of more than 300 years, Prince George’s County has seen great change. Once a struggling wilderness outpost, where men such as Colonel Ninian Beall and his county militia rode the frontier to guard against Indian raids, the county developed during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries into a sophisticated, prosperous tobacco society. When that society met its end in war, small farms growing tobacco and other crops and local commerce became the dominant ways of life until Prince George’s County finally became part of the expanding metropolitan area of Washington, D.C., and now is a place where men and women of all creeds, religions, races, national origins, and economic positions live and work. However, despite these great changes, reminders of the past are all around us—sometimes hidden from sight and sometimes unrecognizable to the newcomer. Although most of our citizens live in a suburban setting today, much of our land still retains its rural character, and agriculture is still the way of life for some. If Prince Georgians of today head out of the city, beyond the Beltway and suburban developments into the large areas that are still country, they can walk into the woods or along the creeks and rivers and see, if for just a moment, a Prince George’s County that the first settlers might have seen more than 300 years ago.
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This appendix includes summary descriptions for 58 historic communities throughout Prince George's County. Appendix B, as in the 1992 plan, is for reference purposes only and provides historical information to county residents, property owners, and communities about the areas surveyed. These identified historic communities are not currently regulated by the county’s historic preservation ordinance, Subtitle 29 of the County Code, although some of the communities contain individual Historic Sites and Historic Resources that are regulated by the ordinance. Thirty-two of these community descriptions were included in the 1992 Historic Sites and Districts Plan. An additional 26 communities, subsequently identified, are included here. Two additional communities, although surveyed as part of the same effort, are not included here. As locally designated historic districts, the Broad Creek Historic District and the Old Town College Park Historic District are the subject of a separate chapter in the plan. The county’s seven National Register Historic Districts (NRHDs), Mount Rainier, North Brentwood, Hyattsville, Riverdale Park, West Riverdale, University Park, and Calvert Hills, and the Greenbelt National Historic Landmark District are included in the detailed descriptions below and are indicated with the symbol NRHD or NHL (National Historic Landmark).

The number of these communities in this appendix, 58, reflects the assignment of an individual Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties number for a distinguishable community but not the double-counting of that community if it happens to be located within more than one of the county’s planning areas. For example, Riverdale Park (68-004) and West Riverdale (68-093) are tallied individually even though they are within the same municipality, but the Clagett Agricultural Area (78-000, 79-000 & 82-000) is tallied as a single community even though it includes properties in three planning areas. All 58 communities have been the subject of "windshield" surveys. The purpose of such surveys is to identify the general characteristics of each area including topography, street patterns, historic architecture, the types of buildings and uses, and the boundaries of the surveyed area. The complete windshield survey forms (which include additional analysis), maps, and representative photographs are available for review at M-NCPPC/Prince George’s County Planning Department’s Historic Preservation Section or on the M-NCPPC/Prince George’s County Planning Department web site, www.pgplanning.org/About-Planning/Our_Divisions/Countywide_Planning/Historic_Preservation.htm.

Rossville (62-023)

Rossville is significant as an example of a small, late-nineteenth-century African-American rural settlement. Rossville was named for Augustus Ross, one of the first landowners along Old Muirkirk Road. Rossville was formed by a group of freed African-Americans who in 1868 established Queen’s Chapel (Historic Site 62-023-21), a Methodist congregation near Beltsville. Land for the church was purchased for five dollars from the Minnix family. The site was originally used as a burial ground for local African-Americans, and a church was later built on the site. The chapel, a log structure, was also used as a schoolhouse for neighboring children. In 1886 individual members of the congregation and other African-Americans purchased 12 lots along the north side of Old Muirkirk Road. By 1889 structures were erected on 11 of the lots. In the late 1890s, Queen’s Chapel was destroyed by fire, and a wood-frame building replaced the log structure. The congregation outgrew the second building and constructed a larger brick church that was completed in 1956. For more than 100 years, Queen’s Chapel has served as a central gathering point for this small African-American community.

Residents of Rossville supported themselves by working at the nearby Muirkirk Iron Furnace and by farming. The largest lot on Old Muirkirk Road was purchased by the Rebecca Lodge #6 of the Benevolent Sons and Daughters of Abraham, a fraternal organization whose purpose was to support its members in times of illness or emergency. On this lot they constructed a lodge now known as Abraham Hall (Historic Site/NR 62-023-07). Over the years, Abraham Hall has been used as a meeting place, church, and schoolhouse.

The rural setting of Rossville remains largely intact, but subdivisions on the north and west of Rossville have begun to encroach on the landscape. The Muirkirk West
Neighborhood Park, owned by M-NCPPC, is located south of Old Muirkirk Road; it protects the viewshed of the neighborhood and provides a natural boundary. Only a few late nineteenth-century buildings are extant; most have been replaced with twentieth-century construction. Most of the construction dates from the 1930s and 1940s. Architectural styles in Rossville reflect a range of popular styles from the 1890s to the 2000s and include Colonial Revival, Craftsman, Dutch Colonial Revival, and vernacular interpretations. Building forms include I-houses, bungalows, Cape Cods, and ranch houses. Many of the structures have been altered by rear and side additions. There are a variety of outbuildings in Rossville, including garages, sheds, and trailers.

**Lakeland (66-000)**

Lakeland was developed as a late nineteenth-century resort community in northwest Prince George's County. The small neighborhood is located in the City of College Park directly east of the University of Maryland’s College Park (UMCP) campus, north of Old Town College Park, and south of Berwyn. Lakeland is bounded by Baltimore Avenue (US 1) on the west and the CSX railroad tracks (formerly the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad tracks) on the east.

Edwin A. Newman, a real estate developer based in Washington, D.C., platted the community in 1890. Newman designed the community as an exclusive resort area conveniently located near Lake Artemesia and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. Newman called the community Lakeland, “on account of the beautiful lake which is to form a delightful feature of its landscape. This lake will cover an area of seven acres, will be fifteen feet deep, and is to be named Lake Artemesia in honor of Mrs. [Clara Artemesia] Newman.” The lake was originally dug as a gravel extraction pit in the 1860s by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company. Newman created a park around the lake, stocked the lake with fish, and provided residents with “pleasure boats.” By April 1891, more than 72 people purchased property in Lakeland and had made over $135,000 in improvements. Newman quickly improved the area by installing gas lights, curbs, gutters, wooden sidewalks, and dirt streets.

At the turn of the twentieth century, African-Americans began to move into the community, although typically along its outer edges. Many new residents were seeking employment at the nearby university. In 1901, John Calvary Johnson became the first black resident to purchase land in the central part of the community. In 1903, the Embry A.M.E. Church was established. The following year, a one-room schoolhouse for African-American children was constructed. A new elementary school was constructed in 1926. The school was funded by the Prince George’s County Board of Education and the Julius Rosenwald Fund.

Despite Lakeland’s overwhelming resistance to incorporation, Berwyn, Calvert Hills, Old Town College Park, Lakeland, Hollywood, Daniels Park, Oak Springs, and Sunnyside were incorporated as part of the City of College Park in 1945. Lakeland remained a small community in the 1950s and 1960s and experienced minimal new development. Due to repeated flooding, in 1969 an urban renewal project was begun. The plan included building earthenwork dikes along Indian Creek, Paint Branch Creek, and Lake Artemesia to prohibit future flooding and demolishing of existing houses that were in the floodplain. The issue divided the small community. Many feared the redevelopment would result in the displacement of families who had lived in Lakeland for years. Over a 15-year period, the $5.7 million dollar project resulted in the demolition of 87 houses and the construction of 40 units of low-income housing, 86 townhouses, 7 single-family houses, and 2 mid-rise apartment buildings—one for senior citizens and the other for students and faculty at the University of Maryland.

Lakeland is improved by buildings that date from circa 1900 to the present. The majority of buildings date from the 1940s through the 1970s. Although few in number, the earliest houses in the neighborhood date from the first decade of the twentieth century and are typically two-story, front-gabled, wood-frame dwellings. The majority of these houses have a one-story, full-width, or wraparound porch. Due to the urban renewal in Lakeland from the 1960s to the 1980s, there are several mid-rise apartment buildings constructed along Navahoe Street, as well as a large townhouse development located on Lakeland Road. The community is predominantly residential; however, buildings in Lakeland also have religious and educational uses. Nonhistoric commercial development is located on the west side of the community along Baltimore Avenue. Public buildings in Lakeland include Paint Branch Elementary School, College Park Community Center, and the College Park Volunteer Fire Department. Land east of the railroad tracks has been purchased by M-NCPPC and...
the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and is used as parkland. Paint Branch Park is located adjacent to Paint Branch Elementary School.

**Daniels Park (66-027)**

Daniels Park was developed as an early twentieth-century streetcar suburb located in northwestern Prince George’s County within the City of College Park. The community is located only a few miles from the boundary of Washington, D.C., north of Branchville and south of Hollywood and the Capital Beltway.

In 1905, Edward Daniels, a real estate salesman from Berwyn, began purchasing property in the Branchville area to establish his own rural retreat. That year Daniels purchased 35 acres of land, part of a tract called “Vernon.” He subsequently platted the subdivision of Daniels Park, located on the east side of Baltimore Avenue (US 1). Daniels first advertised Daniels Park as 1, 2, 3, and 4-acre lots on the “car line.” He noted that Daniels Park was “just the place for poultry-raising.” In later advertisements, Daniels offered 50 by 200-foot lots in Daniels Park for only $100 per lot.

In a letter to the editor of The Washington Post in April 1905, Daniels wrote that more people should consider rural living: “there is a most attractive field for persons of moderate means who have a taste for country life. I am not thinking of the poor and unemployed, but of the large class of clerks and businessmen who are confined to the city during the day most of the year.” Daniels went on to propose a utopian community outside of the city where residents could “maintain a cooperative dairy, laundry, orchards, vineyards, truck gardens, and schools.” He proposed public transportation to run residents to the train and streetcar stations. Daniels suggested that a resident in the country would have “a chance to lead the simple life with every element of social opportunity and pleasure added. In contrast with the ragged, half-built towns along the steam and streetcar cars [sic] that now scar the face of the country, we might have groups of charming and orderly rural homes surrounded by orchards, gardens, and parks worthy of an enlightened and civilized people. Such a settlement could be made the paradise of childhood and the happy retreat of old age.”

In 1906, Daniels continued to add to his holdings, purchasing an additional 49 acres of land that he platted as the Addition to Daniels Park. The Addition to Daniels Park was located directly adjacent to the eastern boundary of Daniels Park. To quickly sell these lots, Daniels organized several auctions where he provided many incentives to potential buyers, including “Free Lots, Free Music, Free Lunch, Free Ride Out.” Both Daniels Park and the Addition to Daniels Park were intended for middle-income professionals who could not afford to live within Washington, D.C., but still desired an affordable and convenient location.

In 1945, Daniels Park was incorporated as part of the City of College Park. After the incorporation, Daniels Park remained an active suburb and continued to be improved. The area along Baltimore Avenue (US 1) was redeveloped as a commercial strip, providing necessary amenities for residents of Daniels Park and the larger College Park community. Today Daniels Park remains a modest commuter suburb.

The community contains a wide variety of buildings constructed between circa 1906 and the present. The majority of buildings constructed in Daniels Park date from the 1940s to the 1980s. There are a number of popular twentieth-century architectural styles represented in Daniels Park including Craftsman, Colonial Revival, and illustrations from the Modern Movement. Common building forms present in Daniels Park include Foursquares, bungalows, Cape Cods, ranch houses, minimal traditional houses, and split-foyers. The residential buildings are modest and display minimal ornamentation, typical of their use for middle-class commuters. The majority of houses are small one- or one-and-a-half-story designs. The topography of the neighborhood is relatively flat and is scattered with mature trees. Lots in the 1905 Daniels Park subdivision are much larger and less regularly shaped than those in the 1906 Addition to Daniels Park. Streets in both subdivisions adhere to a rectilinear grid. Buildings in Daniels Park are predominately residential, although nonhistoric commercial buildings are located along Baltimore Avenue.

**University Park (66-029) NRHD**

University Park, an incorporated municipality, is an early twentieth-century automobile suburb within the US 1 corridor in northwestern Prince George’s County. Beginning in the 1880s, a rapid process of suburbanization began, made possible by a nearby railroad line and the extension of streetcar lines from Washington, D.C. The neighborhood, which developed from 1920 to 1945, is
exclusively residential. Unlike its older neighbors College Park and Riverdale Park, from the onset, University Park was designed to accommodate the automobile.

In April 1920, Harry W. Shepherd and Claude Gilbert platted College Heights, a hilly, 30-acre parcel of land, west of Baltimore Avenue near the present Old Town College Park and the University of Maryland. In 1923, the University Park Company platted a 30-acre subdivision known as Section 1 at the intersection of Baltimore Avenue and Colesville Road. The University Park Company continued to plat subdivisions throughout the 1920s and 1930s, gradually expanding the neighborhood of University Park. The University Park Company sold individual lots with deed restrictions and covenants as well as constructing houses of varying styles for sale. In 1936, the company began to sell parcels to individuals or other companies who carried out their own developments. University Park was platted and developed largely by individual homeowners whose buildings conformed to a set of covenants established by the developer.

A notable feature of the community is the property’s original farmhouse (Bloomfield [Deakins House], Historic Site 66-029-05) and the nearby Deakins family cemetery. Bloomfield, the oldest house in University Park, was constructed circa 1830 as a two-and-one-half-story vernacular farmhouse. The dwelling was rebuilt and reoriented in 1923; it now presents as a Neo-Classical suburban dwelling. The associated Deakins family cemetery, containing approximately 20 burials, is located approximately one block northwest of the house on a separate parcel.

The primary building type is the detached single-family dwelling with a freestanding garage. The neighborhood is characterized by streets of evenly spaced houses shaded by mature trees. Common building forms include American Foursquare, Bungalow, Cape Cod, and two-story, side-gabled Colonial Revivals. The area contains a cross-section of popular early twentieth-century domestic architectural styles, including Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Dutch Colonial Revival, and Craftsman-influenced designs. These houses are vernacular expressions of the prevailing architectural themes of the period. There are no visible changes since the designation of University Park as a National Register Historic District in June 1996. The boundaries of the district have not been compromised, and both the district as a whole and the boundaries retain their integrity.

University of Maryland, College Park (66-035)

The UMCP began as the Maryland Agricultural College, established in 1856 by Charles Benedict Calvert and 18 other wealthy planters. The new institution was created to modernize agricultural practices and enable local farmers to increase productivity. To provide a site for the college, Calvert sold 428 acres of his Riversdale Plantation, known as Rossborough Farm, to the investors of the college.

In 1858, the cornerstone were laid to the Barracks, which served as the first main building on campus. On October 6, 1859, the campus was dedicated, and the first classes were held for the 34 students enrolled at the college. In 1862 the first students graduated. The school struggled during the Civil War, and declining enrollment resulted in the college going bankrupt. From 1864 to 1866, the campus functioned as a preparatory school for boys. In 1866, the Maryland state legislature purchased half of Maryland Agricultural College, resulting in the college’s transition from a private to a public institution. Between 1887 and 1892, the school budget increased approximately 500 percent. The increased budget allowed for the construction of more buildings, an expanded faculty, and a larger student body.

In November 1912, a major fire destroyed the administration and barracks buildings, which served as the main buildings on campus. The buildings were rebuilt, and the institution was renamed the Maryland State College of Agriculture. By 1916, women were admitted into the school, and a liberal arts program was developed. A fraternity and sorority system was created, and the barracks were soon replaced by dormitories. That same year, the school changed its name to Maryland State College. In 1920, the school was again renamed when the state legislature consolidated the College Park campus with the professional schools in Baltimore to create the University of Maryland.

The second quarter of the twentieth century marked significant change at the university. Enrollment began to rapidly increase, growing from 2,000 students in 1935 to nearly 5,000 students by 1945. To accommodate this growth, several residence halls and classroom buildings...
were constructed. The university continued to progress, and the first African-American undergraduate and graduate students were admitted in 1951. The University of Maryland has continued to grow and expand academic programming. Currently there are more than 350 buildings on the University of Maryland’s College Park campus.

The 650-acre campus stretches from Adelphi Road on the west to Paint Branch Drive on the north, Knox Road on the south, across Baltimore Avenue (US 1) to, roughly, Rhode Island Avenue on the east. The historic core of the campus wraps around a large mall. Smaller plazas, courtyards, and walkways create a park-like landscape. The campus contains a variety of buildings constructed between 1803 and the present. Only three extant buildings date from the nineteenth century, Rossborough Inn (1803), Morrill Hall (1898), and Taliaferro Hall (circa 1894–1896). The majority of buildings were constructed from 1940 to 1960. There are a number of popular twentieth-century styles represented on campus, including Georgian Revival, Neoclassical, Colonial Revival, and styles from the Modern Movement. Buildings on campus are typically symmetrical, constructed of brick, and are several stories high; however, the massing and scale of the buildings emphasize the horizontal rather than the vertical. Main entries are commonly emphasized with multiistory, projecting porticoes and elaborate ornamentation. Most roofs are side-gabled or hipped and are covered with asphalt shingles. Common building forms include a variety of plans such as rectangular-shaped, L-shaped, U-shaped, H-shaped, T-shaped, and square plans with open courtyards. Buildings on campus accommodate academic, administrative, recreational, residential, social, and utilitarian functions. In keeping with the growth at the university, many buildings have been altered by the construction of additions, which typically appear on the sides and rear of buildings. The park-like setting of the campus is sited on gently rolling hills, and many buildings have been constructed to take advantage of the natural topography.

**Calvert Hills (66-037) NRHD**

Calvert Hills, a cohesive neighborhood in northwestern Prince George’s County, is an excellent illustration of the residential development on the outskirts of Washington, D.C., in the early twentieth century. The once rural property, historically part of the Calvert family’s Rossborough Farm and Riversdale Plantation, was subdivided in response to the expanding suburban population, the development of the nearby Maryland Agricultural College (now the University of Maryland at College Park), and the College Park Airport. The middle- and upper-middle class suburban community, which is framed by major transportation corridors, developed further with the advent of the streetcar and the automobile. The neighborhood was conceived as additions to the growing subdivision of College Park, which was located to the immediate north of Calvert Hills. The first of the 11 additions, “Fanny A. Calvert’s Addition to College Park,” was undertaken by the Calvert family in response to many speculative development opportunities. In 1945, the many additions to College Park were joined as the neighborhood of Calvert Hills in recognition of the prominent Calvert family and incorporated as part of the Town of College Park.

Calvert Hills is located north of what is now known as the Town of Riverdale Park, south of the area of Old Town College Park, east of Baltimore Avenue (US 1), and west of the WMATA Metrorail/CSX railroad tracks. These major thoroughfares provide access to commercial and employment centers in the surrounding county and nearby Washington, D.C. Baltimore Avenue, in particular, ties the neighborhood to the commercial, aviation, and educational center of College Park. The first portion of the neighborhood, platted in 1907 and replatted in 1921, featured a grid-like plan of rectangular blocks and straight intersecting streets. From 1928 through the 1940s, Calvert Hills was enlarged further through the platting of adjacent parcels with a more curvilinear street pattern. Both the 1861 Martenet map and the 1878 Hopkins map document the residence of Charles B. Calvert; the later map also depicts the residence of Eugene S. Calvert and D. G. Campbell and his wife Ella Calvert Campbell.

Calvert Hills is defined by a variety of architectural styles and building types ranging from high-style designs to vernacular interpretations of these elaborate styles. Primarily, the domestic buildings in Calvert Hills were constructed from the 1890s to infill housing of the late 1990s. Building forms vary from large two-and-a-half-story brick and wood-frame dwellings to smaller bungalow and Cape Cods. Architectural styles employed in Calvert Hills were often diluted, modest examples of Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, Craftsman, and Tudor Revival styles. Also included in Calvert Hills is an example of the stylistically and technologically unique Lustron house at 4811 Harvard Road, which was constructed between 1946–1950. The
community is primarily made up of single-family dwellings but also includes apartment buildings, a school, and post office. Many of the properties include freestanding or attached garages and sheds. The buildings, particularly the single-family dwellings, are buffered from the tree-lined public streets by sidewalks and grassy medians. Many of the blocks are divided by alleys that provide access to garages and reduced on-street parking.

Currently there are no identified historic resources in Calvert Hills. Public buildings in Calvert Hills include the 1938 Calvert Hill Elementary School (4601 Calvert Road) and the 1970 United States Post Office (4815 Calvert Road), which is located on the site of the original post office for College Park. A one-story volunteer firehouse at 4813 Calvert Road, opened in August 1926 to serve the growing community of Calvert Hills and Old Town College Park. Even with two subsequent alterations, the building proved too small for the activities of the fire department and was rehabilitated in 2005 to serve as a single-family dwelling. Despite the commercial growth of neighboring Old Town College Park and Riverdale Park, Calvert Hills remains a purely residential neighborhood composed primarily of single-family and multiple-family dwellings that face tree-lined streets.

No discernable changes have been identified since the listing of Calvert Hills as a National Register Historic District in December 2002. The boundaries of the district have remained intact; both the district as a whole and the boundaries have retained their integrity.

**Greenbelt (67-004) NHL**

Greenbelt is one of three New Deal-era planned communities in the United States, designed as a “green town” by the federal government. “Green towns” were a way to move low- and moderate-income families out of crowded urban areas and into smaller planned communities with more job opportunities while still providing them with the convenience of a large urban area nearby.

The farmland of suburban Maryland was determined to be an ideal setting for the first green town. Designers took advantage of the crescent-shaped plateau in the design and construction of the community, using the curves of the landscapes as their guide. Commercial, recreational, public, and educational buildings form the nucleus of Greenbelt. Residential housing interspersed with parks, recreation areas, and religious buildings wrap around the commercial core. Between 1935–1937, the federal government constructed 574 group houses in 135 buildings, 306 multifamily residences in 12 buildings, five experimental prefabricated detached houses, and rehabilitated seven farmhouses. The rowhouse is the predominant building type in Greenbelt. By 1941, the government was in need of housing for its defense workers and constructed an additional 1,000 wood-frame dwellings. The defense housing was arranged in “superblocks” that face toward courts.

Greenbelt’s success and popularity was due to several different planning concepts including moderately priced housing in a garden or park setting, cluster housing, superblocks with interior green space, an interior sidewalk system that separated pedestrian traffic from vehicular traffic, a central core of commercial, civic, recreational, athletic, and park facilities, and a surrounding belt of open space that created a pastoral setting and was intended to preclude future development.

The architecture of the community reflects its purpose and function. Minimally ornamented, most of the buildings reflect the popular styles of Art Deco, Moderne, and International style. Most buildings were constructed of concrete block with flat roofs, which were practical, inexpensive to build, inexpensive to maintain, and required little skill to construct, allowing for the employment of lesser skilled workers. The commercial buildings were designed in the Streamline Moderne style and are two-story, concrete-block structures covered in brick veneer.

Historic maps depict the rural origins of the area that would become Greenbelt. Both the 1861 Martenet map and the 1878 Hopkins map show scattered farmsteads in the area. The maps illustrate the locations of the Turner and Walker farms. All that remains of these farms are family burial plots. These two cemeteries, along with another burial ground, are designated as historic resources and are owned by the City of Greenbelt.

There are few visible changes in the district since its designation as a National Register historic district in 1980. The buildings have remained remarkably free of alterations and additions, most likely due to the cooperative housing that exists in Greenbelt. Minimal alterations consist of cosmetic changes, including adding vinyl siding, window replacements, removal of paint from brick structures, and changing roofing materials. There has been very little infill
within Greenbelt. Most of the infill dates from the 1960s and 1970s consists primarily of community and religious buildings that are complementary in design and style to the original buildings constructed in the 1930s. Roosevelt Center, the commercial center of Greenbelt, was restored in the 1990s. As part of this restoration, the neon sign of the Greenbelt Theatre has been refurbished, complementing the Streamline Moderne design of the theatre. The NHL nomination notes that only one building, one of the defense houses, has been demolished. The district has remained a very cohesive and intact community since the NHL designation in February 1997.

Berwyn Heights (67-022)

Berwyn Heights was established as a late-nineteenth-century railroad and streetcar suburb approximately eight miles northeast of Washington, D.C. The community is roughly bounded by Greenbelt Road on the north, Edmonston Road on the east, the subdivision of College Park Estates on the south, and the railroad tracks of CSX (formerly the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad tracks) on the west.

In 1888, Edward Graves platted Charlton Heights, a large subdivision comprising roughly 380 acres to the east of the Washington Branch of the Baltimore and Ohio (B&O) Railroad tracks. Lots in the subdivision were long and narrow, approximately 50 feet wide and 100 feet deep. The Charlton Heights Improvement Company subsequently purchased the entire subdivision from Graves in September 1888. Initially, development in the community was slow, but by 1890, approximately 20 houses had been erected. Several of the earliest houses in the neighborhood were mail-order plan houses, typically ordered from R.W. Shoppell's Cooperative Building Plan Association of New York City. In 1896 the subdivision was incorporated as the Town of Berwyn Heights. The neighboring subdivision of Central Heights, located just west of Berwyn Heights, was also incorporated in 1896 as Berwyn. The Berwyn name is believed to be taken from a Presbyterian chapel constructed in 1890 in Central Heights.

By the turn of the twentieth century, Berwyn Heights’ location along improving transportation routes, such as the new streetcar line, sparked additional growth. The community was one of many in this rapidly developing part of Prince George's County to be serviced by the city and suburban railway, which reached the area in the 1890s. By 1910 the small town contained just over 150 residents in 38 houses. In 1915, these neighbors formed the Berwyn Heights Association in an effort to improve the streets, sidewalks, lighting, and the community in general. In 1921, the Potomac Electric Power Company reached its minimum requirement of 50 subscribers and extended electrical service to Berwyn Heights.

The town remained small and largely undeveloped until after World War II (1941-1945). Between 1924–1955, the number of houses in Berwyn Heights grew from 65 houses to 316 houses. In 1945, town residents resisted being incorporated into College Park. The southeastern portion of the community was largely undeveloped until the 1950s when several developers resubdivided portions of Berwyn Heights. Greenbrier Knolls was platted in 1955. The subdivision, consisting of approximately ten acres, was one of the earliest post-war resubdivisions in Berwyn Heights. It was followed by the subdivisions of several lots and the larger College Knolls (1960). By 1970 Berwyn Heights was fully developed. Today the Town of Berwyn Heights has approximately 3,000 residents and 1,000 dwellings.

The town is primarily residential with limited nonhistoric commercial and industrial development located along Greenbelt Road, 55th Avenue, and Ballow Avenue. The community contains approximately 1,000 primary resources constructed circa 1790 to the present, with the majority of buildings constructed circa 1950 to 1965. The oldest house in the neighborhood is known as Sportland (Historic Site 67-005), at 5933 Natasha Drive.

Berwyn Heights contains a collection of popular late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century residential architectural styles, including Queen Anne, Stick, Second Empire, Colonial Revival, Craftsman, Dutch Colonial Revival, and numerous illustrations from the Modern Movement. At least four of the earliest houses in the neighborhood are examples from R.W. Shoppell’s Cooperative Building Plan Association. It appears that there are also several mail-order kit houses from Sears, Roebuck and Co. The largest concentration of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century houses in the neighborhood is located along Ruatan Street, between Berwyn Road and 60th Avenue. The streets are typically lined with mature trees, many of which were planted by the Berwyn Heights Association in the first quarter of the twentieth century. The older houses in the neighborhood
typically have deeper setbacks than the mid-twentieth-century development.

**Avondale (68-000)**

Avondale is a mid-twentieth century automobile suburb located near Eastern Avenue. The community is bounded by Queen’s Chapel Road on the south, Russell Avenue on the east, Ingraham Street on the northeast, Chillum Road on the north, and LaSalle Road on the west.

The community consists of several subdivisions including Avondale Grove (1937-1946), Avondale Terrace (1945-1946), and North Avondale (1950). Taking advantage of a prime location near the District of Columbia and established communities, such as Hyattsville and Brentwood, Section One of Avondale Grove was platted in 1937 by the D.C. Developing Company, Inc. Avondale Grove was advertised in The Washington Post as “Priced Within Your Means $6,950-$7,450-$7,550 and $7,750.” The development was planned to include 200 houses and “one of the most complete parking and shopping centers in the neighborhood.” An article on the development noted that “All homes in this development will be the most modern in floor arrangement and equipment, and nothing but the best materials and the most skilled craftsmanship will be employed in their construction.”

Avondale Terrace, located directly north of Avondale Grove, was platted in 1945 by Avondale Park, Inc. North Avondale, platted in 1950, is located north of Chillum Road and northwest of the larger Avondale community. North Avondale consists exclusively of two-story twin dwellings of brick construction that were designed by architect Harry Kessler and constructed by O’Hara Corporation.

The community contains a variety of modest buildings constructed between 1937 and 1950. There are a number of popular twentieth-century styles represented in Avondale including the Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Dutch Colonial Revival, and illustrations from the Modern Movement. Common building forms include Cape Cods, ranch houses, and minimal traditional houses. Houses are constructed almost exclusively of brick, although other materials appear as cladding, including weatherboard siding, vinyl siding, and stone veneer. Stone veneer appears frequently on the façades of the dwellings, typically covering the first story of the building or used decoratively as quoining.

Almost all of the houses in Avondale Grove and Avondale Terrace feature one-car garages, typically attached to the dwelling. The garages reflect the importance of the automobile in this commuter suburb. The houses in the earlier subdivisions tend to be smaller and more modest in design, typically one-and-a-half stories in height. Dwellings in the northern portion of Avondale Grove and in Avondale Terrace tend to be slightly larger two-story houses, often with side and rear porches and additions. The curvilinear streets of Avondale were designed to take advantage of the hilly topography of the community. In North Avondale, the subdivision is constructed completely of two-story, Modern Movement twin dwellings of masonry construction with flat roofs. These buildings were all constructed in 1950.

Avondale is exclusively residential, although some nonresidential development surrounds the larger neighborhood. The Redemptoris Mater Seminary of Washington is located west of the community, Washington Gas and Light Company is located to the north, the Hyattsville Metrorail station is located to the northeast, and large apartment complexes are located southeast and northwest of the community. One commercial building, a bank, is located southwest of the neighborhood on Queen’s Chapel Road.

**Riverdale Park (68-004) NRHD and West Riverdale (68-093) NRHD**

The subdivisions of Riverdale Park and West Riverdale developed in the late nineteenth century as streetcar suburbs. Both are included in the Town of Riverdale Park located approximately seven miles northeast of Washington, D.C. The town is bounded to the west by the heavily traveled US 1 and bisected by East West Highway.

The area was first developed in 1801 when a Belgian aristocrat, Henri Joseph Stier, purchased 800 acres situated between two tributaries of the Anacostia River known as the Paint and Northwest branches. Stier and his family moved to America several years earlier to escape the advance of the French Republican troops. He named his holdings Riversdale (Historic Site/NHL 68-04-005) and began constructing his residence that same year. The mansion was modeled after the Stier family’s Belgian home, Chateau du Mick and was completed in 1807. In 1803 Stier and his wife Marie Louise returned to Belgium. Riversdale was given to their daughter, Rosalie, who had
married George Calvert, the grandson of the fifth Lord Baltimore, in 1799.

In 1887, the heirs of Charles Benedict Calvert conveyed 474 acres of land to New York City businessmen John Fox and Alexander Lutz who planned on creating an upper-middle-class residential suburb for residents working in Washington, D.C., and Baltimore. The land was platted in 1889 and was named Riverdale Park. In an attempt to differentiate the historic plantation known as Riversdale from the subdivision, the "s" was dropped. The new roads were named in honor of U.S. Presidents and were arranged in a grid pattern that surrounded a central ellipse that served as the site of the commuter train station, the first of which was constructed in 1890. Laid out as a “villa park,” the community featured traffic circles and green space, using the mansion as a central amenity. The three original sections of the suburb utilized relatively uniform lot dimensions and building setbacks, thereby creating a cohesive development of middle- and upper-middle-class housing.

The construction of dwellings in Riverdale Park began in 1890. The buildings reflected popular trends of the time and were of wood-frame construction. Some structures were pyramidal-roof Foursquares, while others had front-gable or cross-gable roofs. Many houses from this period have projecting bays, corner towers, and wraparound porches. By the turn of the twentieth century, Riverdale Park comprised 60 dwellings, a Presbyterian church, a schoolhouse, and a railroad station. The new community straddled the Washington line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, which provided residents an easy commute to Washington, D.C. Recognizing the financial potential of the new suburb, builders purchased groups of lots that were soon improved by high-style, single-family dwellings. The success of Riverdale Park prompted the platting of West Riverdale in 1906. Growth was relatively slow until 1915 when local real estate developer Walter R. Wilson purchased 200 unimproved lots and quickly began construction of modest single-family dwellings to meet the demands of the increasingly suburban population in Prince George’s County. On June 14, 1920, the community was incorporated as the Town of Riverdale. Numerous annexations in the mid-twentieth century have increased Riverdale’s overall size. Late twentieth-century growth was predominantly commercial and centered along Baltimore Avenue, thereby physically and visually separating West Riverdale from Riverdale Park.

In 1998, the town was officially renamed Riverdale Park. Today, the town is made up of a mix of housing styles including 1960s apartment buildings, pre- and post-World War II era buildings, as well as dwellings from the turn of the twentieth century. Riversdale and its remaining eight acres were purchased from private owners in 1949 and is now a house museum operated by M-NCPPC.

In Riverdale Park, there has been some loss of commercial buildings along US 1 and East West Highway. Despite this minimal loss, the boundaries of the districts are sufficiently intact to convey the significance of Riverdale Park and West Riverdale as reflected in the National Register listings of December 2002.

**Hyattsville Residential Area (68-010)**

**NRHD**

The Hyattsville residential area is an example of the many residential subdivisions that emerged in Prince George’s County in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to support the burgeoning population of the nation’s capital. Hyattsville is located six miles northeast of Washington, D.C., and 30 miles southwest of Baltimore, Maryland. The Hyattsville residential area along with the commercial area (68-041), comprise the Hyattsville National Register Historic District. The historic district is roughly bordered by Baltimore Avenue (US 1) to the east, the Northeast Branch of the Anacostia River to the southeast, and the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River to the southwest, with the Baltimore and Ohio (B&O) Railroad tracks (now CSX Transportation) running north-south along the south/southeastern boundary.

Hyattsville developed as a railroad suburb in the mid-nineteenth century and expanded with the early twentieth-century advent of the streetcar and automobile. Anticipating the development of a residential suburb to serve the growing population of the District of Columbia, Christopher C. Hyatt purchased a tract of land in 1845 adjacent to the B&O Railroad and the Washington and Baltimore Turnpike (now Baltimore Avenue) and began to develop town lots. The 1861 Martenet map shows a group of residences, Hyatt’s store, and the B&O station stop. Hyatt’s Addition, which was successfully platted in 1873, was followed by numerous additions subdivided by other developers. The Hopkins map of 1878 depicts further development and the platting of additional roads in the community. Despite Hyattsville’s advantageous location...
along the railroad and turnpike, suburban development was slow until the extension of the streetcar lines in 1899. Hyattsville grew throughout the early twentieth century with no less than 25 additions, subdivisions, and resubdivisions by 1942. With the end of streetcar service and the rise of the automobile, Hyattsville evolved into a successful automobile suburb, with a commercial corridor along Baltimore Avenue that represents the city’s several phases of development.

Residential buildings make up most of the community, with a commercial corridor on the eastern boundary along Rhode Island and Baltimore Avenues. The buildings reflected late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century architectural trends, particularly the Queen Anne, Craftsman, and Colonial Revival styles. Examples of the Shingle, Stick, Italianate, and Modern Movement appear in the neighborhood but minimally. The aboveground resources date from circa 1860–2000. Building uses include single-family, multifamily, commercial, industrial, governmental, educational, religious, and social. The residential buildings of Hyattsville are typically set back from the tree-lined streets on rectangular building lots. Many of these properties have driveways to the side of the primary resources, several with freestanding garages at the rear.

There are no visible changes in the residential area since the amended National Register Historic District was listed in 2004. The amended district now includes both the commercial area (68-041) and additional residential buildings. The boundaries of the district have not been significantly compromised, and both the district as a whole and the boundaries retain their integrity.

Brentwood (68-012)

Brentwood is a late nineteenth-century railroad suburb. Located to the west of the CSX railroad tracks (formerly the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad tracks), the community is bounded by the residential neighborhoods of North Brentwood, Mount Rainier, and Cottage City. The pattern of development in Brentwood followed closely that of nearby Mount Rainier, Hyattsville, Riverdale, and College Park. The affordable prices, healthiness of the area, and the convenient location near the B&O Railroad made all of these communities popular choices for prospective buyers at the turn of the twentieth century.

The community of Brentwood was planned and platted by Captain Wallace A. Bartlett, a white commander of the U.S. Colored Troops during the Civil War. In 1887, Bartlett moved his family from Washington, D.C., to the 206-acre Holladay Farm located northeast of the city adjoining The Highlands (now known as Cottage City). Bartlett subdivided the property and named it the Holladay Company’s Addition to Highland. The northern part of the Addition to Highland, now known as North Brentwood (68-061), was often subject to flooding from the nearby Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River. These less desirable lots commanded lower prices and were marketed toward African-Americans.

Already located near the Highlands railroad station, the extension of the streetcar line in 1898 made the Holladay Company’s Addition even more desirable to prospective buyers. Nearby communities were all experiencing tremendous growth because of the ease of public transportation into the District of Columbia. To take advantage of this, Bartlett formed the Brentwood Company. The group platted Clemson Place, more commonly referred to as Brentwood. The Brentwood name was taken from the nearby Brent family property, which was located approximately one mile inside the boundary of Washington, D.C. The Brentwood plantation was established by Robert Brent, the first mayor (1802–1812) of the District of Columbia.

As the population of the subdivisions grew, so did the needs of the residents. Early residents of the community worshipped at a nearby barn located close to the intersection of Dewey and Wells Streets. In 1904, under the leadership of Reverend A. L. Hughes, the congregation purchased a lot on the corner of Wells and Campbell Streets and a small, front-gable church was soon constructed. Bartlett expended considerable effort to have the swampy areas of his landholdings drained, allowing for the further expansion of his original subdivision. By the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, there were 15 dwellings standing in the Holladay Company’s subdivision and 36 in Brentwood.

In response to the increasing needs of the community, the Brentwood Citizens Association was formed in 1903. In spring 1922, the Maryland General Assembly ratified the charter of the community, officially establishing the Town of Brentwood. The explosive growth of Prince George’s County after World War II also affected established
communities like Brentwood. A garden-apartment complex was built during the war in an effort to provide an affordable and attractive alternative to single-family residences. During the 1950s, several of the earliest dwellings in the subdivision were demolished and the lots were subsequently improved with new houses that offered modern amenities dressed in the most fashionable styles and forms. By 1965, the community was fully developed. Today, the small Town of Brentwood remains a viable, well-planned residential suburb with a racially diverse population of almost 3,000.

Brentwood includes buildings that represent a variety of uses including residential, commercial, industrial, and religious. Public buildings include a town hall, senior center, and fire station. The majority of buildings were constructed between 1900 and circa 1945. Common building forms include I-houses, front-gabled dwellings, L-shaped plans, detached rowhouses, American Foursquares, bungalows, Cape Cods, and ranch houses. The architecture of Brentwood includes vernacular interpretations of popular late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century architectural styles. Houses in Brentwood are typically modest and have minimal ornamentation, indicative of their use for middle-class residents. The community is set on gently rolling hills and flat land. The rectilinear grid of the community is bisected by some angled and curving streets that resulted from later resubdivisions of lots and parcels. Houses are usually set rather close to the road with minimal setbacks.

Mount Rainier (68-013) NRHD

Incorporated in 1910, Mount Rainier is located in northwest Prince George’s County adjacent to the northeast quadrant of the District of Columbia. Oral tradition maintains that the community was named by its early developers, former army officers from Seattle, who named the area after the famed mountain in Washington state. Mount Rainier developed as an early twentieth-century streetcar suburb for the middle class, and the community retains a large and diverse collection of vernacular residences and commercial buildings constructed between 1900–1939.

Mount Rainier remained a rural, agricultural landscape until the early 1900s. Both the 1861 Martenet map and the 1878 Hopkins map show relatively little development in the area that would become Mount Rainier. Roads leading east to Bladensburg and west to Washington, D.C., appear on the historic maps. An early subdivision of the community in the 1890s failed, despite the arrival of a streetcar line in 1897 connecting Mount Rainier with the District of Columbia. Between 1900–1910, eight different subdivisions were platted by various companies. Construction slowly developed along the western edge of Prince George’s County. Locally important real estate developers were involved in the development of Mount Rainier, including J. Harris Rogers and his brother James C. Rogers, who were also responsible for developing portions of Cottage City, Edmonston, Rogers Heights, Hyattsville, and Riverdale Park. In most cases, lots were sold unimproved, and contractors were retained to design and erect the houses. Other lots were developed by speculative investors. Further subdivisions in the 1920s and 1930s expanded the community to the north and to the east. The commercial area of what is now “downtown,” developed around the streetcar station and included grocery, hardware, and supply stores, as well as a bakery, pharmacy, and tailor shop. By the 1930s, new businesses appeared along the commercial corridor of 34th Street and provided access to a movie theater, bowling alley, banking, and auto repair shops.

The gently rolling landscape of Mount Rainier was developed from 1900–1940 and contains mostly modest, detached, single-family dwellings of wood-frame construction. With the exception of six architect-designed buildings, the majority of the buildings in Mount Rainier are vernacular interpretations of popular architectural styles and forms. The street pattern of the community is an extension of Washington, D.C.’s rectilinear grid; however Mount Rainier’s grid is oriented to the northwest. North-south streets are numbered in ascending order from west to east and east-west streets are named and ordered alphabetically from south to north. Rhode Island Avenue, a major diagonal route through the District of Columbia, cuts through the southern portion of Mount Rainier.

Most of the buildings within Mount Rainier are residential, with the single-family dwelling as the prevailing building type. The earliest buildings in the community were constructed between 1900 and 1920, and the majority of these have simple plans with minimal ornamentation. An important early institutional building on Rhode Island Avenue is Star/Potts Hall, (Historic Resource 68-013-01) built circa 1910 as a movie theater and community hall, which since the 1920s has served as a lodge hall for a chapter of the Order of the Eastern Star. However, the architecture ranges from high-style Victorian-era illustrations such as Queen Anne, Shingle, and Stick to
vernacular interpretations of Greek Revival, Colonial Revival, and Craftsman. Common building forms include the I-house, front gable with wing, American Foursquare, and bungalow. Twelve mail-order houses by Sears, Roebuck and Co. have been identified in Mount Rainier and reflect the Craftsman, Colonial Revival, and Dutch Colonial Revival styles. Commercial buildings in the community are centered on Rhode Island Avenue from the District line to Brentwood and on 34th Street from the avenue to north of Bunker Hill Road. Many of the commercial buildings are traditional flat-front forms and have single-, double-, and multiple-store arrangements. Several of the commercial buildings combine residential and commercial functions. There are five revival-style churches in the community that were designed by local architects, one of which was designed by Murphy & Olmstead, a firm nationally known for its ecclesiastical buildings. Public buildings include several schools, a fire station, and City Hall.

The boundaries of the district have not been compromised and both the district as a whole and the boundaries retain their integrity, as listed in the National Register in 1990.

Hyattsville Commercial Area (68-041) NRHD

The Hyattsville commercial area developed along the US 1 corridor as a commercial center for Hyattsville and the nearby communities that emerged in Prince George's County in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to support the burgeoning population of the nation's capital. Hyattsville is located six miles northeast of Washington, D.C., and 30 miles southwest of Baltimore, Maryland. The Hyattsville Commercial Area is included in the Hyattsville National Register Historic District, which is roughly bordered by Baltimore Avenue (US 1) to the east, the Northeast Branch of the Anacostia River to the southeast, and the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River to the southwest, with the Baltimore and Ohio (B&O) Railroad tracks (now CSX Transportation) running north-south along the south/southeastern boundary. Commercial development is centered on the intersection of Rhode Island Avenue, Baltimore Avenue, and Gallatin Street.

Hyattsville developed as a railroad suburb in the mid-nineteenth century and expanded with the early twentieth-century advent of the streetcar and automobile. Anticipating the development of a residential suburb to serve the growing population of the District of Columbia, Christopher C. Hyatt purchased a tract of land in 1845 adjacent to the B&O Railroad and the Washington and Baltimore Turnpike (now Baltimore Avenue) and began to develop town lots. The 1861 Martenet map shows a grouping of residences, Hyatt's store, and the B&O station stop. Hyatt's Addition, which was successfully platted in 1873, was followed by numerous additions subdivided by other developers. Hyattsville developed gradually between the initial platting in 1873 to its final addition in 1942.

Residential buildings make up most of the community, with a commercial corridor on the eastern boundary along Rhode Island and Baltimore Avenues. Blocks on Rhode Island Avenue south of Baltimore Avenue contain the area's oldest structures, which date to the 1880s. These buildings are typically two-story, smaller brick structures that are sited close to the street. Buildings on Baltimore Avenue to the north were constructed from 1900 through the 1950s and are more substantial in size and have larger setbacks to accommodate the automobile. A number of commercial properties are adjacent to residential neighborhoods. One of the earliest commercial structures, built circa 1889, is located at 5121-5123 Baltimore Avenue.

The influence of the automobile on the community resulted in the further commercialization of Baltimore Avenue and Rhode Island Avenue. More than 50 commercial and industrial buildings were constructed along these roads between 1921–1954. Styles represented along the commercial corridor include Art Deco, Art Moderne, Colonial Revival, Neo-Classical, Tudor Revival, and International. The commercial resources are one or two stories tall, typically with flat or shed roofs obscured by parapet walls. Many of the two-story commercial buildings have abstracted patterned brickwork as the only element of ornamentation. A few of the one-story resources display elements of the Art Deco, Art Moderne, and Colonial Revival styles. A substantial portion of the Hyattsville commercial area including both sides of US 1 north of Jefferson Street is currently being redeveloped as a comprehensively designed, mixed-use project.

There have been some changes in the commercial area since it was included as part of the Hyattsville Historic District in 2004. Revitalization and redevelopment continues along the US 1/Baltimore Avenue corridor, including the new 21-acre “Arts District Hyattsville.” This new development, located on both sides of Baltimore Avenue between
Kennedy and Madison Streets, resulted in the demolition of several buildings in the Hyattsville Historic District, including at least two contributing buildings. The Lustine Center/Showroom has been preserved and rehabilitated for use as a community center that will be located in the center of the new development. Despite the demolition of the rear of the building, the Lustine Center remains an important visual landmark in Hyattsville. Arts District Hyattsville consists of new condominiums, rowhouses, art studios, live-work housing, and retail space. Even with these changes, the boundaries of the district have not been significantly compromised and both the district as a whole and the boundaries retain their integrity.

North Brentwood (68-061) NRHD

The Town of North Brentwood, incorporated in 1924, is the oldest incorporated African-American municipality in the county. The small town is located south of the City of Hyattsville and north of the Town of Brentwood.

North Brentwood was planned specifically for African-American families by Captain Wallace A. Bartlett, a white commander of the U.S. Colored Troops during the Civil War. In 1887, Bartlett moved his family from Washington, D.C., to the 206-acre Holladay Farm located northeast of the city adjoining The Highlands (now known as Cottage City). Bartlett subdivided the property and named it the Holladay Company’s Addition to Highland. The northern part of the Addition to Highland, now known as North Brentwood (68-061), was often subject to flooding from the nearby Northwest Branch. These less desirable lots commanded lower prices and were marketed toward African-Americans. The Holladay Land and Improvement Company sold the first lots in 1891 to Henry Randall, an African-American from northern Anne Arundel County. By 1893, Randall’s son, Peter, constructed a dwelling on an adjoining lot. Within several years, three other members of the Randall family purchased lots and constructed wood-frame dwellings in the immediate vicinity. This northern section of the Holladay subdivision was commonly referred to as Randalltown.

Early residents battled regular flooding, which was exacerbated by an eighteenth-century mill race that ran through the center of the community. In order to alleviate flooding problems, Bartlett hired several residents to dig ditches to drain the mill race; the work was completed by 1899. Living conditions for the residents of Randalltown were considerably improved, although flooding continued to be a problem until the 1950s, when the Bladensburg Pumping Station was constructed.

By 1904, the entire subdivision was named Brentwood, and a post office of that name was established. The name Brentwood was taken from the nearby Brent family property, which was located approximately one mile to the southwest in Washington, D.C. The Brentwood plantation was established by Robert Brent, the first mayor (1802–1812) of the District of Columbia. The road that led from the old Brentwood plantation to Bartlett’s new subdivision was still known as Brentwood Road, and Bartlett applied the name Brentwood to his community. However, the name of Randalltown was still used to define the black community located in the northern section of the subdivision. The unofficial boundary between the two communities was Webster Street (then known as John Street). The Brentwood Colored Citizens Association was established in January 1907 under the direction of William Conway, who moved into Randalltown from the District of Columbia in 1905. Typical employment for the residents of Randalltown included day laborers, domestic workers, seamstresses, drivers, and cooks. Some worked at the Government Printing Office, served as messengers at government offices, or porters for the railroad. The community also had a grocer, barber, teacher, and school principal. In 1924, Randalltown was incorporated and renamed North Brentwood, making it the first incorporated African-American community in the county.

During the 1920s and 1930s, the population of North Brentwood expanded, and improvements were undertaken at a greater rate than previously experienced. By 1945, the town’s population was close to 1,500 and boasted a new six-room schoolhouse, two wood-coal-ice dealers, three grocery stores, three beauty parlors, a barber shop, laundry, lumber yard, dentist, lawyer, notary, and a police and fire station.

Today North Brentwood remains a significant African-American community; at the time of the 2000 census, the town’s population was 469. The historic district was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 2003. Since then, several buildings have been demolished and others have been altered with the addition of vinyl siding, window replacements, and new roofing materials. Significantly, the construction of a large church complex, at the center of the community but outside the boundaries of the historic...
district, has lessened the low-scale residential character of the town. North Brentwood is also the planned site of the Prince George’s African-American Cultural Center and Museum.

**Edmonston (68-079) and Edmonston Terrace (68-102)**

The incorporated Town of Edmonston was established at the turn of the twentieth century as a commuter suburb located just northeast of the District of Columbia. The community is bounded by the Town of Riverdale Park on the north and east, the Town of Bladensburg on the south, and the City of Hyattsville on the west.

Edmonston was originally platted in 1903 as two subdivisions: East Hyattsville and Palestine. Several houses in Edmonston predate the subdivisions and were constructed in 1899 by Elisha P. Taylor. East Hyattsville was platted on approximately 70 acres of land by J. Harris Rogers of Hyattsville. The plat included 170 lots, each approximately 50 by 200 feet, resulting in very long, narrow lots. The smaller subdivision, Palestine, was platted by Dr. Charles A. Wells as part of his dairy, Palestine Farm. Twenty-five acres of this land was subdivided into 62 lots, each approximately 75 by 175 feet. Wells constructed approximately five houses for sale, the remainder of the lots were sold unimproved.

The community was home to a working middle-class population, many of whom were employed by the U.S. Government as clerks for the Departments of War, Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Printing and Engraving office, the post office, and the Department of Agriculture. Still other early residents were employed by the local railroads and served as engineers, telegraphers, and motormen. Edmonston was also home to many who worked in the construction and building trades.

As the East Hyattsville community grew, residents desired to incorporate their community in order to provide better services. By 1920, over 103 families resided in 98 dwellings in the small but growing community. In 1924, the town was officially incorporated as Edmonston. It is believed that the community was named for Captain James Edmonston of Bladensburg, who in 1742 purchased 60 acres of land near what is now Edmonston. Edmonston Road, named for the same family, was also an early north-south route that ran between Bladensburg and Vansville. Soon after the town’s incorporation, Robert Funkhouser, a developer of Mount Rainier, purchased several large lots south of Decatur Street (formerly Wells Avenue) where he resubdivided the land into approximately 40 lots, each averaging 40 by 90 feet. Beginning in 1925, Funkhouser built bungalows on each lot and quickly sold them. These bungalows were typically one-and-one-half stories in height with side-gable roofs and a full-width shed roof porch.

In the 1930s, development slowed in the community due to the Depression and did not actively begin again until after World War II, with the subdivision of Edmonston Terrace. Platted in 1945 by Master Builders, Inc., the nine-acre subdivision consisted of 41 lots. Master Builders constructed nearly identical two-story, side-gable, brick houses on all 41 lots. The houses were marketed directly to veterans returning from the war and featured a kitchen, living room, and dining room on the first story, and two bedrooms and one bathroom on the second story. As of the 2000 census, the town population was 959 residents.

Little has changed in Edmonston since the 1993 survey. Edmonston remains a small commuter suburb, located west of Kenilworth Avenue and east of Baltimore Avenue/Rhode Island Avenue. Buildings in Edmonston represent primarily residential use, with a few dwellings rehabilitated for commercial use along Decatur Street and several public buildings including the town hall and recreation center. Buildings range in age from the late nineteenth century to the 1970s, with the majority dating from the 1890s to 1947. There is little modern infill within the community, but many buildings have been altered by modest additions. Building forms represented include the 1-house, front-gabled structures, L-shaped plans, American Foursquare, bungalow, minimal traditional, and ranch houses. Several structures are vernacular interpretations of popular styles, while most represent the Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, and Craftsman styles. The topography of Edmonston is relatively flat with most houses having flat or slightly sloping lots. Houses are typically set close to the road.

**Cottage City (68-096)**

Cottage City is one of the smallest incorporated towns in Maryland and was established as a late-nineteenth-century railroad suburb. The community is located between the Town of Mount Rainier and the Town of Bladensburg near the US 1 corridor.
Located near the Eastern Branch of the Anacostia River, much of the area now comprising Cottage City was originally swampland. In 1608, explorer John Smith noted that the area was inhabited by Native Americans from the Anacostank tribe, who lived on what is now called the Anacostia River. The first settlement in “Yarrow,” as the area around Cottage City was originally known, was established by 1697. During the early eighteenth century, a water-powered grist mill was constructed in the vicinity. Carlton’s Mill (later known as Moyers’ Mill), located on property that is now bounded by Bunker Hill Road and 43rd Avenue, was the first mill constructed in this part of Maryland. The mill operated until the late nineteenth century and stood until its demolition in the 1950s as part of the Anacostia flood control project. Two of the millstones still remain as part of the sidewalk on the 3700 block of 42nd Avenue.

After the economic depression of the early 1890s, the streetcar system expanded, encouraging suburban development in the greater Washington, D.C., area. In 1897, the Maryland and Washington Railway opened a line that ended at Mount Rainier. By 1912 the streetcar line was extended to Berwyn Heights. With the construction of the streetcar system in Prince George’s County, small communities such as Cottage City, Brentwood, and Mount Rainier grew into active commuter suburbs. By 1914 the Highlands was resubdivided a third time and platted as Cottage City. Beginning in World War I (1914–1918), Charles M. Lightbown began constructing one-story cottages there. These bungalows were primarily located on Bladensburg Road and 41st Avenue. Today, Cottage City remains a middle-class commuter suburb in Prince George’s County.

The community contains a variety of buildings constructed from circa 1914 to the 1980s. Buildings in Cottage City reflect a variety of popular twentieth-century styles including Craftsman, Spanish Revival, and Modern Movement. The overwhelming majority of buildings (approximately 90 percent) are one-and-a-half-story bungalows with varying levels of Craftsman-style detailing. Another common building type in Cottage City is the one-story, flat-roofed Spanish Revival-style dwelling. These buildings are typically clad in stucco and have small porticos or entry porches topped by a shed roof covered with regularly-laid Spanish tiles. The dwellings often feature arched openings, typical of the Spanish Revival style. Other less frequent forms include examples of ranch houses and other small side-gabled dwellings. The topography of the neighborhood is flat, and houses have only small setbacks from the street. A strip of commercial development is located along Bladensburg Road. Many of these buildings are dwellings that have been adapted for commercial use.

Colmar Manor (68-103)

The Town of Colmar Manor was established as a commuter suburb in the early twentieth century. The community is situated south of Bladensburg Road, east of Fort Lincoln Cemetery, and west of the Anacostia River.

During the War of 1812, the area now comprising portions of Colmar Manor was involved in a military clash between American and British forces. On August 24, 1814, during the Battle of Bladensburg, British troops quickly defeated the inexperienced American forces and marched south
to the nation’s capital where they captured and burned much of the city. Colmar Manor is best known as the site of nineteenth-century dueling grounds (Historic Site 68-014). The most famous duel took place between Commodore Stephen Decatur and James Barron. After a long-standing feud between the two men, Barron challenged Decatur to a duel in 1820. Both men were wounded and Decatur died from his injuries. The site, now located in a small park near 37th Avenue and Bladensburg Road, served as a dueling ground for at least 26 recorded fights between 1808–1868.

The Shreve House, constructed circa 1817, is believed to be the first house built in the area and is noted on both the 1861 Martenet and 1878 Hopkins maps. The area around Colmar Manor remained farmland until the early twentieth century when part of the Shreve estate was platted and subdivided as Colmar Manor. The name was derived from the “Col” in Columbia and “Mar” from Maryland.

Colmar Manor consists of three subdivisions platted between 1918–1920. The first subdivision was platted as Colmar Manor in 1918 by the J. W. Holloway Company. The Washington, D.C.-based development company advertised lots for sale in Colmar Manor for only $59. That same year, the J. W. Holloway Company platted the First Addition to Colmar Manor and sold lots there for $59. Holloway advertised Colmar Manor as an attractive subdivision of Washington, D.C., which was “cramped for room and must expand.” Colmar Manor’s location outside of the District of Columbia was “in the path of this expansion, half an hour from the center of the city.” Prospective buyers were encouraged to visit Colmar Manor by trolley car or by automobile, demonstrating the easy commute between Washington, D.C., and the new community. In 1920, the adjoining neighborhood of Lenox was platted, extending the grid pattern of Colmar Manor’s streets. The Town of Colmar Manor was incorporated in 1927, and in 1931 the Lenox subdivision was added to the town.

After incorporation, the town continued to grow, and residents soon appealed to the local government for amenities. In the 1930s, the streets were paved, gutters were installed, and a school and municipal building were constructed. In the 1950s, lots along Bladensburg Road were resubdivided and rezoned to provide space for commercial development. Because of a rapid decline in the Colmar Manor area in the 1960s, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development authorized an urban renewal project which resulted in the community being awarded over $8 million for improvements and revitalization. In addition to revitalizing the housing stock and redeveloping the commercial strip along Bladensburg Road, streets were improved, affordable housing was constructed, and the Colmar Manor Park was established on the site of a former landfill.

The community contains a variety of buildings constructed from circa 1918 to the 1970s. Buildings in Colmar Manor reflect a variety of popular twentieth-century styles, including Craftsman, Colonial Revival, Dutch Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, and styles from the Modern Movement. The majority of buildings are one-and-a-half-story bungalows with varying levels of Craftsman-style detailing. An apartment building dating from the late 1930s is located at 4209 Newark Road and is the only multifamily dwelling in the community. The topography of the neighborhood is flat, and houses are set back slightly from the road.

New Carrollton (69-000)

New Carrollton is a mid-twentieth-century residential suburb located approximately five miles from Washington, D.C. The community is bounded by the Capital Beltway (I-495), Annapolis Road, the Baltimore-Washington Parkway (I-295), and Good Luck Road. New Carrollton was originally part of the large landholdings of the prominent Prince George’s County Beall family who owned thousands of acres extending from Upper Marlboro to Georgetown. In the nineteenth century, the Beall family constructed several houses for various family members, including at least two houses located near what is now known as New Carrollton. The Beall family chose to build their houses near the Washington-Annapolis Stage Coach Road, an important early road, now known as Annapolis Road.

The area remained largely rural and undeveloped until the twentieth century. The Beall, Beckett, and Lanham families resided in the area and farmed the land. In the 1920s, Edward L. Mahoney purchased 300 acres of land near present-day Legation Road and constructed a modest Cape Cod dwelling for himself in 1927. Mahoney also built stables and a training track for his horses. In the late 1930s, Mahoney converted the horse track to a midget and stock car racing track. Because of the success of the racetrack, in 1941, Mahoney expanded and modernized
the track. He opened the West Lanham Speedway on his property, which attracted 8,000 fans on opening night.

In the early 1950s, Mahoney’s neighbor Maurice Downes sold his property to Albert W. Turner. Turner was elected as the first mayor of the city in 1954. He named the city for the “historically famous family of Carrolls – founders of American democracy.” Between February 1953 and March 1959, Turner platted 17 sections of “Carrollton,” which he planned to develop into a 1,300-house community. Buyers were able to select their house from 14 available models that sold for $16,200 to $19,500. Turner offered six additional models for sale in 1956. The houses contained two, three, and four bedrooms and featured “plaster walls, basements, and slate roofs. All homes have colored bath fixtures, completely equipped kitchens, fully sodded and shrubbed lots.” Turner marketed Carrollton as an affordable, attractive, and conveniently located community only 20 minutes from Washington, D.C., by car.

Carrollton continued to be a great success, and when Edward Mahoney died in December 1957, Mahoney’s property became the site of Greenbrier, another of Turner’s Modern Construction Company subdivisions in the City of Carrollton. By February 1963, the last lot in Carrollton was sold. The city continued to grow and annexed additional land in subsequent years. In the 1960s, Turner continued to develop Carrollton, constructing shopping centers, apartment buildings, and other commercial buildings in the area. In 1966, it was renamed the City of New Carrollton, to distinguish it from the other two Carrollton cities in Maryland. By 1968, virtually every lot in New Carrollton was improved. The city continued to grow in the late twentieth century as the city government annexed adjoining land. In November 1978, the Metrorail line was extended to New Carrollton.

The community contains a variety of buildings constructed between circa 1953–1965. New Carrollton reflects the period from which it developed. Many houses illustrate the transitional nature of domestic architecture in the 1950s, reflecting both traditional elements of the Colonial Revival style and more modern elements of the Modern Movement. Although the original houses featured slate roofs, very few houses appear to have retained that design feature. Other common materials found in New Carrollton include aluminum, asbestos, and vinyl. Many houses incorporate brick on the first story of the façade and other modern cladding materials on the second story and secondary elevations. Reflecting its establishment as an automobile suburb, approximately 95 percent of houses have either a carport or garage. The curvilinear streets of New Carrollton take advantage of the rolling hills of the landscape. The community is predominately residential, although schools, churches, and public buildings are also located within the neighborhood. Commercial development is located on the perimeter of the neighborhood and is largely concentrated around the shopping centers on Annapolis Road. The New Carrollton Metro Station is located south of the community.

Bladensburg (69-005), North Decatur Heights (69-037), Washington Suburban Homes (69-038)

Located in western Prince George’s County, the Town of Bladensburg was established in 1742 by an act passed by the Maryland General Assembly, establishing a town near Garrison’s Landing on the Eastern Branch (as the Anacostia River was then known). Originally called “Bladensburgh,” the town was named after colonial governor Thomas Bladen. In 1747, Bladensburg was designated as an inspection site for tobacco in Prince George’s County. In order to protect the quality of tobacco being shipped to England, all tobacco grown in Maryland had to pass through inspection sites at Nottingham, Piscataway, Upper Marlboro, or Bladensburg before it was allowed to be publicly sold. By 1776, Bladensburg exported more tobacco than any other Maryland port on the western shore of the Chesapeake. By the late eighteenth century, Bladensburg supported a shipyard, tannery, waterfront wharves, taverns, stores, and dwellings.

The eighteenth-century seaport of Bladensburg has been greatly altered; however several early buildings remain, including four structures predating the American Revolution (1775-1783). The earliest extant building is Bostwick (Historic Site 69-005-67), a Georgian-style building constructed in 1746 by Christopher Lowndes. Lowndes also constructed the Market Master’s House (Historic Site 69-005-08) in 1765, which served as the home for the port’s manager. The Hilleary-Magruder House (Historic Site 69-005-07) was erected by William Hilleary between 1742 and 1746 and was visited by George Washington in 1787. The George Washington House (Historic Site 69-005-02), named in honor of the visiting president, was first constructed as a store in 1760 and was
part of a commercial complex that originally included a tavern and blacksmith shop.

In the early nineteenth century, Bladensburg was the site of pitched battles with the British during the War of 1812. In August 1814 on the Anacostia River and in the streets of the town, the American Chesapeake Flotilla and troops under the command of Commodore Joshua Barney suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of the British. From Bladensburg, the British marched easily into Washington and set fire to the capital's public buildings and changed the course of the war.

By the mid-nineteenth century, the town had evolved from a bustling port to a town that included several churches, shops, and dwellings. As the Anacostia River silted up, the river became unnavigable for larger ships carrying tobacco and supplies. This caused trade and shipping in Bladensburg and other small ports to decrease as Baltimore became the primary port because of its accessibility to more farmers, merchants, and larger ships. The last commercial vessel left Bladensburg in 1843, loaded with sixty hogsheads of tobacco. When the Baltimore and Ohio (B&O) Railroad was constructed in 1835, it bypassed Bladensburg, effectively cutting off the town as a mid-nineteenth-century commercial center.

The construction of the Alexandria Branch of the B&O Railroad in the 1870s spurred development in Bladensburg. In support of this growing industry, two hotels and several new stores were constructed. The northern and eastern portions of the town experienced the most growth, as the town expanded closer to neighboring communities such as Hyattsville. Many new dwellings, outbuildings, and commercial buildings were constructed between 1861–1878. A Freedmen’s Bureau school was established in an old building in the town in 1866, and a schoolhouse for local African-American students was constructed the following year.

In the early twentieth century, the expansion of the streetcar system connected Bladensburg and other communities to Washington, D.C. From the early twentieth century through the mid-twentieth century, several subdivisions were platted on the northeastern edges of the historic town primarily because of the accessibility to this public transportation system. This includes Linwood (1911), Decatur Heights (1915), Whiteley (1919), North Decatur Heights (1925), Section 4 of Decatur Heights (1927), Washington Suburban Homes (1946), and Decatur Heights, Addition A (1947). Bladensburg developed and has continued to be an active suburban community in Prince George’s County since the early twentieth century. Although the town has undergone many changes, it retains several historic buildings that recall the town’s character and importance from the Colonial era to the first half of the twentieth century.

Bladensburg is a bustling community, bisected by Annapolis Road and Kenilworth Avenue. Commercial resources are largely concentrated along these major streets. Buildings in Bladensburg represent a variety of uses including residential, commercial, industrial, religious, and educational. Buildings in the residential area date from the early twentieth century through the 1970s. Architectural styles present include various interpretations of the Colonial Revival, Craftsman, and illustrations from the Modern Movement. The topography of Bladensburg is relatively flat with most houses having level or slightly sloping lots. Houses are typically set close to the road.

**Ardwick (69-023)**

Ardwick was established in the late nineteenth century as a railroad suburb. The community is located in northwestern Prince George’s County approximately six miles east of Washington, D.C. The community is surrounded by modern residential development and is bounded by the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Metrorail line, and MD 450 and US 50. Although its establishment in 1889 and subsequent development was greatly influenced by the construction of the nearby Baltimore and Washington line of the Pennsylvania Railroad, Ardwick’s significance as an African-American community was initiated by William Stanton Wormley, who first used the site as a retreat in the early twentieth century.

Until the late nineteenth century, the area comprising the present-day area of Ardwick was farmland. Both Martenet’s map of 1861 and the Hopkins map of 1878 document limited development in the area that would become Ardwick. A few farms are located around the perimeter of the community but none within the community boundaries. Ardwick was initially platted in 1889 as a railroad suburb by Thomas Mitchell, a Washington, D.C., real estate broker.

The original plan was abandoned soon after platting, and the area remained rural, despite the location near the Ardwick railroad station. The historically African-
American portion of the larger Ardwick community developed along Ardwick-Ardmore Road, between MD 450 and MD 410. In 1897, Hugh Browne constructed a modest wood-frame dwelling on five acres of land. William Stanton Wormley, a prominent African-American educator and artist from Washington, D.C., purchased the house and surrounding acreage in 1903. Wormley was the grandson of businessman James Wormley, who in 1871 established the Wormley Hotel, located at 15th and H Streets in Washington, D.C.

The Wormley House (Historic Site 69-023-17) in Ardwick was used as a country retreat and social center for Wormley and his family, friends, and colleagues, who took advantage of the tennis court and trapshooting range constructed on the property by Wormley. The range served as a meeting place for the Trap Shooting Club known as WorTayCarBro, named after the families of the founding members Wormley, Taylor, Carson, and Brooks. Many prominent members of the African-American community in Washington, D.C., spent time at the Wormley property. Before his death in 1919, Wormley began selling parcels of his land to friends and family in 1911. They constructed modest dwellings of their own, creating a small community of professional African-Americans who commuted to Washington, D.C. Many of these homeowners were affiliated with the black public school system in Washington, D.C., and settled in the area between 1911–1945. Gradually the weekend retreat at Ardwick evolved into a community mostly made up of black professionals who permanently resided there.

Later in the twentieth century, the community has been greatly affected by the expansion of nearby transportation routes, including local highways and the Metrorail line. This expansion, combined with new multifamily housing north of Ardwick-Ardmore Road, resulted in the demolition of several dwellings associated with the African-American community. New suburban development surrounding the historic community has also impacted the physical landscape of Ardwick.

The small historic community is clustered on both sides of Ardwick Ardmore Road, between Buchanan Street on the west and MD 410 on the east. The community contains a variety of buildings constructed between the 1890s and 2000, the vast majority built in the 1950s. Buildings in Ardwick reflect a variety of vernacular and popular styles including the Colonial Revival and the Modern Movement. Building forms include rectangular-shaped plans, Cape Cods, Bungalow, and Ranch houses. The topography of the neighborhood is flat, and houses have varying setbacks from the road. The community is exclusively residential. Commercial, religious, and educational buildings are located outside of the survey area, primarily along Annapolis Road (MD 450).

Cheverly (69-024)

Cheverly was established as an early twentieth-century community located one mile from the northeastern border of Washington, D.C. Cheverly is bordered by the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, Landover Road, and US 50. Mount Hope (Historic Site 69-024-11), constructed circa 1839 by Fielder Magruder, Jr., is the oldest house in the community. At its largest, the Mount Hope plantation contained 843 acres of land. Mount Hope is documented on both Martenet’s map of 1861 and Hopkin’s 1878 atlas as “E. Magruder Res.” and the only residence in the area. After Magruder’s death in 1888, the property changed hands several times until a 193-acre parcel of land, including Mount Hope, was purchased by Robert Marshall in 1918. Marshall, a former stockbroker and land developer from Ohio, purchased the surrounding acreage and began to plat the neighborhood of “Cheverly.” Marshall lived in Mount Hope where he undertook a restoration of the house. Robert Marshall, president of the Washington Suburban Realty Company, platted seven sections of Cheverly between 1918 and 1926. Taking advantage of the natural topography, Marshall designed Cheverly to take advantage of the curving, hilly landscape. Marshall named his new neighborhood after Cheverly Gardens, an adjoining 43-acre subdivision he acquired in 1918 near Landover Station.

The subdivision was quickly improved, and in October 1920 the first street, now called Cheverly Avenue, was paved. To spur development, between 1921–1925, Marshall constructed 34 kit houses, the majority of which were designed by Sears, Roebuck and Co. and McClure Homes Company. By 1923, all roads in Cheverly were surfaced, and street lamps were installed. That same year, the first school for the neighborhood was constructed. By 1924, more than 25 houses were built in the neighborhood and more than 350 lots had been sold. Houses ranged in price from $5,000 to more than $15,000. The majority of lots in
Cheverly were improved by individual owners; however, several were improved by speculative builders.

In 1927, after a failed attempt to redevelop Forest Road into a grand avenue leading to the Beaver Dam Country Club (now the Prince George’s Ballroom, Marshall lost control of the Washington Suburban Realty Company and was replaced by Edwin Dutton. In 1931, the Town of Cheverly was incorporated. It was not until after World War II (1941-1945) that construction activity began to increase again. Several new churches were built, and the town acquired the ten-acre town park. In 1958, Cheverly expanded by one-third with the annexation of the Cheverly Industrial Park. Later in the twentieth century, the expansion of the Metrorail line to Cheverly in 1978 solidified the community as a commuter suburb of Washington, D.C.

The town contains a variety of buildings constructed from circa 1839 to the present, although the overwhelming majority of buildings in Cheverly were constructed from 1921 through the 1950s. Buildings in Cheverly reflect a variety of popular twentieth-century styles including Craftsman, Spanish Revival, Colonial Revival, Dutch Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, and a number of interpretations from the Modern Movement. Common building forms include bungalows, Cape Cods, ranch houses, and minimal traditional houses. There are a number of extant kit houses in the neighborhood, most of which were Sears and Roebuck designs. A variety of materials and decorative treatments are illustrated in Cheverly including brick, stone veneer, stucco, and half-timbering. The neighborhood is hilly, and the landscape of the community was designed to take advantage of the topography, resulting in curvilinear streets and irregular lot shapes. The community has a mature canopy of trees, and there are several parks for town residents. The buildings in Cheverly are almost exclusively residential, although there are several religious and social buildings in the community. Public buildings in Cheverly include a school, community center, and town hall, all of which are located outside of the area originally platted by Robert Marshall.

Landover Hills (69-042)

The Town of Landover Hills includes approximately 148 acres of hilly land bounded by Annapolis Road (MD 450), 68th Place, Ardmore-Ardwick Road, and the Amtrak right-of-way. In the early twentieth century, the vicinity consisted of two small farms and several tracts of heavily wooded land. The community was planned by Monroe and Dorothy Warren. Monroe Warren (1895-1983) was the founder and senior partner of the prolific construction company Monroe and R.B. Warren, Inc., which was founded in 1920. Warren was one of four sons of Assistant U.S. Surgeon General B.S. Warren. Monroe Warren also founded Meadowbrook, Inc., which existed from 1932 to 1966. During the 1930s, Warren became one of the most active builders of low-cost housing on a grand scale in the Washington, D.C., area.

In Landover Hills, by 1940, model homes were ready for inspection, and homebuyers could purchase lots within the subdivision. By 1943, houses were being built on Taylor Street and the vicinity. Because of the shortage of materials brought on by World War II, the houses on the streets south of Taylor Street were built as prefabricated units. Shortages of building supplies slowed the completion of houses and forced the builder to make design changes, such as changing heating systems from oil to coal. These early houses ranged in style from simplified Colonial Revival to small ranch houses and traditional gable-roof forms, executed in both brick and frame construction. A one-and-a-half story Cape Cod and a two-story Colonial Revival were marketed as “Twin ‘Silver Star’ Model Homes” and cost $4,700 and $5,000 respectively.

Early residents gathered in their homes to form a civic association and a fire department. The first post office was established on May 16, 1945 at 4419 72nd Avenue, the home of Edward and Ann McEntee. The rear wall of their kitchen was converted into a walk-up window where postal business could be conducted. Four years later, the post office moved to Oliver’s Store where it remained until the Landover Hills Shopping Center was expanded and could provide space for a full-size post office. The Town of Landover Hills was incorporated in 1945.

Landover Hills Elementary School opened in September 1948. The building included many innovations, such as a functional fireplace in the library, large airy classrooms with individual exits to play areas, chalkboards at student height, boys’ and girls’ bathrooms adjacent to each classroom, a large principal’s office, a teachers’ lounge, a health room, a cafeteria, and a auditorium with a raised platform and velvet curtains. Enrollment rapidly outstripped facilities. Opening with 400 students, the school population grew to 820 by 1951.

St. Mary’s Roman Catholic Church started as a mission church of St. George Church in Ardmore. In the early 1940s, Landover Hills’ Roman Catholics attended mass at the small wooded structure known as “the Cathedral in the Pines.” The 9.5-acre property for St. Mary’s was purchased in 1948, and two officers’ mess halls, acquired from the War Assets Administration, were transported from Richmond and rebuilt. The buildings were assembled on the Buchanan Street side of the property, and exterior brickwork was added. Ascension Lutheran Church was dedicated on March 3, 1957, and Christ United Methodist Church was completed in 1962. By 1971, the number of houses in the town had reached 470, and the population had risen to a peak of 2,000. In 2010, the population of the town was 1,534. To date, no detailed architectural survey or historical analysis of the Town of Landover Hills has been conducted.

Lincoln (70-049)
Lincoln was established in the early twentieth century by African-Americans as a rural retreat located eight miles east of Washington, D.C., south of Glenn Dale, east of Seabrook, and north of Annapolis Road.

In 1908, the Lincoln Land and Improvement Company, Inc. purchased nearly 200 acres of land along the Washington, Baltimore, and Annapolis (WB&A) Electric Railroad and platted the community of Lincoln. Thomas J. Calloway, an African-American educator, developer, and attorney from Washington, D.C., was vice president and general manager of the Lincoln Land and Improvement Company. Calloway envisioned the community as a vacation retreat and garden suburb for African-Americans. In the early twentieth century, there were few options for affordable housing for middle-class African-Americans in the county. However, several other black communities developed contemporaneously including North Brentwood, Fairmount Heights, and Glenarden. Lincoln was the only community marketed as a rural retreat for African-Americans. The community was designed with “roomy” streets that stretched 50–70 feet wide and building lots that were 50 feet by 150 feet and sold for $270. The original radiating street plan for the community was only partially developed, and the intended semicircle design of Crescent Avenue with a community park inside was never realized.

In 1910, noted black architect Isaiah T. Hatton designed the first house in Lincoln for Thomas Calloway (Historic Site 70-049-33). Hatton was a Washington-based architect who studied under William Sidney Pittman. Hatton designed a number of prominent landmarks in the city, including the Dunbar Theatre and the Whitelaw Hotel. By 1915 approximately ten families lived in Lincoln including Isaiah Hatton, who designed several houses in the community. Calloway noted that through Hatton’s guidance, the community was able “to maintain a high standard of excellence in home planning.” The community quickly became a retreat for a number of prominent African-American families who were attracted to the quiet rural setting. Lincoln had its own station on the electric interurban line with a general store and schoolhouse located nearby. Development in Lincoln peaked in the early 1920s. Several residents purchased multiple lots, and a few even farmed on their land. The children of Lincoln attended school at the one-room schoolhouse in nearby Buena Vista or traveled to Washington, D.C., to attend classes. In 1921, members of the civic associations of Lincoln and Buena Vista successfully lobbied the Board of Education to allocate funds for the construction of a school in Lincoln, which was built with assistance from the Rosenwald Fund.

In the 1930s, growth in Lincoln began to decline. Due to decreasing ridership as a result of the increasing popularity and accessibility of the automobile, the railroad ceased operations in 1935. The community was further impacted when the construction of the George Palmer Highway (now called MD 704 or Martin Luther King, Jr., Highway) was not paved as far as Lincoln. Residents who did not own a car were landlocked, and the lack of public transportation in the area made it difficult to travel to the District of Columbia. As a result, the community returned to its roots as a vacation and retreat community for Washington, D.C.’s black professional population. Although Thomas Calloway envisioned that Lincoln would eventually gain its own municipal government, the community remained a loosely knit, semirural community which remained largely rural until the 1970s when a building boom began. In the 1980s, several historic structures were demolished, including the Lincoln railroad station and the original Seaton Memorial A.M.E. Church.
The community contains a wide variety of buildings constructed between 1910 and the present. The majority of the buildings in Lincoln were constructed from 1965–1980s. There are a number of popular twentieth-century architectural styles in Lincoln, including Craftsman, Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, Contemporary, and several illustrations from the Modern Movement. There are approximately five extant buildings that date from 1910 to 1920. In the 1970s, many of the original large lots were resubdivided, which resulted in the construction of nonhistoric infill and irregularly sized lots. The community is almost exclusively residential and is composed of single-family dwellings. The only exceptions are a church and a school located southwest of the residential area and included in the survey of the community.

Glenn Dale (70-052)

Glenn Dale developed as a late nineteenth-century railroad suburb south of the intersection of Lanham-Severn Road and Glenn Dale Boulevard. In the 1870s, the Pennsylvania Railroad established a route from Baltimore through Upper Marlboro to Pope’s Creek in Charles County and a branch line into Washington, D.C. The small communities of Lanham, Seabrook, and Glenn Dale were established on this Washington branch when the localities were selected as the site of new railroad stations.

Glenn Dale originally developed from part of the Duvall family’s large land holdings. Martenet’s map of 1861 shows the rural area, settled only by a few families including the Duvalls, a prominent Prince George’s County family. In 1871 the Duvall family, who owned the nearby plantation of Marietta, sold some of their land to their family attorney, John Glenn. Glenn began to sell parcels of his land, and the area soon became known as Glennville. By 1878 the Hopkins map documents that the small village, then called “Glendale,” contained several residences, a saw mill, brick yard, blacksmith shop, a store, post office, and St. George’s Episcopal Church, all centered on the Glenn Dale train station.

In 1885 the community of “Glendale” was officially platted in two sections and was likely named for the train station of the same name. The railroad tracks bisected the small community, which consisted of approximately 81 lots of varying sizes. Lots were located both north and south of the railroad tracks and ranged from small (50 feet by 176 feet) to large, including one lot approximately 330 feet by 1,320 feet. Section 1, the southern portion of the plat, remains largely as originally platted in 1885.

In the early twentieth century, the community, now called “Glenn Dale,” remained a small railroad village. By 1900, the village contained approximately 17 houses. Despite the community’s location in a largely rural area where many residents’ occupation involved agriculture, some residents of Glenn Dale commuted to Washington by train. The USDA Plant Introduction Station, established in Glenn Dale in 1920, provided employment for local residents and encouraged the construction of several houses near the Introduction Station on Bell Station Road. In the 1930s the District of Columbia constructed Glenn Dale Hospital, which was used as a tuberculosis sanitarium for the poor. Although there was some initial opposition to its construction, the hospital encouraged local improvements and provided employment opportunities for residents. Glenn Dale remained largely undeveloped until the second half of the twentieth century. In the 1970s several resubdivisions of larger lots resulted in small clusters of development scattered throughout the community.

The community contains buildings constructed from the 1870s to the present. Buildings in Glenn Dale reflect a variety of popular styles including Queen Anne, Craftsman, Colonial Revival, Dutch Colonial Revival, and a number of illustrations from the Modern Movement. Common building forms include L-shaped plans, bungalows, Cape Cods, minimal traditional houses, ranch houses, split-foyer, and split-level houses. The oldest houses in Glenn Dale were typically situated on the largest lots in the neighborhood and were originally used as farmhouses. As residents of Glenn Dale stopped farming in the early twentieth century, these lots were subdivided, resulting in modern infill. This pattern of development has resulted in irregularly shaped lots of differing sizes and varied setbacks in the neighborhood. The topography of Glenn Dale is relatively flat. The majority of buildings in the community are residential, although there are several religious and educational buildings. A few nonhistoric commercial buildings are located north and south of the railroad tracks. Public buildings in Glenn Dale include a post office, fire station, and the Glenn Dale Elementary School. The small community is surrounded by modern subdivisions including Wood Pointe, developed in the late 1980s and Glenn Dale Village, developed circa 2004. Glenn Dale Hospital was abandoned more than twenty years ago and purchased by M-NCPPC in 1995. The 210-acre
campus, located outside of the survey area, is currently being evaluated for redevelopment.

**Seabrook (70-053)**

Seabrook was established in the 1870s as a resort community on the Pennsylvania Railroad line in northwest Prince George’s County. Seabrook is located approximately 12 miles east of Washington, D.C., south of Lanham Severn Road (MD 564), and north of Annapolis Road (MD 450).

In the 1870s, several railroads began expanding through Prince George’s County to connect to Washington, D.C. The Pennsylvania Railroad established a route from Baltimore through Upper Marlboro to Pope's Creek in Charles County and a branch line into Washington, D.C. The small communities of Lanham, Seabrook, and Glenn Dale were established on this Washington branch when the localities were selected as the site of new railroad stations.

In 1871, Thomas Seabrook, an engineer for the Pennsylvania Railroad, purchased 500 acres of land around one of the planned railroad stations. Seabrook subdivided the property and built three identical Gothic Revival-style cottages for use by his family and friends. By 1880, the railroad station, the three cottages, and a few commercial buildings had been constructed in Seabrook.

Thomas Seabrook died in 1897, and his will devised his land to his heirs. Seabrook's widow sold one of the undeveloped lots to the school commissioners, who soon constructed a school house at 6116 Seabrook Road. The Seabrook School (Historic Site 70-053-13) remains one of the earliest surviving schoolhouses in Prince George’s County. Seabrook’s family retained control of his property until 1912 when they sold the remaining undeveloped lots to Tyrrel E. Biddle. After the property was purchased by Biddle, Seabrook began to slowly develop. Lots on the northern side of Lanham-Severn Road were resubdivided in the 1930s and in the 1950s by the Seabrook Realty Corporation. By 1957, approximately 185 houses had been constructed in Seabrook. In the mid-twentieth century, commercial development expanded along both Lanham-Severn Road and Annapolis Road.

The community contains a variety of buildings constructed between the 1880s–1990s. The vast majority of buildings in Seabrook date from the mid-twentieth century. There are a number of popular architectural styles represented in Seabrook including Gothic Revival, Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Spanish Revival, and a variety of styles from the Modern Movement. Common building forms include rectangular-shaped plans, bungalows, Cape Cods, ranch houses, minimal traditional houses, and split-level houses. The streets are laid in a grid pattern that runs parallel to the railroad tracks and Lanham-Severn Road. The community is bisected by Lanham-Severn Road and commercial development is concentrated along this thoroughfare and Annapolis Road. Many of the buildings along these routes are residential buildings rehabilitated for commercial use. Development north of Lanham-Severn Road dates from the 1950s through the 1990s, although the majority of this development dates from the third quarter of the twentieth century. Several office buildings are located in the northern part of Seabrook, in addition to the residential and commercial buildings.

**Fletchertown (71A-022)**

Fletchertown is a late nineteenth-century rural African-American community, located south of Huntington and northwest of Bowie. The historic community of Fletchertown is centered on Old Fletchertown Road. In the late nineteenth century, Gabriel Fletcher, an African-American farmer, began purchasing land to establish a farm for his family near Bowie. In 1892, Fletcher purchased lot number 6 from the estate of George W. Wood. Fletcher purchased the 13.5-acre lot for $150. The following year at a public auction, Fletcher purchased lot seven for $500, which contained 6.32 acres.

Gabriel Fletcher was born circa 1857 in Maryland. The 1880 census lists Fletcher as a single, 23-year-old mulatto living with his mother and siblings in Queen Anne, Prince George’s County. His occupation is listed as laborer. By 1900, the census notes Fletcher living in Bowie with his wife of 14 years, Virginia, and their five children. He is listed as owning his home, and his occupation is recorded as farmer. After Gabriel and his wife purchased their land near Bowie, members of the extended Fletcher family, including Gabriel’s mother and brother, moved to the area. The majority of their neighbors either farmed or worked for the railroad. By 1910, the census notes that the small community was known as “Fletchertown.”

Because of Fletchertown’s proximity to Bowie, the small village never became self-sufficient and remained a rural residential area. Residents traveled to the railroad village of Bowie for necessities, social activities, and church. Before the 1920s, African-American children in Fletchertown
traveled to Bowie to attend school at Horsepen Hill. As the population of Fletchertown increased, the community petitioned to have a school constructed in the area. In 1921, the Prince George’s County Board of Education recommended constructing one school to serve the residents of both Fletchertown and Duckettsville, another small African-American village on the outskirts of Bowie. Both communities protested and the Board of Education eventually relented, allowing each village to have its own school. The Fletchertown Elementary School was funded by bonds and the Rosenwald Fund. The one-room schoolhouse finally opened in 1922 and served up to 50 children at a time through grade seven. In 1952, the Board of Education sold the schoolhouse for $1200 and it was subsequently converted into a private residence. The schoolhouse is no longer extant.

In the mid-twentieth century, Fletchertown remained a small rural village; however, residents began selling off portions of their property and new houses were constructed in the community. Development has continued in the late twentieth century with the late-1990s subdivision of Nazario Woods (located on the south side of Old Fletchertown Road), the 1990s subdivision of Northridge (located northwest and west of Fletchertown), and the platting of “Pleasant Ridge” in 2006 by Capitol Development Design, Inc., (located on the north side of Old Fletchertown Road).

The community contains a variety of buildings constructed between circa 1890 and the present. Approximately three buildings in Fletchertown were constructed prior to 1930. These include a late nineteenth-century I-house, a circa 1924 Foursquare (Noble Strother House—Historic Resource 71A-022-04), and a vernacular dwelling constructed circa 1910. The overwhelming majority of resources in the area were constructed between 1990 and the present. Styles represented in Fletchertown include the Colonial Revival and illustrations of the Modern Movement. Building forms present in the community include the I-house, Foursquare, bungalow, ranch houses, and minimal traditional houses. Houses in the subdivision of Nazario Woods on the south side of Old Fletchertown Road are two-story, five-bay, side-gabled dwellings with a central projecting front-gabled bay. The facades of the houses are covered with a brick veneer, while the side and rear elevations are clad with vinyl siding. All of the houses have an attached garage on a side elevation. Fletchertown is exclusively residential and is composed of single-family dwellings. The topography of the neighborhood is hilly and houses are set on irregular lots of varying sizes. Private roads off of Old Fletchertown Road provide access to houses located between Old Fletchertown Road and the Northridge subdivision to the west.

Huntington/Bowie (71B-002)

Incorporated in 1874, the City of Bowie is located in the northeastern portion of the county. Within the sprawling City of Bowie is a historic core comprising the small railroad community originally known as Huntington City. This community was situated at the junction of the main line of the Baltimore & Potomac Railroad and its spur line into Washington, D.C.

Much of Bowie is part of the early eighteenth century estate known as Catton, which was owned by Robert Carvile of St. Mary’s City. By 1719, the property was purchased by Jacob Henderson, rector of Queen Anne’s Parish, who renamed the area “Belair.” Samuel Ogle, and his future son-in-law Benjamin Tasker (Senior), purchased the 2,500-acre estate in 1737 and constructed the Belair Mansion (Historic Site 71B-004), which remained in the family until 1871. The site of Huntington was located five miles northwest of the Belair Mansion. Martenet’s map of 1861 documents the area as a rural community with small farms scattered across the landscape. In 1853, a state charter was granted to the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company, with Oden Bowie as its president. Bowie, who was born at Fairview, near the Belair estate, had fought in the Mexican War and served in the Maryland House of Delegates and the Maryland State Senate. Plans to construct the railroad line were stalled by the Civil War; construction finally began in 1868, sparking suburban development plans.

In 1869, Ben M. Plumb, a developer and speculator from Washington, D.C., and his associates purchased a 300-acre farm from Henry Carrick at the future juncture of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad and the spur line to Washington, D.C. In 1870, he platted Huntington City on a rectilinear grid that was bisected diagonally by the railroad tracks. The tract was laid out with streets named after trees running north and south, and numbered streets running east and west. The 2,500 square-foot lots were offered for sale at $25 each. Purchases of the lots began almost immediately with some of the earliest buildings constructed by the railroad company. The first train passed through Huntington in 1872, and a train...
station was constructed later that year. The station was named Bowie for Oden Bowie, president of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad and then governor of Maryland. As the community grew, residents became interested in incorporation, and in March 1874 the Maryland General Assembly granted a charter to the commissioners of Huntington and established the Town of Huntington. In 1882, the town commissioners changed the name of the town to Bowie, in honor of Governor Oden Bowie, whose efforts had helped establish the railroad in Prince George’s County.

As in much of Prince George’s County, development during World War II was slow, but picked up significantly after the war. In 1956, William J. Levitt, whose best-known development was Levittown in Nassau County, New York, purchased the Belair estate. His plan was to develop a 2,200-acre community, the largest ever attempted in Prince George’s County. Levitt began to lobby the Town of Bowie to annex his development surrounding the Belair mansion. The large expansion of Bowie at this time divided the city into named sections, and thus, the original railroad town became known as the Huntington section of Bowie. Levitt and others continued to construct new subdivisions in the Bowie area. During the initial flurry of development in the mid-twentieth century, Huntington remained a quiet town with minimal infill constructed from the 1950s–1970s. In the 1990s, the City of Bowie purchased the remaining railroad buildings from Amtrak, moved them to their present site in the Huntington area, and rehabilitated the buildings for use as a museum. Suburban growth began to expand into the Huntington area in the late twentieth century and early twenty-first century.

The community is predominantly residential with a significant concentration of historic commercial buildings. Buildings range in age from circa 1880 to the present. Common building forms include I-houses, front-gabled buildings, L-shaped plans, bungalows, American Foursquares, Cape Cods, and split-foyers. Architectural styles in Huntington include vernacular interpretations of the Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, and Dutch Colonial Revival. The majority of residential buildings are wood-frame construction, although there are masonry buildings including some of rock-faced concrete block. The community is relatively flat with gently rolling hills.

**Seat Pleasant (72-007)**

Seat Pleasant was established as a late-nineteenth-century streetcar suburb that adjoins the eastern corner of the District of Columbia. The community is located south of Martin Luther King, Jr., Highway and Seat Pleasant Drive and is bisected by Addison Road.

In 1873, Benjamin L. Jackson, William B. Jackson, and George J. Seufferle platted the large community of Seat Pleasant. The community was named for the nineteenth-century estate of the Williams family that was destroyed by fire in the mid-nineteenth century. The early plat shows several buildings including houses, farms, outbuildings, cabins, and one store, reflecting the rural nature of the area.

Large-scale development did not begin in Seat Pleasant until after the extension of the rail lines and streetcar lines from Washington, D.C. Although the District of Columbia developed a streetcar line in the 1860s, it was not until the 1890s that service was extended to communities in Prince George’s County. Seat Pleasant was located at the convergence of two railroad lines and the streetcar line, which made it a convenient location for commuters. In 1898, the East Washington Railroad, also known as the Chesapeake Beach Railway, was extended from the District line at Chesapeake Junction (as Seat Pleasant was originally known) through Prince George’s County to Chesapeake Beach in Calvert County. By 1908, train service ran from Washington, D.C., through Seat Pleasant terminating in Annapolis. Taking advantage of the prime location near the rail lines, two new subdivisions were platted. In 1906, lots 14 and 15 of Seat Pleasant were resubdivided and platted as Oakmont. That same year, lots 12 and 13 were resubdivided and platted as Seat Pleasant Heights. Both subdivisions featured small, narrow lots, typically 25 feet by 150 feet, similar to those found in Washington, D.C. Also in 1906, community members gathered to choose a new name for Chesapeake Junction. Several names were debated, but the community agreed on “Seat Pleasant” and requested that a Seat Pleasant post office be established in the community. The Town of Seat Pleasant was incorporated in 1931. In 1935, the WB&A ceased operations as the popularity and accessibility of the automobile increased. The WB&A tracks were dismantled and the right-of-way was paved to serve as a road.

Beginning in the mid-twentieth century, Seat Pleasant continued to grow, and many areas underwent
redevelopment. In the 1950s, many buildings, particularly along Martin Luther King, Jr., Highway and Seat Pleasant Drive, were demolished to make way for new commercial buildings and new housing. The opening of the Capitol Heights and Addison Road-Seat Pleasant Metrorail stations in the 1980s again spurred redevelopment and resulted in the construction of large commercial developments near the stations.

Seat Pleasant contains a wide variety of buildings constructed from the 1890s through the present. The largest period of development dates from the 1890s through the 1940s. Buildings in Seat Pleasant reflect a variety of popular architectural styles including Queen Anne, Italianate, Colonial Revival, Craftsman, and several illustrations of the Modern Movement. Several structures are vernacular interpretations of popular styles. Common building forms in Seat Pleasant include Foursquare, bungalow, Cape Cod, ranch houses, minimal traditional houses, and split-levels. A building form in Seat Pleasant is the detached rowhouse. These wood-frame houses are typically two stories in height with a full-width porch and have either a flat roof or a shed roof. Most display modest interpretations of the Queen Anne or Italianate styles, common in the late nineteenth century. Also common in Seat Pleasant is a number of two-story, front-gabled dwellings with a full-width porch. The community is predominately residential and composed of single-family dwellings, although lots are of varying sizes.

**Fairmount Heights (72-009)**

Fairmount Heights is an early twentieth-century African-American suburb located just outside the easternmost corner of the District of Columbia in Prince George’s County. The community is roughly bounded by Sheriff Road, Balsamtree Drive, 62nd Place, and Eastern Avenue. In the late nineteenth century, the area that would become Fairmount Heights was the site of several small farms that were purchased and consolidated by land speculators in the first decades of the twentieth century. Fairmount Heights contains six subdivisions platted between 1900–1923 by different developers. The initial platting contained approximately 50 acres that were divided into lots typically measuring 25 by 125 feet.

Developers encouraged African-Americans to settle in the area, and the subdivision became one of the first planned communities for black families in the Washington, D.C., area. The earliest dwellings were of wood-frame construction of modest size; however several substantial houses were also built. Early on, the neighborhood was home to several prominent African-Americans, including William Sidney Pittman (Historic Site 72-009-18), a noted architect and son-in-law of Booker T. Washington. Pittman took an active interest in the development of his own neighborhood. He formed the Fairmount Heights Improvement Company to construct a social center for the community. Pittman had Charity Hall constructed, which was used for social events, as a church, and as the community’s first school.

In 1908, the WB&A Railway opened, providing easy access for commuters into Washington, D.C. Residents of Fairmount Heights used the neighboring Gregory Station, located in Seat Pleasant. Other African-Americans, encouraged by the development in Fairmount Heights, soon settled in the area. In addition to the Pittmans, James F. Armstrong (supervisor of Colored Schools in Prince George’s County) (Historic Site 72-009-24), Henry Pinckney (White House steward to President Theodore Roosevelt)(Historic Resource 72-009-33), and Doswell Brooks (supervisor of Colored Schools in Prince George’s County and the first African-American appointed to the Board of Education) (Historic Resource 72-009-36) all constructed houses in the neighborhood. Fairmount Heights was also home to a growing professional community, and many residents worked as clerks or messengers for the federal government. The increased growth in the community created a pressing need for a dedicated school that resulted in the construction of the Fairmount Heights Elementary School (Historic Site 72-009-09). Designed by William Sidney Pittman, the school opened in 1912. In 1920, developer Robinson White constructed 19 bungalows on 62nd Avenue in the original Fairmount Heights subdivision.

After several unsuccessful attempts to incorporate in the 1920s, the Town of Fairmount Heights was officially incorporated in 1935 with a mayor-council form of
government. By the end of the 1930s, the new town consisted of a brick schoolhouse, four churches, a fire department, print shop, and several restaurants and stores. The community continued to grow in the mid-twentieth century and was largely developed by the 1980s. Today the community remains a predominately African-American suburb.

The community contains a wide variety of buildings constructed between 1901 and the present, although the majority of buildings date from 1901–1975. There are a number of popular twentieth century styles represented in Fairmount Heights, including Queen Anne, Craftsman, Colonial Revival, and examples from the Modern Movement. Many of the dwellings are vernacular interpretations, while others appear to be mail-order kit houses by Sears, Roebuck and Co. Common building forms include American Foursquares, bungalows, shotgun houses, ranch houses, split-foyers, and a number of L-shaped and T-shaped plans. Many buildings have irregular massing due to modern additions. A common building type in Fairmount Heights is the modest, minimally ornamented two-story, front-gabled, wood-frame dwelling constructed in the early twentieth century. The majority of houses in Fairmount Heights are wood-frame construction and are clad with a variety of modern replacement materials, although a few houses do retain their original materials. The topography of the neighborhood is hilly and houses have uniform setbacks. The community is predominately residential and contains single dwellings, twin dwellings, and multiple dwellings including apartment buildings. Fairmount Heights contains several religious, social, and educational buildings.

**Glenarden (72-026/73-026)**

Glenarden is significant as an early twentieth-century suburban community that was established in 1908 as a result of the development of the WB&A Electric Railway. In February 1910, William R. Smith of the District of Columbia purchased 78 acres on the WB&A line between Lincoln and Ardwick Station. Later that year, Smith purchased a 76.3-acre parcel along the WB&A line from the estate of Ann H. Bowie. In 1911, the larger parcel was platted as Glenarden Heights; in 1913, the smaller parcel was platted as Glenarden. A third parcel, across the railroad line from Glenarden, was platted as Ardwick Park in 1921, but not recorded. Later Ardwick Park was resubdivided and named Glenarden Woods. Glenarden Woods was annexed by Glenarden in the 1950s; however, the Ardwick Park area had been referred to as Glenarden from its earliest days.

Smith’s Glenarden Development Company marketed the community of Glenarden to African-Americans. In 1922, the two-room Glen Arden school was constructed with the assistance of the Julius Rosenwald Fund in the Ardwick Park section. That year, St. Joseph’s Catholic Church was built on a five-acre site in the same area. By the end of the 1940s, there were 51 dwellings in the area, with 25 in Glenarden, 20 in Glenarden Heights, and six in Ardwick Park. The lack of amenities such as public utilities and paved roads likely hindered development of the suburban enclave. Through the efforts of the Glenarden Civic Association, in 1939, the Town of Glenarden was incorporated by an act of the Maryland General Assembly. During the period when the town’s fortunes were rising, the WB&A Electric Railway Company’s business was on the decline, and WB&A ceased service in 1935. Access to the District of Columbia and other employment centers was facilitated a decade later when the Washington, Marlboro, and Annapolis Motor Lines, Inc. began offering bus service between Glenarden and Seat Pleasant.

W.H. Swann, who had served as president of the Glenarden Civic Association, became the town’s first mayor in 1939. Improvements undertaken during his two-year term included the introduction of home heating and electricity, the surfacing of roads, and the establishment of a police force and a fire department. In 1943, the town hall was constructed, and in 1950, a post office. In 1957, the original two-room school house was replaced with a modern facility, Glenarden Woods Elementary School. Raymond Smith opened a barber shop on George Palmer Highway in the early 1950s. Smith recalls that there were a number of businesses owned by African-Americans on the block serving the community of Glenarden, including his barbershop, two restaurants, a dry cleaner, and a gas station. Area businessmen supported activities for the youth of the community. In 1954, a recreation center was erected at Church Street and Piedmont Avenue. Members of the Glenarden Men’s Club provided the center’s playground equipment. In the 1950s and 1960s, the population of Glenarden grew due to annexation of Glenarden Woods, Glenarden Apartments, and Tyrol Estates. In 1961, the population was 1,336.
In 1964, the construction of I-495, the Capital Beltway, resulted in the removal of all houses on Sixth Street and on the east side of Fifth Street. The semicircular streets around the Glenarden railway stop were removed circa 1965 for construction of a municipal center that replaced the first town hall. St. Joseph’s Catholic Church moved from its original location in Ardwick Park in 1967. The community underwent a further transformation in the mid-1970s when the town received a HUD Community Development Block Grant. As many as 600 households were scheduled for relocation in the 1960s and 1970s, with much of older housing replaced with public housing. Few buildings from the first decade of development stand in the community. The earliest buildings are dwellings dating from the 1920s and are either the modest vernacular with Colonial Revival characteristics or bungalows. Other residential building forms in the community include Cape Cod, ranch, and split-level. The houses display a variety of cladding materials including brick, concrete block, and aluminum and vinyl siding, with some façades containing a mix of two materials. The houses east of Brightseat Road are larger than those on the west. Many of the smaller houses have been expanded with additions. A majority of the houses in the Town of Glenarden were constructed after the mid-1960s. In the final decades of the twentieth century, the population and area of Glenarden continued to grow with the assistance of further annexation. The Washington Commerce Center and Carrollton Station subdivision were annexed in 1983. In 1985, Glenarden annexed the 245-acre Royal Gons tract on its eastern boundary. In summer 2008, construction was underway on a $500-million mixed-use development on the Gons site.

Capitol Heights (75B-005) and Greater Capitol Heights (75A-056)

Capitol Heights was established in the early twentieth century as a residential suburb adjacent to the southeastern boundary of Washington, D.C. In 1904, the subdivision was platted in three sections by Otway B. Zantzinger, a Baltimore-based businessman. Zantzinger’s subdivision included approximately 4,000 lots on land that was originally a large parcel of woodland. The majority of lots in Capitol Heights were long, narrow, rectangular parcels. Lots were priced between $20 and $60 and offered for sale with one dollar down and one dollar a month. Later advertisements noted that the segregated subdivision was intended for whites only. As part of his commitment to the success and growth of the neighborhood, at his own expense, Zantzinger constructed an elementary school for Capitol Heights residents. Opened in 1905, the school had over 100 children in attendance in its first year. By 1907, Zantzinger had sold over 3,500 lots and more than 1,000 residents had made Capitol Heights their home.

Although the subdivision was not directly located on the railroad or streetcar lines, the adjacent neighborhoods of Maryland Park and Seat Pleasant were served by the rail lines. Because of its relative convenience to public transportation and the affordability of the houses due to low construction costs, Capitol Heights proved to be a popular new subdivision. Capitalizing on this popularity, in 1909, Zantzinger platted Greater Capitol Heights, a 400-acre tract of land located on the southern edge of Capitol Heights that included an additional 4,500 lots.

Residents of Capitol Heights and Greater Capitol Heights were white, had small families, and had working-class jobs that included firemen, salesmen, electricians, plasterers, carpenters, post office workers, merchants, and printers. The growing community incorporated as the Town of Capitol Heights in 1910 in an effort to improve roads and public services for residents. Advertisements for Greater Capitol Heights promoted the community as “cool and delightful. No Landlord. No Rent. No Building Restrictions. No Malaria. No Mosquitoes. No Sleepless Nights. Pure Water. High Elevation. Perfectly Healthy. Beautiful Shade.” The community was noted as being “Within the one-fare radius” but “nevertheless completely out of the city and an ideal site for the founding of homes by those who have long been forced to see their slender means being exhausted by city rentals.” In 1925, Capitol Heights was finally served by a bus line that ferried residents between their neighborhood and Washington, D.C. The arrival of the bus line, along with increased ownership of automobiles, resulted in a change of demographics as more African-Americans began to move into the once-segregated Capitol Heights in the mid-twentieth century.

By the third quarter of the twentieth century, the historic commercial core of Capitol Heights was losing many businesses, largely because of the construction of a new Central Avenue that bypassed the town. By the 1970s, the once-bustling commercial corridor along Old Central Avenue had begun to decline, and buildings were being abandoned. Many of the commercial buildings along Old Central Avenue were demolished in the 1980s. Vacant lots and parking lots that took the place of the commercial...
buildings in Capitol Heights have no visual or physical relationship to the neighborhood. Residential construction in Capitol Heights and Greater Capitol Heights was largely completed by the mid-1970s. The sense of a neighborhood remained despite the loss of the commercial core. Today, Capitol Heights contains over 4,100 residents, of which 92 percent are African-American.

The community contains a wide variety of buildings constructed between 1904 and the present. The majority of buildings constructed in Capitol Heights and Greater Capitol Heights date from the 1910s through the 1970s. There are a number of popular twentieth-century architectural styles represented in the community, including Craftsman, Colonial Revival, and examples from the Modern Movement. Vernacular interpretations from the Queen Anne style are also present. The residential buildings are modest and display minimal ornamentation, typical of their use for middle- and working-class residents. The majority of houses are small one- or one-and-one-half-story designs. The topography of the neighborhood is hilly with houses built on sloping lots often with partially exposed basements. Some residential buildings in the community have been rehabilitated for commercial use.

**District Heights (75A-057)**

District Heights was established in the first quarter of the twentieth century as a commuter suburb located approximately two miles east of the District of Columbia. District Heights is very roughly bounded by Walker Mill Road to the north, Ritchie Road to the east, Pennsylvania Avenue to the south, and Brooks Drive to the east. In the late nineteenth century, the land that became District Heights was farmland owned by Major Leander P. Williams. Williams’ farm was located adjacent to the Washington and Marlboro Turnpike. In 1925, the 505-acre Williams farm was purchased by the District Heights Company. The company chose the site because of its elevated location close to Washington, D.C. Clean water and sewage disposal were provided by natural springs and two streams that ran through the area. Before the construction of any houses, the District Heights Company laid out streets, curbs, sidewalks, water lines, electric lines, and fire plugs.

By 1926, the District Heights Company constructed approximately 25 houses, which included five-room “California” bungalows and two-story, six-room American Foursquare houses. The new subdivision was described as a “community of homes for government employees” and a place that “answers the cry of the wage earner for a restricted community coming up to the high ideals of the average workingman and still at a price within his reach.” Commercial development was limited to the edge of the community along Marlboro Pike. A service station and the Sanitary Grocery Store were constructed in 1926 to serve the growing neighborhood. Between 1926–1936, the District Heights Company continued to build new houses and sell lots for the construction of individual houses.

The Town of District Heights was incorporated in 1936 by the Maryland General Assembly. In the 1940s, District Heights was improved by several different developers. All of the companies constructed modest, affordable, single-family houses with Federal Housing Administration (FHA) financing and planned for federal employees. Typical houses included Cape Cods and minimal traditional-influenced designs. These companies were subsequently replaced in 1946 when Manhattan subway builder Samuel R. Rosoff, dubbed “Subway Sam,” established Washington Estates, Inc. and purchased the remaining 300 acres of undeveloped land in District Heights.

Over the next 15 years, Washington Estates, Inc. added four additional sections to District Heights and operated as a merchant builder, constructing a large number of modest, modern houses. Rosoff and his son, Nathaniel B. Rosoff, streamlined construction and repeatedly used the same architectural designs throughout the community. The FHA-approved housing was marketed to returning veterans from World War II. The community was advertised as having “winding roads, wooded lots, and shaded streets, laid out in a manner to preserve the natural charm and beauty...” As part of their development, the Rosoffs also constructed District Heights Apartments (now known as the Woodland Springs Apartments). These Colonial Revival-style garden apartments were built from 1949 through 1951. The 925-unit garden-apartment complex was located to the north of the single-family residential development constructed by Washington Estates, Inc. New houses gradually grew larger, moving from one-and-one-half-story minimal traditional and Cape Cod-inspired designs and one-story ranch houses to two-story Modern Movement split-foyers and split-levels. In 1960, District Heights was excluded from M-NCPCC’s jurisdiction and was subsequently known as the City of District Heights.

Buildings in District Heights are primarily residential with limited commercial development along Marlboro Pike.
Buildings range in age from 1925 to circa 1965. There is little modern infill within the community. Building forms represented include the bungalow, American Foursquare, Cape Cod, minimal traditional, ranch houses, split-foyers, and split-level houses. Styles represented in the survey area include Craftsman, Colonial Revival, various examples from the Modern Movement, and limited illustrations of the Tudor Revival and Dutch Colonial Revival. The topography of District Heights is relatively flat with some rolling hills. Houses typically have a consistent setback, approximately 25 feet from the road. Houses constructed in the 1960s are sometimes set on the lots at an angle to the street, creating undulating patterns in the streetscape. The earliest sections of District Heights, platted in 1925 and 1929 have a rectilinear pattern, while sections platted from the 1940s through the 1960s have curvilinear streets with long blocks, as recommended by the FHA.

Boulevard Heights and Bradbury Heights (75A-058)

Boulevard Heights and Bradbury Heights were established in the early twentieth century as adjoining residential suburbs adjacent to the southeastern boundary of Washington, D.C. Located on the southeast side of Southern Avenue, the two subdivisions were platted four years apart but were developed simultaneously and now read as one cohesive neighborhood. In 1901, the widowed Laura E. Baker of Washington, D.C., purchased 35 acres of wooded land, and in January 1906 the residential subdivision of Boulevard Heights was platted. Boulevard Heights was a small subdivision located on a roughly triangular parcel. The land was divided into approximately 600 lots with a rectilinear grid plan creating 19 blocks. The individual lots were long and narrow, approximately 20 feet wide and 100 feet deep. The Boulevard Heights Company offered lots for sale at $25, $75, and $100. New construction was slow.

In 1909, Washington-based real estate developer Robert F. Bradbury purchased 106 acres of land to the northeast of Boulevard Heights. Bradbury paid $16,000 for the property, of which almost 18 acres were located in the District of Columbia on the northwest side of Southern Avenue. Responsible for developing large portions of southeast Washington, D.C., Bradbury platted Bradbury Heights in June 1909. Like the adjoining Boulevard Heights to the southwest, Bradbury Heights continued the grid pattern and street naming system of Washington, D.C. The lots, approximately 1,500 in total, were 20 feet wide and 100 feet deep. Lot sales in Boulevard Heights began to pick up in 1910 and continued with steady sales through 1914. The onset of World War I, however, slowed sales.

Development slowly continued in the two subdivisions through the 1920s and 1930s. Several builders began purchasing lots and constructing neighboring houses, which were offered to prospective homeowners. Unlike the first homebuyers of Boulevard Heights and Bradbury Heights who purchased vacant land, prospective homeowners of this period were provided with completed houses, typically outfitted with all of the available modern conveniences. Many of the residential buildings directly reflected the influence of the Federal Housing Administration’s (FHA) guidelines for small houses and neighborhood planning, such as mass production, standardization, and prefabrication. Thus, Boulevard Heights and Bradbury Heights, with their well-established domestic facilities and accessibility to various modes of public transportation, proved to be one of the best locations in Prince George’s County for the integration of the suburban ideals of home ownership and community in a single real estate transaction.

Today, the two subdivisions of Boulevard Heights and Bradbury Heights remain modest residential suburbs in Prince George’s County, illustrating the housing forms and styles of the early to mid-twentieth century. The community contains a wide variety of buildings constructed between circa 1906 and the present. The majority of buildings constructed in both Boulevard Heights and Bradbury Heights date from circa 1915 through circa 1970. There is no discernable difference between the development plans of the two subdivisions, nor the buildings constructed in either location. There are a number of popular twentieth-century architectural styles represented in the community, including Craftsman, Colonial Revival, and a variety of illustrations from the Modern Movement. Common building forms present in both subdivisions include Foursquares, bungalows, Cape Cods, ranch houses, minimal traditional houses, split-foyers, and split-levels. The residential buildings are modest and display minimal ornamentation typical of middle-class residences. The majority of pre-World War II-era houses are small one- or one-and-one-half-story designs. Later construction by developers is typically one-and-one-half-story or two-story houses. The topography...
of the neighborhood is hilly and is scattered with mature trees. Because of the terrain, many houses sit on sloping lots with exposed basements. Setbacks along the streets vary. Many of the houses constructed in the mid-twentieth century have either detached garages or garages integrated into the basement level. Streets in both subdivisions adhere to a rectilinear grid. Buildings in Boulevard Heights and Bradley Heights are predominately residential with limited commercial development located along Southern Avenue. Several residential houses on the main thoroughfares of Southern Avenue and Alton Street have been rehabilitated for commercial use.

**Forest Heights (76A-036)**

Forest Heights was established in 1940 as a suburban residential community adjacent to the southeastern boundary of Washington, D.C. Located on the south side of Southern Avenue, the community is divided by Indian Head Highway. In 1940, the Washington Heights Realty Corporation platted Forest Heights on a 136-acre tract of undeveloped, wooded land. The streets were named after Native American tribes, such as Iroquois Way and Mohican Drive. In June 1941, real estate firm McKeever & Whiteford advertised a “Special for Builders.” They invited “reliable” builders to see their “beautiful new subdivision. 400 wooded lots, approved for FHA low-cost housing loans.” By October of that year, Southern Maryland Homes, Inc. was pre-showing their model home in the Forest Heights subdivision. The “Homes of Five and Six Rooms” in the “Defense Area” sold for $5,250 to $5,990 and were advertised for their convenient location near the Navy Yard and Naval Research Laboratory. As the name Forest Heights implies, the new suburb was located outside the low-lying city.

After World War II, the economy in Maryland was stable enough to support private construction once again. This had a tremendous effect on growing suburbs like Forest Heights, which by 1949 contained approximately 300 houses with new construction continuing at a rapid pace. These new houses were marketed directly to veterans returning from the war and employees of the outlying government and military installations. The opening of the South Capitol Street Bridge (now called the Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge) in 1950 provided an easier commute between the District of Columbia and Prince George’s County, thus attracting new residents to Forest Heights. The improving methods and routes of transportation offered to the residents of Forest Heights encouraged development more rapidly than previously experienced. In 1954, Ralph and Jean Rocks resubdivided a portion of Forest Heights and platted three sections on which they constructed large, two-story twin dwellings. These twin dwellings, constructed by Allen & Rocks, Inc. were chosen as one of The Washington Post’s “Homes of ’54.” The “semidetached” house was offered for sale at $13,950 with no down payment. The houses featured “three bedrooms, 1 ½ baths, copper plumbing, full basement and equipped kitchen.” The houses were “pre-engineered and prefabricated” by American Houses, Inc. The twin houses proved to be overwhelmingly popular, and by 1955 Allen & Rocks, Inc. had sold 180 houses and was opening their third section for development. Throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, the town of Forest Heights annexed several parcels of land on both sides of Indian Head Highway, gradually increasing the municipal boundaries of the town. Forest Heights was fully developed as a residential suburb by 1965. Today, the community remains an active commuter suburb and contains approximately 2,600 residents who live in more than 900 houses.

The community is predominately residential with limited commercial development located on the northeastern edge along Livingston Road. The community contains a variety of buildings constructed between 1940 and the present. The majority of buildings in the survey area date from 1940 and circa 1956. There are a number of popular mid-twentieth-century architectural styles represented in the community, including Colonial Revival and numerous illustrations from the Modern Movement. Many of the buildings show the influence of both the Colonial Revival and Modern Movement, demonstrating the transitional nature of mid-twentieth-century architectural styles, fenestration, and materials. Common building forms include Cape Cods, ranch houses, minimal traditional, split-foyer, and split-level houses. Both wood-frame and masonry houses are found throughout the community. Houses are typically one or one-and-one-half story in height, although two-story Colonial Revival-style buildings are scattered throughout the community. The neighborhood is largely single-family houses; however, the southeastern portion of the community developed by Allen & Rocks, Inc. consists completely of two-story twin dwellings. The buildings in Forest Heights are modest and display minimal ornamentation, typical of middle-class residences. The topography of the neighborhood
is hilly, overlooking the nation’s capital, and scattered with mature trees. The platting and individual houses in the neighborhood show the influences of the FHA standards and guidelines. The curvilinear streets have long, uninterrupted blocks with houses on large, evenly spaced lots.

**Morningside (76A-039)**

Morningside is a suburban residential community located immediately northwest of Joint Base Andrews (formerly known as Andrews Air Force Base). Developed in the 1940s, Morningside is one of many World War II-era communities that were established outside the larger Washington metropolitan area to serve the rapidly growing population. Morningside was originally platted in 1937 and consisted of 79 irregularly shaped lots that varied in size from 5,000 square feet to over 117,000 square feet. In 1939, a public auction was held to sell the unimproved lots in Morningside. The “Large Wooded Lots” were described as being near Suitland, Maryland, and just three-and-one-half miles from Washington, D.C. An advertisement in the Washington Post noted that by October 1940, over 100 houses in Morningside had been sold, and between 30–40 families were already in residence. By 1941, over 100 families lived in Morningside, which was then called Morningside Village. The modest, four-room houses were sold for $2,990, and Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loans were available for prospective homebuyers.

Capitalizing on the popularity of Morningside, in 1942, landowner Boyd Farinholt worked with Walter Powers to plat and develop a 54-acre plot of land they named Upper Morningside. Influenced by the FHA’s standards and guidelines that were published between 1934–1940, this plat consisted of curvilinear street plans; large lots with consistent setbacks; long, uninterrupted blocks; and several culs-de-sac. Farinholt and Powers worked as operative builders and commissioned builders Hopkins and Wayson of Brandywine to build the houses. By selecting a single builder, Farinholt and Powers were able to streamline the large-scale production of houses, resulting in quicker and more affordable construction. Upper Morningside was developed around a circa 1900 house, known in the community as the Thomas Farmhouse. The building is seen on a 1938 aerial of the area and predates all other buildings in the community. Located at 4406 Maple Road, the house is a current reminder of Morningside’s history. Taking advantage of the demand for housing and the prime location near Joint Base Andrews (formerly Andrews Air Force Base), builders Randolph Hopkins and Morgan Wayson purchased land on the south side of Upper Morningside and, in 1947, platted the First Addition to Upper Morningside. The small subdivision of 65 lots continued the curvilinear street plan of Upper Morningside. To solve the numerous problems faced by the growing community in the 1940s, the Town of Morningside was incorporated in 1949. The town faced continual problems with flooding and lack of adequate water and sewer services. In the mid-1950s, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission constructed water and sewer lines in the community and, in the 1970s and 1980s, Community Development Block Grants dramatically improved the infrastructure of the community with the installation of storm drains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and paved streets. By 1970, the community was fully developed.

The community is predominantly residential, with limited commercial development located on the eastern edge along Suitland Road. The community contains a variety of buildings constructed between circa 1900 and 2000. The majority of buildings in the survey area date from circa 1940 to circa 1952 and are modest Cape Cod houses. Other building forms in the community include ranch houses and split-foyers. The oldest building in the neighborhood, the Thomas Farmhouse, is a vernacular L-shaped house constructed circa 1900 and altered in the early twentieth century by the addition of a one-story, one-bay porch. Mid-twentieth-century architectural styles represented in the community include the Colonial Revival and illustrations from the Modern Movement. The overwhelming majority of houses are wood frame with limited examples of masonry construction. Houses are typically one to one-and-one-half stories in height, although two-story split-foyer buildings are scattered throughout the community. The buildings in Morningside are very similar in design to each other, illustrating their construction by a single operative builder. The houses are modest and display minimal ornamentation, typical of mid-twentieth-century residences designed for the middle class. The platting and individual houses in the southern portion of the survey area show the influence of the FHA guidelines on the design of the neighborhood. The curvilinear streets have long, uninterrupted blocks with houses on evenly spaced lots with even setbacks. Although developed as a commuter suburb, there are very few lots with garages.
**Hillcrest Heights (76A-044)**

Hillcrest Heights is a mid-twentieth-century residential suburb located just south of the southeastern boundary of Washington, D.C., and Prince George’s County. The community of Marlow Heights is located to the south. Branch Avenue, a heavily traveled road, runs to the east of the neighborhood.

Prior to the platting of the first subdivision, the land that would become Hillcrest Heights was undeveloped and heavily wooded. The land was originally part of the eighteenth-century plantation known as Colebrooke, which was owned by the Addison family. Section One of Colebrooke, the first subdivision, was platted just east of Branch Avenue in 1940. Many of the elements of the subdivision design reflected the planning guidelines and standards promoted by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), such as the curvilinear plan, long uninterrupted blocks, proximity to public transportation, and adaptation of the design to the topography of the land. Large-scale development in Hillcrest Heights began in earnest after World War II. Returning veterans and increasing numbers of federal workers poured into the area and needed affordable, safe, attractive, and well-planned communities. Anthony Carozza and his wife Anna Louise had amassed nearly 800 acres of land east of old Naylor Road in the early 1940s.

After the war, in 1946, Carozza platted Hillcrest Heights, which was named for the nearby Hillcrest neighborhood of Washington, D.C. Prompted by Carozza’s success, other developers began to move into Hillcrest Heights to take advantage of the affordable land. In the late 1940s and 1950s, Paul P. Stone, a Washington, D.C., real estate developer, began plating additional sections to Hillcrest Heights. Stone planned a 300-house development of “all-brick ramblers.” Buyers could choose from nine different plans, with prices beginning at $12,750. In 1948, one of Stone’s designs was chosen as a Washington Post “Home of '48.” The house was described as a “Monterey-Modern house” with a canopied terrace, “huge picture windows,” and “a wall of glass brick,” which separated one of the rooms.

In the early 1950s, construction in the larger Hillcrest Heights area moved away from single-family detached houses, to “semidetached” twin dwellings. Constructed of concrete blocks faced with brick, the houses were 21 by 29 feet and 17 by 28 feet. One of the twin houses was chosen as a “Home of '50” and was described as two units, each consisting of six rooms separated by a party wall. The house had a “convenient powder room” on the first floor and a “fully equipped kitchen approximately the same size as the living room.” The three-bedroom units had air conditioning, a hot-water tank, garbage disposal, and “a handy broom closet.” Each unit also had a basement with a separate entrance. The construction of twin dwellings continued throughout the 1950s. As a result, Hillcrest Heights has the largest concentration of twin houses in the county. Although Carozza originally constructed Colonial Revival-style twin houses, the designs became much more influenced by the Modern Movement and the desire of homebuyers who wanted new architectural styles and forms. The 1960s brought additional subdivisions by established and new builders in the community, as well as new mid-rise apartment complexes and commercial development in the larger Hillcrest Heights area. By 1965, Hillcrest Heights was largely developed, although limited development continued through 2000 with the construction of townhouses and single-family residences.

Buildings in the community are primarily residential with commercial development located along Iverson Road and Branch Avenue. The majority of buildings in the community were constructed between 1945–1965. There are a variety of building types that include single-family residences, twin dwellings, garden-apartment complexes, and mid-rise apartment buildings. Building forms present in the community include Cape Cods, minimal traditional, ranch houses, split-foyers, and split-levels. The Modern Movement is the predominant architectural influence in Hillcrest Heights, although there is a significant amount of Colonial Revival-style designs. The community also contains three Lustron Homes, which are clustered together on 29th Avenue. The Lustrons appear to be in excellent condition with minimal alterations. The community is hilly; however, the individual subdivisions were designed to accommodate the landscape and topography.

**Camp Springs (76B-000)**

Camp Springs was originally established in the mid-nineteenth century at the intersection of present-day Branch Avenue (MD 5) and Allentown Road. Camp Springs is located adjacent to and west of Joint Base Andrews. Today Camp Springs is roughly bounded by the Capital Beltway (I-495) on the north, Henson Creek and...
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Cherryfield Road on the west, Kirby Road on the south, Joint Base Andrews on the east, and Wesson Drive on the northeast. Early maps of the area note that it was originally called “Allentown,” in honor of the Allen family, who were large landholders in the community. Martenet’s map of 1861 documents a settlement at the crossroads of present-day Branch Avenue and Allentown Road. The small community comprised houses, a Methodist Church, school house, a blacksmith shop, and several stores. By 1878, as documented by the Hopkins map, the growing community was also known as Camp Spring. The Hopkins map denotes the Camp Spring post office, Methodist Church, blacksmith shop, and many residences, the majority of which were constructed between 1861–1878. According to local legend, the community was named Camp Springs by the soldiers fighting in the Civil War who traveled through the area and set up camp near the abundant natural springs. The community experienced remarkably slow growth throughout the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth century. Yet, a school for black children was constructed as early as 1902. In 1924, the building was replaced with a new one-room schoolhouse; the construction of which was funded by Julius Rosenwald’s foundation.

Subdivision of rural agricultural land in the area began in 1936, with the creation of the T.B. Middleton Farm subdivision. This residential subdivision was created from Manchester Farm, a late nineteenth-century farmstead. The first buildings constructed in the subdivision were modest Craftsman-style bungalows located along Old Branch Avenue and Middleton Lane. Camp Springs remained a small, quiet, and rural community until World War II, when the need for housing and government facilities prompted development. In August 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt ordered the construction of a military airfield. The Camp Springs Army Airfield opened in May 1943. The airfield was renamed Andrews Field in 1945, and in 1947, the name was changed to Andrews Air Force Base. The opening of the military base encouraged steady growth in Camp Springs, albeit for a limited period. The majority of the twentieth-century development was located northwest of the intersection of Old Branch Avenue and Allentown Road, surrounding the earlier Middleton Farm subdivision.

Two of the earliest extant buildings and historic sites in the area are now located on Joint Base Andrews. Belle Chance (Historic Site 77-014) is a Spanish Colonial Revival-style house erected in 1912. The fireproof house was constructed of concrete for Dr. William Stewart. Forest Grove Methodist Church Chapel 2 (Historic Site 77-001) was built in 1914 to replace two earlier churches on the same site. The Gothic Revival-style church is surrounded by a cemetery with headstones that date from 1874–1938. The oldest extant building in Camp Springs is believed to be Old Bells Methodist Church (Historic Resource 76B-017), which was constructed in 1910.

The area is predominantly residential with limited commercial development scattered along Old Branch Avenue and little modern infill. Building forms represented include bungalow, Cape Cod, minimal traditional, ranch houses, split-foyers, and split-levels. Styles represented in the survey area include Craftsman, Colonial Revival, and various illustrations of the Modern Movement. The survey area is located on gently rolling hills, with varying street patterns. Some of the earlier subdivisions are set on a roughly rectilinear grid, while the subdivisions from the mid-twentieth century are more curvilinear, reflecting the influence of the Federal Housing Administration’s guidelines and standards for residential subdivision design.

Clagett Agricultural Area (78-000/79-000/82A-000)

The Clagett Agricultural Area, consisting of approximately 2,700 acres west of Upper Marlboro was named for the Clagett family that owned most of the surrounding land. When originally surveyed and defined in 1987, the community was an example of a rural agricultural landscape in Prince George's County. However, as a result of modern residential development, much of the area no longer conveys this significance.

In the late seventeenth century, Thomas Clagett I purchased a 250-acre tract of land called Weston, which was passed down through several generations of Clagetts. Over time, the parcel was added to and resurveyed, resulting in a parcel of approximately 500 acres. The first brick structure on the property was built circa 1713 but burned during the Revolutionary War (1775-1781). Probably before 1820, Thomas Clagett VI built a Federal style house possibly incorporating an earlier structure. Called Weston (Historic Site 82A-000-07), the structure would be the first of several houses built for members of the Clagett family. Thomas Clagett VI and his wife, Harriet
White Clagett had at least eight children who survived into adulthood. With his second wife, Clagett had five more children.

All told, Clagett provided eight of his children with property and houses typically coinciding with their marriages. Throughout the nineteenth century, Clagett VI began purchasing land surrounding his plantation to expand his land holdings and secure property for his heirs. The 1850 census indicates that Clagett VI held $66,140 worth of real estate and reported owning 94 slaves that ranged in age from infancy to 75 years old. In 1860, the census reports that Clagett’s real estate was valued at $120,000, while his personal estate was valued at $150,000. Not including the six plantations previously given to his family members at the time of his death in 1873, Clagett owned more than 800 acres of land.

Clagett gave his son, Charles, The Cottage (Historic Site 78-000-18), his son Robert received Oakland (Historic Site 79-000-34), daughter Eliza received Bowieville (Historic Site 74A-018), grandson Thomas received Keokuk. From the senior Clagett’s second marriage, son Thomas received Weston (Historic Site 82A-000-07), son Gonsalvo received Strawberry Hill (Historic Site 78-000-23), daughter Sallie received a portion of Moore’s Plains (Historic Site 79-002), and daughter Adeline received a portion of Greenland. In turn, Charles Clagett devised Ingleside to his son, Charles T. Clagett, and Navajo to his son William B. Clagett.

Martenet’s map of 1861 shows the various farmsteads scattered throughout the area around Upper Marlboro. Prominent families include Clagett, Bowie, Calvert, and Duvall. By 1878 when the Hopkins map was created, the Clagett family farmsteads are well documented. New stores, residences, and a schoolhouse were established along the Washington and Marlboro Turnpike (now MD Route 4/Pennsylvania Avenue) between Centreville and Upper Marlborough, providing additional amenities for members of the community.

While the Clagett Agricultural Area retains its rural character, rapid suburbanization and late-twentieth-century infill have significantly detracted from the landscape. The gently rolling farmland of the area is dotted with woodlands; however, large parcels of this land have been cleared for new subdivision developments. Several agricultural buildings are extant and include barns and stables that still reflect the agricultural heritage of the area. There are a variety of architectural styles represented in the Clagett Agricultural Area from 1820 to the 1990s. These include Federal, Greek Revival, Italianate, Colonial Revival, as well as vernacular and modern interpretations of these popular styles. The majority of historic residential buildings in the community date from the mid-to late-nineteenth century and are set far back from main roads, down private drives.

Two historic resources have been demolished in the Clagett Agricultural Area. Navajo (78-000-22) and the Navajo Tenant House (78-000-36) are no longer extant. In addition, the slave quarters and all outbuildings associated with Keokuk (78-000-14a) have been demolished, and the house at Ingleside was destroyed by fire.

Little Washington (78-039)

Little Washington is a small mid-twentieth century neighborhood located north of the community of Westphalia in central Prince George’s County. Little Washington is bounded by Washington Avenue on the north, Douglas Avenue on the northeast, Sansbury Road on the southeast, South Cherry Lane on the south, and D’Arcy Road on the southwest.

Historic maps document that Little Washington was rural until the platting of the first subdivision in 1941. Martenet’s map of 1861 shows virtually no development in the area that became Little Washington. By 1878, the Hopkins map documents a few dwellings constructed to the north and west of the present-day neighborhood.

Little Washington was platted in three separate sections from 1941 to 1949. The first section, along Alms House Road (now D’Arcy Road) was platted in 1941 by Leon E. Tayman of Upper Marlboro. Section 1 contained nine lots, ranging in size from 0.32 acres to 0.88 acres. Lots were long and narrow, with approximately 100 feet of frontage along the main road. In 1947, Tayman platted Section 2, off of Alms House County Road on a newly established road, known as South Cherry Lane. Section 2 included 22 lots on approximately 16 acres. Lots on the north side of Cherry Lane were very long and narrow, while those on the south side were shallower with the same frontage.

Little is known about subdivider Leon Tayman. He was a resident of Upper Marlboro, and the 1930 census notes that he was born in 1886 and lived with his parents, one brother, several nieces and nephews, and a domestic servant. Tayman’s profession was listed as an
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Upper Marlboro (79-019)

Located in central Prince George’s County, the Town of Upper Marlboro was established when the General Assembly of the Province of Maryland passed the “Act for the Advancement of Trade and Erecting Ports and Towns” in 1706 and 1707 in order to establish commercial centers in Maryland. The community was first known as the Town of Marlborough, but was soon changed to Upper Marlborough, distinguishing it from (Lower) Marlborough in Calvert County. In the early twentieth century, the name was commonly shortened from Marlborough to Marlboro’ then finally to Upper Marlboro, as it is known today.

By 1718, county residents petitioned to have the county seat moved from Charles Town to Upper Marlboro, which was completed in 1721. Chosen for its location on the Western Branch of the Patuxent River, the area was thought to be a convenient trading location. With its designation as the county seat, Upper Marlboro soon became the social, political, and commercial center of the county. Because of its location near the river, in 1747, Upper Marlboro was designated as an inspection site for tobacco. In order to protect the quality of tobacco being shipped to England, all tobacco grown in Maryland had to pass through inspections sites at Nottingham, Piscataway, Upper Marlboro, or Bladensburg before it was allowed to be publicly sold. Horse racing was an important sport in eighteenth-century Maryland, and Upper Marlboro soon became a popular destination for those seeking to watch the races. The first courthouse was constructed in 1721 and was later replaced in 1798. That building was replaced by a large one in 1881, and the present court house is on the site of its 19th century predecessor.

As the Patuxent River and the Western Branch silted, they became unnavigable for large ships transporting tobacco. Even without the tobacco industry, the thriving commercial and political center of Upper Marlboro supported the local economy in the nineteenth century. Upper Marlboro provided a number of shops and amenities for its residents and visitors. The town was served by several hotels, law offices, and other stores that included a barber shop, carriage factory, tailor, cabinet maker, tinner, doctor’s office, and the offices of the Planter’s Advocate and the Marlboro Gazette. The most significant development was the addition of the Popes Creek line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad to the east of town.

Upper Marlboro is also an important African-American community. After the Civil War (1861-1865), a number of freedmen purchased land in Upper Marlboro and constructed a Methodist meetinghouse. Working with the Freedman’s Bureau, the community established a school for the local black children in 1867. The small African-American community began to grow and soon built houses...
within the town limits. During the construction of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad near Upper Marlboro, another small black community developed on the eastern fringes of town (outside the survey area), near the railroad lines. Known as Sugar Hill, the neighborhood was populated by families who assisted in the construction of the railroad.

During the twentieth century, Upper Marlboro continued to expand. Several fires resulted in the rebuilding of structures, particularly commercial buildings along Main Street, while some older buildings received new facades and renovations. In the early 1940s, the Victorian-era county courthouse was extensively remodeled in the Colonial Revival style. The original building was well-disguised by the addition of a large portico, flanking wings, and a bell tower.

Upper Marlboro contains a remarkable collection of buildings from the eighteenth to the early twentieth century that reflect the evolution of Upper Marlboro from a rural village to a thriving small town and county seat. The majority of extant buildings date from the mid- to late-nineteenth century. Popular styles found in Upper Marlboro include both high-style and vernacular interpretations of Greek Revival, Italianate, Gothic Revival, Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, and Craftsman styles. Building types include I-houses, L-shaped plans, American Foursquares, bungalows, Cape Cods, and ranch houses. Houses within the town are set back from the street on grassy lots. Concentrated along Main Street, the commercial buildings are typically constructed side-by-side and are set very close to the street.

There are still a few small agricultural outbuildings that remain within the town limits.

**Woodland (79-063)**

Woodland is a rural agricultural community located in central Prince George’s County, east of Upper Marlboro. The land associated with the area known as Woodland was owned by Clement Hill, Jr., who patented 748 acres called Compton Bassett in 1699. The first frame building erected on the site was demolished when the family built a large Federal style brick house circa 1780. Compton Bassett (Historic Site 79-063-10) is also the site of a rare example of a private Roman Catholic chapel erected by the Hill family. This is the last remaining private chapel in Prince George’s County. The Hill family continued to add acreage to their landholdings, and by 1818, Dr. William Hill, Hill's great-grandson, amassed 2,184 acres, which he resurveyed and renamed “Woodland.” His holdings stretched from the Patuxent River on the east to the limits of Upper Marlboro on the west. When Dr. Hill died in 1823, his land was divided among his four children. After Hill’s death, his descendants constructed several houses located nearby including Bleak Hill (Historic Site 79-063-06) and Ashland (Historic Site 79-063-11). John C. Wyvill, a prominent local carpenter, was responsible for the construction of several now historic buildings in the community including the Eckenrode-Wyvill House (Historic Site 79-063-08) and Linden Hill (Historic Site 79-063-50).

William Beanes Hill, who inherited Compton Bassett from his father, received a charter in 1854 to construct a toll bridge across the Patuxent River, connecting Anne Arundel and Prince George’s counties. The bridge became known as Hill’s Bridge and connected to the Marlboro-Queen Anne Road, further establishing the road as an important transportation route. In 1850, Hill reported owning 62 slaves, ranging in age from one to 100 years. In 1860, Hill had reduced the number of slaves he owned to 32, and these were housed in four “slave houses.” That same year, his plantations produced 500,000 pounds of tobacco, considerably higher than other plantations in the area. In addition to being a successful planter, Hill was also involved in the political aspects of life in Prince George’s County, serving for 25 years as the Chief Judge of the Orphans Court and serving one term in the Maryland State Senate.

Other significant buildings in the area include the houses of two freedmen, constructed on land that belonged to Henry Waring Clagett. A one-and-one-half-story wood-frame dwelling at 3708 Old Crain Highway (Documented Property 79-063-70) was built sometime before 1875 by Freedman John Henry Quander. A former slave of Mordecai Plummer, Quander purchased one-and-a-half-acres of land from Henry Clagett (Plummer’s nephew). Freedman Nat Beall constructed his one-story dwelling at 3702 Old Crain Highway on land he bought from Clagett in 1874. The 1860 Federal Census lists Clagett as owning 26 slaves; it may be possible that Beall was a former Clagett slave.

Old Crain Highway, which bisects the community, is an important early road that roughly follows the circa 1700
The Hopkins map of 1878 documents the small Chapel Hill settlement. Chapel Hill Methodist Episcopal Church and several buildings are noted in the area. It was believed that the meetinghouse was constructed sometime between 1880 and 1883, when the two-acre parcel (with a meetinghouse noted in the deed) was legally conveyed to the trustees. However, its presence on the Hopkins map suggests it was constructed prior to 1878. In the 1880s, several families of free blacks began to establish farms in the area. This rural village was a community composed of a few close-knit families. Jeremiah Brown and his son-in-law, Albert Owen Shorter, purchased several five-acre parcels from the Hatton family in 1887. Other African-American families, including the Thomas, Calvert, Brooks, Coleman, Bowling, and Henson families, settled in the area by 1900 and were enumerated in that year's federal census.

The 1920s mark the beginning of significant improvements in Chapel Hill and the establishment of a more permanent community. In 1922, a benevolent society lodge was built and offered financial support for members and served as a gathering place for community events. In 1927, the new Livingston Road was constructed, connecting Chapel Hill more directly to Broad Creek and Piscataway. By the late 1930s the Chapel Hill community comprised approximately 35 houses and several general stores in addition to the church, schoolhouse, and benevolent lodge. Chapel Hill had developed into a stable community of closely related families, albeit rural and small.

Since the mid-twentieth century, the community has experienced growth with only remnants of the early African-American community left intact. The community remained largely rural. In the 1970s, many of Chapel Hill’s earliest buildings were demolished as a result of road-widening projects. The original church was replaced in 1975 with a new building. The first two schoolhouses, the benevolent lodge, and many early dwellings were also demolished. Many of these buildings were replaced with commercial buildings and new single-family houses. In recent years, the rural area surrounding Chapel Hill has been improved with modern residential subdivisions. With these changes, traces of the early African-American community are hard to detect.

The majority of resources were constructed from circa 1925 to circa 1965. Buildings in Chapel Hill are predominately residential with scattered commercial development located throughout the village but primarily at the intersection

Chapel Hill (80-018)

Chapel Hill is a rural African-American village that emerged in the late nineteenth century at the crossroads of Old Fort Road and Livingston Road in the Fort Washington area of Prince George’s County. The small community is located approximately eight miles south of Washington, D.C. Before the Civil War, the area that would become Chapel Hill had been part of several antebellum plantations, which were situated on tracts of land known as “Boorman’s Content” and “Frankland.” The village’s name most likely was derived from an early private Catholic chapel on the Frankland tract that was demolished by the end of the nineteenth century. The only above-ground reminders of the chapel are several headstones that still stand at the site. In the late nineteenth century, Chapel Hill evolved around a schoolhouse and a Methodist meetinghouse. In 1868, the Freedmen’s Bureau, which was established by Congress in 1865 to direct the construction, establishment, and maintenance of schools and hospitals for former slaves, built a schoolhouse in the small community.
of Old Fort Road, Livingston Road, and Old Piscataway Road. The rural community also contains two churches and two cemeteries. Building forms include L-shaped plans, bungalows, minimal traditional, ranch houses, split-foyers, and split-levels. Chapel Hill is set on gently rolling hills and a large portion of the surrounding land is still heavily wooded but threatened with new residential development. Buildings are located along Old Fort Road, Livingston Road, and Old Piscataway Road and sit on lots that vary in size from a quarter of an acre to several-acre parcels. Setbacks of the houses also vary; the earliest houses in Chapel Hill are typically located close to the road, as a result of several road-widening projects in the late twentieth century.

**Silesia (80-049)**

Silesia is a small community that was established in the late nineteenth century in western Prince George’s County west of Indian Head Highway, near Fort Washington. Centered on the intersection of Livingston Road and Fort Washington Road, the small community is largely the product of a family of German immigrants who settled in Prince George’s County at the end of the nineteenth century.

Robert Stein, born in the Silesia region of Prussia, immigrated to the United States in the late nineteenth century to study at Georgetown University. After graduating, Stein returned briefly to Germany where he recruited his brother and a friend to return with him to Prince George’s County. Upon his return, Robert Stein purchased 320 acres of land near Broad Creek, which was then named Broad Creek Farm. This large parcel of land contained Harmony Hall (Historic Site 80-024-011), an early-eighteenth-century Georgian mansion, and Want Water (Historic Site 80-024-010, now ruinous), an early-eighteenth-century house. Stein’s land extended east across present-day Livingston Road and south to the future intersection of Livingston Road and Fort Washington Road.

Over time, Stein, his brother, and their friend, Joseph Adler began encouraging their families to immigrate to the United States and settle in Broad Creek. In 1889, Robert Stein petitioned the courts to have the small community named Silesia, after his homeland. The number of newcomers began to grow, and by 1930, a community of Germans and their first generation of American-born children was established. Census records from 1920 and 1930 indicate that the residents of Silesia made their living by farming, as laborers, or as merchants. In 1903, a post office and one-room school opened. The Silesia School served the community until the opening of a larger school in Oxon Hill in 1923. The White Horse Tavern, an early-nineteenth-century landmark in Silesia, was demolished in 1903 and Robert Stein constructed a grocery and feed store on the site. The Tilch family (related to the Steins) also constructed a tavern in Silesia in 1935. Further growth in the established community remained relatively stagnant until the limited residential construction occurred in the 1950s off of Livingston Road.

After the opening of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge and the Capital Beltway in the early 1960s, the western portion of Prince George’s County, where Silesia is located, began to grow. Although Silesia remained relatively unchanged during this period, the increasing number of children in the larger area resulted in the construction of Harmony Hall Elementary School in 1965 just north of Silesia and south of Harmony Hall. The school operated until 1981 when it was closed and later enlarged for use as a regional arts center.

Today, the small community of Silesia remains a quiet and largely undeveloped area. The Broad Creek Historic District (80-024), located immediately to the north of Silesia, and parkland surrounding the community have helped insulate Silesia from the development pressures occurring elsewhere in Prince George’s County. There are approximately 40 residents in Silesia.

The community contains a variety of buildings constructed between circa 1925 and the 1980s. Both residential and commercial buildings are located in Silesia. Architectural styles present in the community include Craftsman and various illustrations of the Modern Movement. Building forms include bungalows and ranch houses. Several of the houses appear to be kit houses, particularly those at 11015-11019 Livingston Road and 10706 Livingston Road. Residential buildings are typically wood-frame construction and are one to one-and-one-half stories in height. The buildings in the community are very modest, with minimal ornamentation. Outbuildings are numerous and include sheds, utility sheds, equipment sheds, and small barns. The community is set on gently rolling hills with large portions of heavily wooded and undeveloped land. Houses are set on lots of varying sizes and shapes with inconsistent setbacks. The sizes and shapes of the
Cheltenham (82A-042)

Cheltenham is located in southern Prince George’s County between Old Crain Highway (US 301) and MD 5. The survey area is located at the intersection of US 301, Surratts Road, and Frank Tippett Road. Cheltenham developed as a result of the expansion of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad in the early 1870s. The railroad ran through the agricultural areas of Prince George’s County, which allowed farmers to transport their crops in larger volume. Cheltenham was named for the Bowie family’s plantation of the same name, located southwest of the village. In 1870, the plantation was converted to a shelter for homeless and orphaned African-American children. Established by Enoch Pratt, the “House of Reformation and Instruction for Colored Children” at Cheltenham provided both shelter and education for these young children. The school was also a place of employment for many local residents. In the 1930s, the site was purchased by the State of Maryland and renamed the “Boy’s Village.” The site, used as a training/vocational school, was desegregated in the 1960s.

Martenet’s map of 1861 shows little development in the area that would later become Cheltenham. As a result of the Popes Creek line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad, Cheltenham began to grow in the 1870s. The small town supported several stores, a railroad depot, the House of Reformation, Church of the Atonement (Episcopalian), and included the dwellings of many new families who moved to the area. In 1922, construction began on Crain Highway, which created a direct route between Baltimore and southern Maryland. Completed in 1927, the highway ran directly through Cheltenham. New development was centered on the newly constructed road, rather than the rail lines. Even with the new transportation route, growth in Cheltenham remained relatively slow until the construction of small subdivisions in the 1930s. Spurred by the increase of affordable housing in Greenbelt and other areas in Prince George’s County, several tracts of land in Cheltenham were subdivided, which resulted in the Schultz, Ballard, and Townsend subdivisions. These lots were purchased and improved by individual owners. Construction began again after World War II (1941-1945), when land was again subdivided. Lot sizes in Clinton Vista were reduced from three acres to less than half an acre in size. Later subdivisions in the 1950s and 1960s include Cheltenham Forest, Poplar Hill Estate, Clinton Park, and Shannon Square. Public buildings in Cheltenham include Boy’s Village, U.S. Naval Communications Station, Maryland State Tobacco Warehouse, and Tanglewood Elementary School.

Little remains of the late nineteenth-century community. Several commercial buildings, churches, residences, and the railroad depot have been demolished. What remains of the Cheltenham survey area is centered on the intersection of Crain Highway (US 301) and Frank Tippett Road, with Sarah Landing Road as the northern boundary. The buildings along this stretch of road reflect the change in Cheltenham from a small railroad village to a small crossroads village oriented to the automobile and the highway. In the late nineteenth century, the railroad’s importance diminished as the automobile became a more important and affordable means of transport. New highways, such as Crain Highway, constructed in the 1920s, added to the ease and convenience of automobile travel.

The structures on Frank Tippett Road range in age from the 1870s to the present. At this writing, a new subdivision, Marlboro Crossing, is being constructed on the northern side of Frank Tippett Road and features large houses on half-acre lots. Other suburban houses are located northwest of the survey area. The survey area includes approximately 20 primary resources and numerous secondary resources including sheds, garages, barns, and other outbuildings. Many of these buildings reflect the agricultural origins of Cheltenham and the surrounding area. The topography of Cheltenham is flat, with small wooded areas. Land surrounding the survey district to the southeast and southwest remains agricultural and undeveloped. Setbacks vary, but most structures are located close to the road. The commercial center of Cheltenham is located at the corner of Crain Highway and Frank Tippett Road. The Cheltenham Store still operates today as a liquor store/market. Building forms include I-houses, bungalows, and ranch houses. Styles include vernacular interpretations of popular Victorian-era styles such as Queen Anne. Other styles reflected include Colonial Revival, Craftsman, and the Modern Movement.

Naylor (82B-000/86A-000)

The agricultural village of Naylor is located in southeastern Prince George’s County along Croom Road, between...
Nottingham Road on the north and Candy Hill Road on the south. In 1650, Major Thomas Brooke patented the Brookfield tract, a large parcel encompassing land bounded by Mattaponi Creek on the north, the Patuxent River on the east, Deep Creek on the south, and a stone marked T.B. on the west (associated with the village of T.B.). Croom Road, a significant north-south route supposedly established by Native Americans, became an important thoroughfare in Prince George's County. By 1745, the road was officially recognized and in 1794 appeared on Dennis Griffith's map of Maryland.

The Brookfield property remained in the Brooke family until 1856, when Benjamin Duvall purchased 450 acres of the parcel. That same year, Duvall added a wood-frame addition on the north side of an existing two-story brick structure on the property, believed to be the original seventeenth- or eighteenth-century Brooke farmstead. Called Brookfield (Historic Site 86A-000-18), this property passed through the Duvall family and was divided among heirs in 1903. After receiving this property, several members of the Duvall family constructed residences nearby. The Duvalls were also instrumental in the construction of Brookfield United Methodist Church (Historic Resource 82B-000-13), donating the land to the church in 1886. The village was known as Brookfield until the establishment of the post office in the Naylor House (Historic Resource 86A-000-26) circa 1911. The Duvall family continued to live in the area, and succeeding generations constructed their own houses in Naylor in the 1920s and 1930s.

The 1861 Martenet map shows virtually no development in Naylor. William Duvall’s residence is the only building in the Naylor community. By 1878, the Hopkins map documents new residences constructed by the Duvall family, a blacksmith shop, and a school for African-American children, located to the south.

In the early twentieth century, Naylor functioned as a self-sufficient agricultural village. Many of the necessary amenities were provided within the small community. The Naylor House (named for its inhabitants) was used as a residence as well as a store and post office for village residents. A shed attached on the rear of the building was used as a feed store and doubled as the local polling place. The commercial building located at 12300 Croom Road, called Paul's General Store, served as a general store, gas station, and repair shop from the 1930s through the 1950s. Within the community there was also the Brookfield United Methodist Church and social hall.

Naylor remains a small, rural agricultural village. There are approximately 15 buildings (excluding outbuildings) located along this stretch of road, with a concentration clustered around the intersection of Croom and Candy Hill Roads. Buildings in Naylor represent residential, agricultural, commercial, and religious uses and range in age from the mid-nineteenth century to the 1970s. The majority of buildings date from the late nineteenth century to the first half of the twentieth century. There is very little modern infill within the Naylor community. Building forms represented include the I-house, rectangular, bungalow, and ranch house. The majority of buildings are vernacular, although some display elements of the Colonial Revival and Craftsman styles. Brookfield United Methodist Church is a vernacular interpretation of the Gothic Revival style. The gently rolling farmland of Naylor is dotted with wooded areas, and many of the houses are set close to the road. The agricultural landscape has been well preserved and many agricultural buildings remain extant.

Nottingham (82B-035)

Located in southeastern Prince George’s County, the community of Nottingham was established when the General Assembly of the Province of Maryland passed the “Act for the Advancement of Trade and Erecting Ports and Towns” in 1706 and 1707 in order to establish commercial centers along the rivers in Maryland. In 1747, Nottingham was designated as an inspection site for tobacco. In order to protect the quality of tobacco being shipped to England, all tobacco grown in Maryland had to pass through inspections sites at Nottingham, Piscataway, Upper Marlboro, or Bladensburg before it was allowed to be publicly sold. Between 1791 and 1801, Nottingham exported more than 8,340 hogsheads of tobacco. These small landing communities grew as commercial activity was drawn to tobacco warehouses located on the banks of rivers and nearby creeks.

Beginning in the late eighteenth century, Baltimore began to develop as a large port, with more farmers using Baltimore for the inspection, sale, and shipping of their tobacco. As Baltimore grew, the smaller river communities began to diminish as centers of commercial activity. The Patuxent River became more shallow, which limited the size of ships that could navigate the waters. By the late nineteenth century, Nottingham began to decline, and
the population steadily decreased as families relocated to other areas. A devastating fire in 1901 destroyed most of the buildings in the small community, leaving only a few extant structures.

The 1861 Martenet map shows a small town situated on the banks of the Patuxent River. Within the town there were several nonresidential buildings, including the Stamp & Son Store and Post Office, a blacksmith shop, and a hotel run by William Quinn. The 1878 Hopkins map shows some changes in Nottingham. The map indicates the addition of a schoolhouse (Historic Site 85B-035-16) located in the northern part of the town, as well as several warehouses on the river banks.

The majority of buildings in Nottingham are late twentieth century infill, some constructed as recently as 2002. There is only one remaining nineteenth-century building (the Turton-Smith House, Historic Site 82B-035-17), although several other residences were constructed immediately after the fire in 1901. The Colonial Revival is the predominate style in Nottingham, whether a vernacular or modern interpretation. Most buildings sit close to the road and are oriented to face the Patuxent River. The topography of Nottingham is gently sloping towards the river. The Patuxent River continues to erode the banks of Nottingham.

Piscataway (84-023)

Piscataway, located in southwestern Prince George’s County, is one of the oldest villages in the county. Piscataway takes its name from a Native American tribe of the same name that lived in the area along Piscataway Creek. The Piscataway tribe was known to inhabit this area by the sixteenth century, with settlements stretching from Piscataway Creek to Anne Arundel County and across the Chesapeake Bay. After John Smith’s landing in 1608, white settlers eventually made their way along the Potomac River pushing out the native tribes. The Village of Piscataway was officially established after the General Assembly of the Province of Maryland passed the “Act for the Advancement of Trade and Erecting Ports and Towns” in 1706 and 1707 in order to establish commercial centers along the rivers in Maryland. The Act stated that a town was to be erected “on the South Side of Piscataway [sic] Creek, at or near the Head thereof, to contain 40 or 50 Acres, at the Discretion of the Commissioners.” At the time, there was already some trading happening in the area. William Hutchison owned a storehouse located near what would become the village.

In 1747, the Village of Piscataway was designated as an inspection site for tobacco. In order to protect the quality of tobacco being shipped to England, all tobacco grown in Maryland had to pass through inspections sites at Nottingham, Piscataway, Upper Marlboro, or Bladensburg before it was allowed to be publicly sold. These small landing communities grew as commercial activity was drawn to the tobacco warehouses located along the river and creek banks. Taking advantage of the location, several stores soon opened in the village. A few of these functioned as import/export shops, purchasing tobacco for export, while importing goods for the local farming community. Also contributing to the success of Piscataway was the development of roads that connected the village to other communities. In 1757, the postal route was established from Annapolis to St. Mary’s County, and it passed directly through the village.

Piscataway was also the site of several early taverns, including Catherine Playfay’s tavern, which began operation in 1741. In the 1790s, the tavern was replaced with a new brick structure that also operated as a tavern. Run by Isadore Hardy and known as Hardy’s Tavern (Historic Site 84-023-05), the family continued to operate the tavern until the mid-nineteenth century. Thomas Clagett also ran a tavern in Piscataway, beginning in the late eighteenth century. A portion of the building still remains as part of a private residence and is known as Piscataway Tavern (Historic Site 84-023-03).

Piscataway began to decline in the early nineteenth century. Beginning in the late eighteenth century, Baltimore developed as a large port, with more farmers using Baltimore for the inspection, sale, and shipping of their tobacco. As Baltimore grew, the smaller river communities began to diminish as centers of commercial activity. Due to large-scale deforestation to build warehouses and other buildings, the silting of Piscataway Creek made its waters more shallow and not available for larger boats to dock and trade their goods. In 1858, the tobacco inspection warehouse was sold into private hands, officially ending Piscataway’s significance as a trading post. By 1900, the population had dropped to 100 residents.

Piscataway remains a small linear village; there has been some loss of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century-buildings, but the examples that remain are outstanding
illustrations of their time period. The majority of buildings date from the nineteenth century. Styles represented in Piscataway include Georgian, Greek Revival, Italianate, Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, and Craftsman. Suburban development is beginning to encroach on the small community. The “Villages of Piscataway” (also known as “The Preserve at Piscataway”) is a 879-acre mixed-use development currently being constructed south of Floral Park Road at the intersection with Piscataway Road and Danville Road. The “Villages of Piscataway” will contain commercial/retail buildings, single-family dwellings, and townhouses. For now, the historic Village of Piscataway is visually buffered from the new development by surrounding trees on the south side of the Village; however, the majority of the forested land is owned by the “Villages of Piscataway” and may be developed in the future.

Brandywine (85A-032)

Brandywine is a late-nineteenth-century railroad village located in southern Prince George’s County. According to tradition, Brandywine was named after the Revolutionary War’s Battle of Brandywine by a member of the Early family, one of the original landowners in the area. Brandywine developed as a small crossroads village at the convergence of an old stagecoach road (now MD 381) and old Indian Head Road. Martenet’s map of 1861 shows only a few improvements in the Brandywine community. Homes of the Early, Robinson, Burgess, Gibbons, and Cooksey families are documented, along with William H. Early’s store and post office and a blacksmith shop located to the west of the village.

The establishment of the Popes Creek Line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad in the 1870s brought new development to the area. In 1872, William H. Early purchased a 42-acre tract of land that ran parallel to the railroad tracks and was located north and south of Brandywine Road. This small parcel of land became the center of the village of Brandywine and was soon populated by additional residences, stores, and a hotel. The 1878 Hopkins map shows the new residential buildings in the small village, along with the addition of a schoolhouse and several stores. The most significant improvement was the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad’s tracks through Brandywine. The Hopkins map also shows plans for the development of Brandywine City, a planned development that was to take advantage of new transportation routes provided by the railroad. Because passenger service through Brandywine never prospered, the plans for Brandywine City never materialized. A second railroad line constructed by the Southern Maryland Railroad Line in the 1880s brought additional residents to the village. The population of Brandywine peaked in 1882 with approximately 250 residents; however, despite the construction of the second rail line, Brandywine’s population dropped to 60 residents by the early twentieth century.

The Early family remained prominent residents of Brandywine. After the death of William H. Early in 1890, his 3,000 acres of land were divided among his children, who soon built high-style residences facing the railroad tracks along Cherry Tree Crossing Road. Members of the Early family were also largely responsible for the construction of the Bank of Brandywine (Historic Site 85A-032-30) and the Chapel of the Incarnation (Historic Site/NR 85A-032-27), two important local landmarks. The family retained ownership of the William H. Early Store (Historic Site 85A-032-11) through the mid-1950s and some family descendants still live in the Early residences.

The topography of Brandywine is relatively flat. Buildings along Brandywine Road are a mix of commercial and residential structures set close to the road. Many of the commercial buildings are former single-family residences that have been rehabilitated to serve as commercial buildings. Likewise, a few commercial buildings have been rehabilitated to function as residences, such as the Bank of Brandywine building. The buildings in Brandywine date from the 1870s–1970s and reflect a variety of styles including various interpretations of Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, Mission, Craftsman, and Modern Movement. Common building forms include I-houses, rectangular plans, American Foursquare, bungalows, and ranch houses. The dwellings along Cherry Tree Crossing Road retain the most integrity. Constructed by members of the Early family, these houses remain some of the largest and most high-styled buildings in Brandywine. The buildings are oriented to face the railroad tracks rather than the road, indicating the importance of the railroad in the late nineteenth century. Modern subdivisions dating from the 1970s–1990s surround the survey area.

T.B. (85A-033)

T.B. is named for two of the largest nineteenth-century landowners in the area: William Townshend and Thomas Brooke. Tradition maintains the name was derived from a
boundary stone carved with T and B, marking Townshend’s property to the west and Brooke’s property to the east. The community was first called Tee Bee Junction for the number of roads that converged in the village. T.B. was the crossroads for several old roads including Accokeek Road, Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road (MD 381) and several other east-west roads that ran between the important ports of Piscataway on the Potomac River and Nottingham on the Patuxent River. Today, T.B. is still at the junction of several important roads including MD 5 (Branch Avenue), Dyson Road, Brandywine Road, and Old Brandywine Road. US 301 runs north to south and is located east of T.B.

T.B. developed as a small crossroads community in the early nineteenth century. The first documented building was not constructed until circa 1830 and served as a dwelling for a member of the Townshend family. The family later constructed a small store adjacent to their property. Family tradition recounts that subsequent houses such as the J. Eli Huntt Residence (Documented Property 85A-017) were built by William Townshend as a carpentry exercise for his sons. Townshend had subdivided his property, creating building lots that were then improved by the construction of houses and commercial buildings.

The 1861 Martenet map documents only a few structures in T.B. Residences of the Grimes, Gibbons, Gwynn, and Marlow families are shown, as well as the carpentry shop of J.H. Marlow and William Murray’s tavern. By 1878, the Hopkins map demonstrates growth in the community with several new families living in the area. New buildings included a blacksmith shop, a store and post office, and a school house. In the late 1880s, the population of T.B. peaked at 150 residents. At the time, the village supported two schoolhouses (one for African-American students and one for white students), two churches, two blacksmith shops, two undertakers, two general stores, and two doctor’s offices. As other communities were established and continued to grow around the turn of the twentieth century, T.B. remained stagnant and later lost residents to Brandywine, the site of two railroad lines and a larger commercial area. In the mid-twentieth century, construction of MD 5 and the expansion of Old Crain Highway further reduced T.B.’s importance as a commercial center and residential area.

T.B. is currently a small community with a few commercial establishments including a liquor store and ice cream shop/restaurant. The majority of buildings that remain in T.B. date from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century and have been heavily altered. Only two buildings, the Marlow-Huntt Store (Historic Site 85A-033-14) and the Casket Shop remain relatively intact and reflective of their original design. One former commercial building is currently being used as a church, and several residences are located on Old Brandywine Road. Two vacant barns located off of Brandywine Road are reminders of T.B.’s agricultural past. Buildings in the community are sited close to the roads. The topography of T.B. is flat. A sand and gravel extraction site is located north of the crossroads. Nearby public buildings include Gwynn Park Junior High, and Gwynn Park Senior High School, located northeast of the village.

Croom (86A-027)

The village of Croom is centered on the intersections of Croom Road, Duley Station Road, and St. Thomas Church Road; the small village of approximately 50 buildings represents rural development in the county from the 1740s through the 1960s. Croom was named for a tract of land called “Croome,” located northwest of the village patented by the Clagett family in 1671. Thomas John Clagett, born on his family’s Croom homestead, was the first Episcopalian Bishop consecrated in America. In 1800, Clagett was named Chaplain of the United States Senate. He served at St. Thomas Church (Historic Site/National Register 86A-027-07) from 1780–1810, when he founded Trinity Episcopal Church in Upper Marlboro.

The village of Croom began to develop in the mid-nineteenth century as a rural village centered among St. Thomas Church (circa 1745, Historic Site/National Register 86A–027–07), several residences, and John Coff ren’s general store (circa 1853) (Historic Site/National Register 86A-027-11). By 1857, a post office was established in Croom and was operated out of Coff ren’s store. Because of its location between the port of Nottingham and the county seat of Upper Marlboro, Croom Road became an important thoroughfare in Prince George’s County. Croom Road acted as a significant north-south route supposedly established by Native Americans. By 1745, the road was officially recognized, and in 1794, appeared on Dennis Griffith’s map of Maryland. By the 1860s, Croom had expanded to include the residences and shops of a miller, a carpenter, a mechanic, and a blacksmith. By this time, a new parsonage and a schoolhouse were erected to serve
the small community. The 1861 Martenet map documents these buildings clustered in the small village. The 1878 Hopkins map shows very little change in the village.

The majority of buildings in Croom date from the late nineteenth century through the 1930s, with limited infill from the mid- to late twentieth century. Most of the buildings are single-family dwellings, although agricultural buildings, a church and rectory, and several commercial buildings exist. The survey district is located on both sides of Croom Road with Croom Airport Road marking the northern boundary and West End Farm as the southern boundary.

The gently rolling farmland contains buildings that date from the mid-eighteenth century (St. Thomas’ Church) through the 1960s and represent a variety of styles, most of which are vernacular buildings ornamented to reflect popular styles. The majority of buildings in Croom date from the late nineteenth century through the late 1930s. Buildings in the survey district have a variety of setbacks; some are located close to the road, while others are set away from the road, down winding private drives. Styles represented in the village include Greek Revival, Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, Craftsman, and vernacular interpretations of these popular styles. Building forms include L- and T-shaped plans (both front- and side-gabled roofs), I-house, front-gable-with-wing, rectangular, bungalow, Cape Cod, and ranch houses. There is very limited infill from the mid- to late twentieth century. Only two commercial buildings were noted in the Croom survey district; both are general stores that provide groceries and necessities for the local population.

Because of the convenient location and open land, new residential developments are planned south of Croom, near West End Farm (Historic Site 86A-005) and west of Croom Road. Although outside of the survey district, these new developments are indicative of the pressure on rural villages in Prince George’s County to develop pastoral farmland into planned residential communities.

Woodville/Aquasco (87B-036)

Aquasco is a rural agricultural village; and Aquasco Road (MD 381) serves as the major north-south transportation route in the community. The center of the village is marked by the intersection of Aquasco Road, St. Mary’s Church Road, and Dr. Bowen Road. The majority of late nineteenth and early twentieth century resources are located on both sides of Aquasco Road, which gives the village a linear feel. Aquasco was named for a nearby tract of land that was patented in 1650 and known by Native Americans as “Aquascake.” The village’s location between the Patuxent River on the east and Swanson’s Creek on the west creates a fertile area of farmland, primarily used to grow tobacco.

Historically, tobacco was an important commodity in the community. The area’s close proximity to the Patuxent River not only contributed to the fertility of the land but also allowed access for the shipment of goods in and out of the community. By 1746, the production of tobacco was significant enough that a tobacco inspection warehouse was proposed for construction close to the community at Trueman’s Point. Although the inspection station was never established, the landing was integral to commerce and trade. In the eighteenth century, the area around Aquasco was divided into large tobacco plantations. By the end of the eighteenth century, Aquasco Road was established through the area, resulting in the formation of a small village known as Woodville.

By the mid-nineteenth century, Martenet’s 1861 map documents a grist mill, several stores, a tavern, blacksmith shop, several churches, and a wind mill. The Hopkins map of 1878 documented only a few changes, primarily the construction of new residences, an additional blacksmith shop, and an African-American church southwest of the village. The Hopkins map notes the village was called Aquasco for the post office located there. After the Civil War, some freed slaves who formerly worked on the tobacco plantations around the Woodville-Aquasco area remained in the area to work as tenant farmers. In 1867, a small Freedmen’s Bureau school was built for African-American students and also served as a Methodist meeting place. Ten years later, another schoolhouse was constructed on the northern edge of the village. This schoolhouse was replaced in 1934 by the Woodville School. Woodville was also the site of the first Episcopal chapel established for African-Americans in Prince George’s County. St. Phillip’s Chapel (Historic Site 87B-036-12) was constructed circa 1878; the chapel was destroyed by fire in 1976, but the cemetery associated with the church remains and is maintained by the congregation.

In the early twentieth century, the village remained a small, closely-knit community. The Woodville Town Hall was constructed in the early 1900s as a social hall, which allowed families to interact during dances, meetings, and
the twentieth century. In 1925, developer Walter L. Bean purchased several parcels of land from families who had long owned considerable amounts of land in the area. One such farm was owned by a white family, Thomas Wood and his family. The area was originally known as Woodville. Bean purchased this land, adjacent to Trueman Point, with the idea of creating a resort community for African-Americans from the Washington area.

Bean’s land was surveyed and platted in small lots that were then heavily advertised in the African-American newspapers of Washington, D.C. The sales manager for Eagle Harbor was M. Jones, who, during the years of 1925 and 1926, released voluminous advertisements for the new resort. Advertisements in the Washington Tribune in the mid 1920s boast “500 Plots at 1 Cent, Payable 20 percent down and balance in 40 equal Weekly Payments”; the new $50,000 Hotel will “Double Values at Eagle Harbor within the next thirty days!” and “Come to Eagle Harbor Plenty of accommodations for Vacationists and Week-End Parties Fine Beach, Bathing, Boating, Fishing, Merry-go-round, Cafes, Tea Rooms, Boarding Houses, Sugar Bowl Bath House, Large Excursion Boat. And Ideal Place for Sunday School and Private Picnics. Fishing Parties and Week-end Visitors!”

The resort was only 30 miles from Washington over fine roads, and the community would be “a high class summer colony for the better people.” Lots were offered for $50 or less, and prospective buyers could (for $1.00 round-trip bus fare) visit the resort for inspection. This was a period when Highland Beach, north of Annapolis, was a popular resort community, and Eagle Harbor also began to attract a good number of middle class blacks. People began building small cottages for their summertime use, and by 1928, the Eagle Harbor Citizens Association was already exploring the idea of incorporation. The town was officially incorporated in 1929.

Just over a year after Walter Bean began the process of developing Eagle Harbor, the Maryland Development Corporation began purchasing property immediately to the north, also fronting on the Patuxent, with the goal of developing another resort community. This second community, Cedar Haven, never equaled Eagle Harbor’s success as a resort, and much of its land has remained undeveloped. Eagle Harbor is still a small and quiet river-
front community; there are piers for fishing and boating, a town hall and public parkland, but not a trace today of the several hotels that once attracted visitors.

Today in Eagle Harbor there are approximately 60 dwellings, only four of which are from the early building period; most of the buildings are for summer use only, and for most of the year, the atmosphere of the community is quiet and rural. The area is true to its rustic resort roots with homes having wells for drinking water and private septic tanks. Some houses are purported to still have their outhouses, although their current use is unknown. There is very little turnover in houses with many being passed down within the same family. There was growing concern in the 1980s about the influx of white residents and the possibility of a larger development takeover. In the 2001 Washington Post Article “Safe Harbor on the Patuxent,” Myrna White, chairman of the town commission, whose grandfather was one of the founders of Eagle Harbor, stated regarding the increase in white population that “it’s something new for us, but no problem.”

Cedar Haven (87B-039)

Established in 1927 as a waterfront community, Cedar Haven was designed as a summer refuge for African-Americans. The community was located on a three-hundred acre parcel, about an hour outside of Washington, D.C., and along the Patuxent River. The founders of Cedar Haven hoped it would rival the adjacent resort town of Eagle Harbor, established just a year earlier. Although the resort never took off the way Eagle Harbor did, it was an important place for blacks in Prince George’s County. Cedar Haven, like Eagle Harbor, was built on lands that were once a part of the Trueman’s Point Landing (Historic Site 87B-028), a historic river port along the Patuxent River. In 1817, Trueman’s Point was acquired by Weem’s Steamboat Company and served as a steamboat port into the twentieth century. The steamboat company went bankrupt not long after Cedar Haven and Eagle Harbor were established, leaving the wharf open for use by the new resorts for African-Americans.

Early advertisements for the community spoke of an “exclusive” community of hills, beaches, woodlands, and meadows with fishing and crabbing, sports, hotels, dinners, and dancing. The promotional literature claimed that a “60 foot boulevard sweeps across the stately crescent shaped beach, lined with stately cedars from end to end.” Advertisers claimed that Cedar Haven was a safe place for children, where they could escape the dangers of city streets and learn the names of the country’s greatest African-American leaders from the street names. They could swim at the natural beaches or enjoy the playground. Visitors could enjoy the summer activities by the water and stay for the fall foliage. For summer visitors, there was a bathhouse on Crispus Attucks Boulevard equipped with 80 locker dressing rooms, separated for men and women, as well as trained attendants. A lounging porch faced the water. Members of the community often gathered at the waters’ edge to watch ships go up and down the Patuxent River. Those without houses could stay at the Cedar Haven Hotel, a large bungalow with a full length porch resting on stone piers, which was equipped with gas, electricity, a garage, and a dance hall; the hotel was well-known for its chicken dinners.

Early construction in Cedar Haven comprised small bungalows and cottages with porches and large setbacks. Many trees were cleared to make room for new houses, but trees were also planted along the roads to provide shade. Sears, Roebuck, and Co. kit homes, such as the Magnolia, the Bellhaven, and the Whitehall, were used as models for new homes in the community. Residents were encouraged to order homes from Sears or model homes after their patterns. Some of the most notable houses in the neighborhood included Sojourn, White Cedars, and Bellana. The first house, Sojourn, was built in 1927 by Mr. and Mrs. William H. Thompson and was a small, front gable house clad in wood shingles with an enclosed front porch. It was later improved with a large addition, fireplace, and paved driveway. White Cedars, owned by Mrs. Z. Ella M. Gunnell and Mrs. Mary Hawley, was a ten-room, two-apartment bungalow, with a screened porch surrounding the entire dwelling. The Bellana, named after owner Anna E. Bell still stands and is a front-gable house on a raised pier foundation with an open flat-roofed porch.

The houses, which are mostly one and one-and-a-half story, gabled cottages and bungalows, characteristically have raised foundations, porches, and large yards. Many of the houses have been modified over the years with additions and replacement materials. Many houses in the area resemble or are Sears, Roebuck kit homes, as builders in the 1920s were encouraged to model their small, inexpensive bungalows after the Bellhaven or Whitehall. Most of the houses have small sheds, garages, or other outbuildings on the lot as well. The streets in Cedar Haven were laid out in a grid pattern, with the north/
south thoroughfare, Banneker Boulevard, anchoring a number of smaller streets. Richard Allen Street is the main road running east and west, although it is quite narrow and without curbs or lighting. Most of the other streets are small, and many do not run far off the main road. Although many maps show the streets laid out in a grid pattern, most of the streets were never fully extended or paved. The roads are narrow, with no curbs, street lights, or sidewalks, and are heavily shaded by rows of trees and dense woods to the west. All the streets in Cedar Haven were named after significant figures in African-American history, such as the poet Paul Dunbar; the founder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, Richard Allen; and Blanche K. Bruce, the first African-American to preside over the senate. Although Cedar Haven never achieved the success that Eagle Harbor did as a resort community, its history, landscape, and architecture make it a significant African-American site in Prince George’s County.
Appendix C

**M-NCPPC-Owned Properties**

**HS**: Historic Site  
**HR**: Historic Resource  
**NR**: National Register  
**NHL**: National Historic Landmark  
**E**: Maryland Historical Trust Easement

Property titles in bold type indicate county-designated historic sites. Property titles in regular type indicate historic resources. Individual listings in the National Register of Historic Places are identified by NR; National Historic Landmarks are identified by NHL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Name of Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>62-004</td>
<td>Snow Hill, Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NHL</td>
<td>62-006</td>
<td>Montpelier and Cemetery, Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>62-023-07</td>
<td>Abraham Hall, Beltsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>65-006</td>
<td>Adelphi Mill &amp; Storehouse, Adelphi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>66-004</td>
<td>College Park Airport, College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>68-002</td>
<td>Walker-Mowatt Mill Site, Riverdale Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NHL E</td>
<td>68-004-05</td>
<td>Riversdale (Calvert Mansion), Riverdale Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>68-014</td>
<td>Dueling Grounds, Colmar Manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-005-16</td>
<td>Peace Cross, Bladensburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-021</td>
<td>Cherry Hill Cemetery, Riverdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-028</td>
<td>Publick Playhouse, Bladensburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>70-020</td>
<td>Marietta &amp; Duvall Family Cemetery, Glenn Dale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-028</td>
<td>Dorsey Chapel (Brookland Methodist Church), Glenn Dale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-050</td>
<td>Glenn Dale Hospital, Glenn Dale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-053-13</td>
<td>Seabrook School, Lanham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>71A-006</td>
<td>Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Railroad Bridge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-006</td>
<td>Newton White Mansion &amp; Warington Cemetery, Mitchellville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-007</td>
<td>Cottage at Warington, Mitchellville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-018</td>
<td>Chelsea, Upper Marlboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-012</td>
<td>Queen Anne Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>74B-013</td>
<td>Hazelwood, Upper Marlboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>74B-022</td>
<td>Robinson Property, Bowie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>75A-001</td>
<td>Concord and Cemetery, Capitol Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76A-001</td>
<td>Ridgeway House, Suitland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>79-019-28</td>
<td>Darnall’s Chance &amp; Burial Vault, Upper Marlboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR E</td>
<td>80-001</td>
<td>Oxon Hill Manor, Oxon Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-051</td>
<td>Riverview Road Archeological Site, Fort Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Properties without notation will be evaluated for designation or listing in the future.
Appendix C: M-NCPPC-Owned Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NR E</td>
<td>81A-007</td>
<td>Mary Surratt House, Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81B-003</td>
<td>Thrift Schoolhouse, Clinton</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>82A-041</td>
<td>Woodyard Site, Upper Marlboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-003</td>
<td>Billingsley, Upper Marlboro</td>
<td>Upper Marlboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-004</td>
<td>Mount Calvert, Upper Marlboro</td>
<td>Upper Marlboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-024</td>
<td>Archeological Site #168 (Mattaponi Site), Upper Marlboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-035</td>
<td>Nottingham School House, Upper Marlboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-038</td>
<td>Columbia Air Center, Upper Marlboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85A-004</td>
<td>Robinson-Billingsley House, Brandywine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85A-005</td>
<td>John Townshend Grave, Brandywine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85A-006</td>
<td>Old School House, Brandywine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Properties without notation will be evaluated for designation or listing in the future
INVENTORY OF HISTORIC CEMETERIES

Historic burial grounds and cemeteries are valuable elements of the county’s cultural heritage because they provide biographical and genealogical information, display the folk art of tombstone carving, and preserve natural features of the landscape, including old trees and mature plantings. All cemeteries are protected by state law, but it is essential that the individual jurisdictions be informed of the locations of historic cemeteries so that developers can be alerted to their existence, and the cemeteries themselves can be preserved. This appendix lists all of the known cemeteries in Prince George’s County, 230 at this writing. Of those, 225 were listed in the 1992 Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan. Two hundred eight cemeteries have been precisely located through Historic Preservation staff survey work, or are recorded in Stones and Bones, Cemetery Records of Prince George’s County, Maryland, published in 1984 (with an addendum in 2000) by the Prince George’s County Genealogical Society.

Ivy Hill Cemetery (Laurel 3) was originally listed in the Inventory in the 1981 and 1992 Historic Sites and Districts Plan. It is not included in the current plan because the City of Laurel is outside the regional district and not subject to the county historic preservation ordinance. Sites without a number have not been recorded on a Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties (MIHP) form.

The cemeteries in the list that follows are arranged in planning area order. Cemeteries that are located on the grounds of properties in the inventory of historic resources are shown using the following symbols.

Legend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Historic Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Historic Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHL</td>
<td>National Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property titles in **bold** type indicate county-designated historic sites. Property titles in regular type indicate historic resources. Individual listings in the National Register of Historic Places are identified by NR. National Historic Landmarks are identified by NHL.
## Appendix D: Inventory of Historic Cemeteries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Name of Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>60-001</td>
<td>Edmonson Grave (on grounds of Timanus-Supplee House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>60-007</td>
<td><strong>Ammendale Normal Institute Cemetery, and St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Chapel Cemetery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-040</td>
<td>Owens Family Cemetery (Brooklyn Bridge Road, between Supplee Lane and Rocky Gorge Road, Laurel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-041</td>
<td>Maryland National Memorial Park (US 1, Laurel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>61-009</td>
<td><strong>St. John’s Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Baltimore Avenue, Beltsville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61-071</td>
<td>Morsell Family Cemetery (Wicomico Street, near Caroline, Beltsville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61-072</td>
<td>Brown-Miller Family Cemetery (National Agricultural Library property, Beltsville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61-073</td>
<td>Prather Family Cemetery (near CSX Railroad, Beltsville Agricultural Research Center property, one mile south of Sunnyside Avenue, Beltsville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61-074</td>
<td>Site of Shaw’s Meeting House &amp; Cemetery (Old Gunpowder Road, Beltsville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61-075</td>
<td>French Family Cemetery (Riggs Chaney Road, Beltsville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>62-003</td>
<td><strong>Oaklands &amp; Snowden Family Cemetery</strong> (Contee Road, Laurel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NHL</td>
<td>62-006</td>
<td><strong>Montpelier &amp; Snowden Family Cemetery</strong> (Muirkirk Road, Laurel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>62-023-21</td>
<td><strong>Queen’s Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church Site &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Old Muirkirk Road, Rossville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62-036</td>
<td>Duvall Family Cemetery (south of Muirkirk Road, Beltsville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>64-005</td>
<td><strong>Perkins Methodist Chapel &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Springfield Road, Glenn Dale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64-016</td>
<td>Site of Pleasant Grove Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery (Springfield Road, Beltsville, BARC property)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64-017</td>
<td>Hall Family Cemetery (Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC) property, Beltsville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65-028</td>
<td>George Washington Cemetery (Riggs Road, Adelphi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65-029</td>
<td>Mt. Lebanon Cemetery (Riggs Road, Adelphi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66-029-07</td>
<td>Deakins Family Cemetery (on subdivision lot near Bloomfield, 66-029-05, Queens Chapel Road, University Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66-035-08</td>
<td>McNamee Family Cemetery (University of Maryland, College Park campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66-069</td>
<td>Scaggs Family Cemetery (Lot 73, Addition to Daniels Park, Erie Street and Rhode Island Avenue, College Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR NHL</td>
<td>67-004-03a</td>
<td>Walker Family Cemetery (Greenbelt Historic District, Walker Drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR NHL</td>
<td>67-004-03b</td>
<td>Turner Family Cemetery (Greenbelt Historic District, Ivy Lane and Edmonston Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR NHL</td>
<td>67-004-03c</td>
<td>Hamilton Family Cemetery (Greenbelt Historic District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>68-004-03</td>
<td><strong>Calvert Family Cemetery</strong> (East West Highway, Riverdale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>68-015</td>
<td>Fort Lincoln Cemetery (Bladensburg Road, Brentwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>69-005-10</td>
<td>Evergreen Cemetery (52nd Avenue near Newton Street, Bladensburg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>69-021</td>
<td><strong>Cherry Hill Cemetery, Adams Family</strong> (Ingraham Street, Beacon Heights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69-040</td>
<td>Onion Family Cemetery (Auburn Avenue near Riverdale Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69-041</td>
<td>Stephen Family Cemetery (northeast corner, 59th Avenue and Sheridan Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Name of Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>70-008</td>
<td>Whitfield Chapel Site &amp; Cemetery (Whitfield Chapel Road, Lanham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>70-020</td>
<td>Marietta &amp; Duvall Family Cemetery (some remains moved from Duvall Family Cemetery, 70-022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>70-022</td>
<td>Duvall Family Cemetery (near Glenn Dale Fire Station, Glenn Dale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-052-27</td>
<td>St. George's Episcopal Chapel &amp; Cemetery (Glenn Dale Road, Glenn Dale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-091</td>
<td>Western Star Lodge Site &amp; Cemetery (associated with Dorsey Chapel, Brookland Methodist Church, 70-28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70-092</td>
<td>Talbert Family Cemetery (south corner, intersection of Springfield and Good Luck Roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70-093</td>
<td>Weed Grave Site (off of MD 450 near Seabrook Road, Lanham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71A-009a</td>
<td>Holy Trinity Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>71A-012</td>
<td>Magruder Family Cemetery (Smithwick Lane, Mitchellville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71A-013</td>
<td>Fairview &amp; Bowie Family Cemetery (Fairview Vista Drive, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71A-019</td>
<td>Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery, White Marsh (Annapolis Road, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71A-046</td>
<td>Beechfield (Turner) Property &amp; Duckett Family Cemetery (US 50 &amp; MD 193, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71A-047</td>
<td>Bowie Family Cemetery (site of Cedar Hill, Seward Road, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71A-048</td>
<td>First Lutheran Church &amp; Cemetery (Duckettown Road, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71A-049</td>
<td>Merkel Family Cemetery (Merkel Farms Road, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71A-050</td>
<td>Isaac Family Cemetery (Lancaster Lane, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71B-001</td>
<td>Ascension Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery (MD 564, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71B-002-34</td>
<td>Site of Bowie Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery (Chestnut Avenue, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>71B-004</td>
<td>Belair Mansion &amp; Ogle Family Cemetery (Tulip Grove Drive, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>71B-006</td>
<td>Lansdale Grave (north side of MD 197 across from Bowie Town Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>71B-008</td>
<td>Mitchell Family Cemetery (Porsche Court, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>71B-015</td>
<td>Fair Running &amp; Duvall Family Cemetery (Laurel Bowie Road, Laurel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>71B-016</td>
<td>Melford &amp; Duckett Family Cemetery (Melford Boulevard, Maryland Science and Technology Park, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71B-020</td>
<td>Hardisty Family Cemetery (Mase Lane, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71B-021</td>
<td>Hall Family Cemetery (Collington Meadows, James Ridge Road, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>72-005</td>
<td>Ridgely Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery (MD 450, Landover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>72-008</td>
<td>Addison Chapel—St. Matthew’s Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery (Addison Road, Seat Pleasant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>72-045</td>
<td>Harmony Memorial Park (Sheriff Road, Landover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72-062</td>
<td>Magruder Family Cemetery (near M-NCPPC’s Prince George's Ballroom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72-063</td>
<td>First Baptist Church of Glenarden Cemetery (Brightseat Road, Glenarden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-006</td>
<td>Newton White Mansion &amp; Warington Cemetery (Enterprise Road, Mitchelville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-009</td>
<td>Rose Mount Site &amp; Kent Family Cemetery (St. Joseph’s Drive, Lanham)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Including Lloyd Family moved from 70-17 Site of Buena Vista, home of G.W. Duvall and Bowie Family, moved from 71A-9, Willow Grove
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Name of Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73-014</td>
<td>Contee Family Cemetery (at site of Ranelagh, Castlewood Place, Largo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>73-016</td>
<td><strong>Magruder-Clagett Family Cemetery</strong> (adjoining Mount Lubentia, Largo Road, Largo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73-031</td>
<td>Hilleary Family Cemetery (near Three Sisters, 73-2, located at the Catholic Rest Home on Lottsford Vista Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73-032</td>
<td>Waring Family Cemetery (Site of Heart’s Delight, Largo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-004</td>
<td><strong>Holy Family Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Woodmore Road, Mitchellville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74A-009</td>
<td>Mount Oak Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery (intersection of Church Road and Woodmore Road, Mitchellville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-010</td>
<td><strong>Mullikin’s Delight &amp; Mullikin Family Cemetery</strong> (Church Road, Mitchellville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74A-015</td>
<td><strong>Partnership &amp; Hall Family Cemetery</strong> (MD 450, Mitchellville, on grounds of Six Flags Amusement Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74A-036</td>
<td>Cross-Slingluff Family Cemetery (Locust Glen Drive, Mitchellville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74B-004</td>
<td>Peach-Walker Family Cemetery (Arden Forest Drive, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74B-005</td>
<td>Hamilton Family Cemetery (Mill Branch Place, Bowie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-006</td>
<td><strong>Carroll Methodist Chapel &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Mitchellville Road, Mitchellville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-010</td>
<td><strong>Mount Nebo AME Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Queen Anne Road, Queen Anne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-015</td>
<td><strong>Clagett House at Cool Spring Manor &amp; Clagett-Darnall Family Cemetery</strong> (Clagett Landing Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>74B-015</td>
<td><strong>African American Cemetery at Clagett House at Cool Spring Manor</strong> (Clagett Landing Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74B-059</td>
<td>Howard Family Cemetery (Clagett Landing Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74B-060</td>
<td>Jones Memorial Gardens Cemetery (west side of US 301, south of Mitchellville Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>75A-001</td>
<td><strong>Concord &amp; Berry Family Cemetery</strong> (Walker Mill Road, Capitol Heights vicinity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75A-004</td>
<td>Duncan Grave, Site of Alms House (D’Arcy Road, Forestville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>75A-006</td>
<td><strong>Epiphany Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Ritchie Road, Forestville)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>75A-008</td>
<td><strong>Forestville ME Church Site &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Ritchie Road, Forestville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75A-012</td>
<td>Mount Calvary Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery (Marlboro Pike, Forestville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75A-061</td>
<td>Jackson Memorial Church Site &amp; Cemetery (Marlboro Pike, near Joint Base Andrews Naval Facility Washington Naval Facility Washington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75A-062</td>
<td>Cedar Hill Cemetery (Pennsylvania Avenue, Suitland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>75A-063</td>
<td>Lincoln Memorial Cemetery (Suitland Road, Suitland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75A-064</td>
<td>Washington National Memorial Park (Suitland Road, Suitland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75A-065</td>
<td>National Capital Hebrew Cemetery (corner of Fable Street and Abel Avenue, Capitol Heights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75A-066</td>
<td>Pleasant Lane Missionary Baptist Church &amp; Cemetery (Abel and Emo Streets, Capitol Heights)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Name of Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76A-004</td>
<td><strong>St. Barnabas Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (St. Barnabas Road, Oxon Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76A-046</td>
<td>B’nai Israel Congregation Cemetery (St. Barnabas Road, Oxon Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76A-047</td>
<td>Thomas Family Cemetery (Morgan Road, Forestville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76A-048</td>
<td>Soper Family Cemetery (Auth Road, Camp Springs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>76B-006</td>
<td><strong>St. Ignatius Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Brinkley Road, Oxon Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>76B-008</td>
<td>St. Paul’s Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery (St. Barnabas Road, Oxon Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>76B-011</td>
<td>Bayne Family Cemetery (near Apple Grove Elementary School, off of Bock Road, Oxon Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76B-016</td>
<td><strong>Mount Hope AME Church Site &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Allentown Road, Clinton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76B-017</td>
<td><strong>Old Bells Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Allentown Road, Camp Springs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76B-046</td>
<td>Old Oxon Hill Methodist Church Site &amp; Cemetery (Oxon Hill Road, Oxon Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>76B-066</td>
<td>Beall-Love Family Cemetery (across Old Brandywine Road from Middleton House, 76A-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76B-067</td>
<td>Dawson Family Cemetery (near 3233 Brinkley Road, Oxon Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76B-068</td>
<td>Hebb Family Cemetery (Moore Park, 5300 Temple Hill Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76B-069</td>
<td>Sellner Family Cemetery (200 yards behind 9103 Allentown Road, Fort Washington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>77-001</td>
<td><strong>Forest Grove ME Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Chapel #2) (Joint Base Andrews Naval Facility Washington Naval Facility Washington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>77-012</td>
<td>St. Luke’s ME Church Site &amp; Cemetery (Leapley Road, near Joint Base Andrews Naval Facility Washington Naval Facility Washington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>77-014</td>
<td><strong>Belle Chance &amp; Darcey Family Cemetery</strong> (Joint Base Andrews Naval Facility Washington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>78-008</td>
<td>Osborn-Talburtt Family Cemetery (Westphalia Road near Marlboro-Ritchie Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>78-010</td>
<td>Dunblane Site &amp; Magruder-McGregor Family Cemetery (Westphalia Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78-011</td>
<td>Ritchie Baptist Church &amp; Cemetery (Sansbury Road, Westphalia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>78-013</td>
<td><strong>Blythewood &amp; Smith Family Cemetery</strong> (Mellwood Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>78-017</td>
<td><strong>Charles Hill &amp; Pumphrey Family Cemetery</strong> (Old Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro vicinity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79-001</td>
<td>Bowie Family Cemetery (Manor Gate Terrace, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>79-004</td>
<td><strong>Mount Pleasant &amp; Waring Family Cemetery</strong> (Mount Pleasant Road, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-019-15</td>
<td><strong>Trinity Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Church Street, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-019-22</td>
<td><strong>Dr. William &amp; Sarah Beanes Cemetery</strong> (Elm Street, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>79-019-28</td>
<td><strong>Darnall’s Chance House Museum &amp; Burial Vault</strong> (Governor Oden Bowie Drive, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79-019-71</td>
<td>Forrest Family Cemetery (Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79-019-72</td>
<td>Trinity Episcopal Cemetery (Rectory Lane, Upper Marlboro)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79-019-73</td>
<td>Tyler Family Cemetery (Rectory Lane, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Name of Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>79-019-74</td>
<td>Site of Marlborough Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery, Upper Marlboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-030</td>
<td>Mount Carmel Roman Catholic Cemetery (Old Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-046</td>
<td><strong>Union Methodist Episcopal Chapel Site &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Valley Lane, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-057</td>
<td>Riverdale Baptist Church Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-059</td>
<td><strong>St. Barnabas’ Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery, Leeland</strong> (Oak Grove Road, Leeland) ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>79-063-10</td>
<td><strong>Compton Bassett, Dependencies &amp; Hill Family Cemetery</strong> (Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro vicinity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>79-113</td>
<td>Hodges Family Cemetery (Susan Hodges Place, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>79-114</td>
<td>Smith-Tomlin Family Cemetery (Lake Forest Drive, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>79-116</td>
<td>Hilleary Family Cemetery (Leland Road, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-017</td>
<td>Hatton Family Cemetery (Livingston Road and Chalfont Avenue, Piscataway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>80-018-01</td>
<td>Grace ME Church Site &amp; Cemetery (Grace Methodist Church, Piscataway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-050</td>
<td><strong>Addison Family Cemetery</strong> (west of MD 210 south of I-95/I-495, at site of original Oxon Hill Manor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-053</td>
<td>Humphreys-Edelen Family Cemetery (between Gallahan and Old Fort Roads, Fort Washington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>80-054</td>
<td>Site of Old Providence Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery (Old Fort Road, Friendly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NHL</td>
<td>81A-001</td>
<td><strong>Poplar Hill on His Lordship’s Kindness &amp; Daingerfield-Sewall Family Cemetery</strong> (Woodyard Road, Clinton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81A-027</td>
<td><strong>Christ Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Old Branch Avenue and Woodley Road, Clinton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81A-028</td>
<td>St. John the Evangelist Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery (Old Branch Avenue and Clinton Street, Clinton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81A-029</td>
<td>Forest Hills Memorial Gardens (Brandywine Road and Clinton Way, Clinton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81A-030</td>
<td>Resurrection Roman Catholic Cemetery (Woodyard Road, adjoining Poplar Hill, 81A-001, Clinton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81A-031</td>
<td>Gray Family Cemetery (Eton Lane &amp; Allan Drive, Clinton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>81B-001</td>
<td><strong>Steed Family Cemetery</strong> (Tinker’s Branch Way, Fort Washington area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>81B-004</td>
<td><strong>Wyoming &amp; Marbury Family Cemetery</strong> (Thrift Road, Clinton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>81B-011</td>
<td><strong>Providence ME Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Old Fort Road south, Friendly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82A-000-07</td>
<td><strong>Weston &amp; Clagett Family Cemetery</strong> (Old Crain Highway, Upper Marlboro vicinity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82A-002</td>
<td>Pleasant Hills &amp; Cemetery (Croom Station Road and US 301, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82A-010</td>
<td>Duvall Family Cemetery (South Osborne Road, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Including Hilleary Family Cemetery (79-116) that will be moved from the Beechtree Housing Development.

⁴ Including the Bowie Family Cemetery moved from the site of Friendship, Kettering, the Bowie Family Cemetery moved from the site of Willow Brook, and the Carter grave moved from Goodwood.

⁵ Including the Lyles Family Cemetery (80-014) moved from Riverview Road Archeological Site.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Name of Cemetery</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82A-015</td>
<td><strong>Holy Rosary Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Rosaryville Road and US 301, Rosaryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82A-019</td>
<td><strong>Boys’ Village of Maryland Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Tippett Road and Surratt Road, Cheltenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>82A-026</td>
<td><strong>Bellefields &amp; Sim Family Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Duley Station Road, Croom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82A-036</td>
<td>Tayman Family Cemetery (Douglas-Reamy farm on Old Indian Head Road, Cheltenham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82A-042-21</td>
<td><strong>Cheltenham Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Southwest US 301, Cheltenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82A-107</td>
<td>Claggett Family Cemetery</td>
<td>Croom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82A-108</td>
<td>Maryland Veterans’ Cemetery</td>
<td>(US 301, Cheltenham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>82B-000-13</td>
<td><strong>Brookfield United Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery at Naylor</strong></td>
<td>Croom Road, Naylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82B-003</td>
<td>Billingsley &amp; Cemetery (Green Landing Road, Upper Marlboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>82B-012</td>
<td>Ghiselin Family Cemetery (Croom Road and Nottingham Road, Naylor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82B-047</td>
<td>Chew Road Slave Cemetery (Chew Road, Upper Marlboro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82B-048</td>
<td>Hollyday Family Cemetery (Fenno Road, Upper Marlboro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>83-008</td>
<td><strong>Christ Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Farmington Road West, Accokeek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83-031</td>
<td>Clagett Family Cemetery (15901 Livingston Road, Accokeek)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>84-014</td>
<td>Asbury Methodist Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery (Accokeek Road, Piscataway)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84-020</td>
<td>Bellevue &amp; Cemetery (Manning Road, Accokeek)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>84-023-10</td>
<td><strong>St. Mary’s Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Piscataway Road, Piscataway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85A-005</td>
<td>John Townshend Grave (Dyson Road, Cheltenham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85A-018</td>
<td>Union Bethel AME Church &amp; Cemetery (Floral Park Road, Brandywine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85A-020</td>
<td>McKendree Methodist Church Site &amp; Cemetery (Accokeek Road, Brandywine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85B-003</td>
<td>Aist Family Cemetery (Cedarville Road, Cedarville)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85B-004</td>
<td>Grace ME Church North &amp; Cemetery (Cedarville Road, Cedarville)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85B-009</td>
<td>House of Prayer Church of God &amp; Cemetery (North Keys Road, Brandywine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>86A-002</td>
<td>Church of the Atonement Site &amp; Cemetery (South US 301, Cheltenham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-004</td>
<td><strong>Brookewood &amp; Eversfield-Bowie Family Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Duley Station Road, Croom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-012</td>
<td><strong>St. Simon’s Episcopal Church Site &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>St. Thomas Church Road, Croom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-013</td>
<td><strong>St. Mary’s Methodist Episcopal Church Site &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Croom Airport Road, Croom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-015</td>
<td><strong>Mattaponi &amp; Bowie Family Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Mattaponi Road, Croom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86A-022</td>
<td><strong>Benjamin Mackall House and Mackall Family Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Plantation Drive, North Keys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>86A-027-07</td>
<td><strong>St. Thomas Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>St. Thomas Church Road, Croom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86A-057</td>
<td>Site of Boone’s Roman Catholic Chapel &amp; Cemetery (Van Brady Road, Rosaryville)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86A-058</td>
<td>Talbert-Hall Family Cemetery (Cross Road Trail, Cheltenham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Name of Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86B-001</td>
<td><strong>Gibbons Methodist Episcopal Church Site, Educational Building &amp; Cemetery</strong> (North Keys Road and Gibbons Church Road, Brandywine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86B-004</td>
<td><strong>Skinner Family Cemetery</strong> (Cheswicke Lane, Croom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86B-005</td>
<td><strong>Nottingham-Myers Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Brooks Church Road, Nottingham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS NR</td>
<td>86B-014</td>
<td><strong>St. Paul's Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Baden-Westwood Road, Baden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>86B-018</td>
<td><strong>Immanuel United Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Aquasco Road, Brandywine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>86B-020</td>
<td>Brooke-Bowie Family Cemetery (Candy Hill Road, Naylor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86B-039</td>
<td>Burke Cemetery (Baden Westwood Road, Brandywine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86B-040</td>
<td>Gibbons Family Cemetery (west side of Gibbons Church Road, Brandywine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86B-041</td>
<td>Greenfield Family Cemetery (Bald Eagle School and Nelson Perrie Roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>86B-042</td>
<td>Erickson-Roundell Tomb (Tanyard Road, Nottingham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86B-043</td>
<td>Early Family Cemetery (Brandywine Road, Brandywine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>87A-009</td>
<td><strong>Connick's Folly &amp; Connick Family Cemetery</strong> (Aquasco Road, Brandywine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>87A-010</td>
<td><strong>St. Thomas Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Aquasco Road, Horsehead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87A-013</td>
<td>Downing Family Cemetery (Croom Road, MD 382, Aquasco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>87A-017</td>
<td>Turner Family Cemetery (Site of Anchovie Hills on MD 382)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87A-060</td>
<td>Naylor Family Cemetery (Horsehead Road, near Westwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87A-061</td>
<td>Wilson Family Cemetery (Milltown Landing Road, Brandywine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87A-062</td>
<td>Trueman Family Cemetery (Aquasco Road, Aquasco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>87B-003</td>
<td>Eastview Site &amp; Wood Family Cemetery (St. Mary's Church Road, Aquasco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>87B-033</td>
<td><strong>John Wesley ME Church Site &amp; Cemetery</strong> (Christ Church Road, Eagle Harbor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>87B-036-12</td>
<td><strong>St. Phillip's Episcopal Chapel Site &amp; Cemetery</strong> (St. Phillip's Road, Aquasco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>87B-036-23</td>
<td>Scott Family Cemetery (St. Phillip's Road, Aquasco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87B-036-36</td>
<td>Site of Woodville Methodist Church &amp; Cemetery (Aquasco Road and Eagle Harbor Road, Aquasco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>87B-036-37</td>
<td><strong>St. Mary's Episcopal Church &amp; Cemetery</strong> (St. Mary's Church Road, Aquasco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87B-036-38</td>
<td>St. Dominic's Roman Catholic Church &amp; Cemetery (Aquasco Road, Aquasco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87B-040</td>
<td>Savoy Family Cemetery (Trueman Point Road, Eagle Harbor area)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cemeteries listed below are identified in Stones and Bones, but their locations could not be positively identified.

- 60  Hall-Reed Family Cemetery (Brooklyn Bridge Road near Dorset Road, Laurel)
- 61  Boteler Family Cemetery (near Beltsville)
- 62  Duvall Family Cemetery (Howard University Property, south of Muirkirk Road, east side of Old Baltimore Pike, Beltsville)
- 67  Duvall Family Cemetery (BARC property, Beltsville)
- 70  Harvey Family Cemetery (Presley Road near Good Luck Road)
- 72  Robey Family Cemetery (back yard of 7619 Allendale Drive, Palmer Park)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Name of Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hill Family Cemetery (Hill Road, Landover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cromwell Grave Site (Sheriff Road, Landover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clark Family Cemetery (US 301 just north of MD 214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones-Cowman Family Cemetery (Padsworth Farm, Queen Anne Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith Family Cemetery (two miles from Queen Anne Bridge, on Queen Anne Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suit Family Cemetery (unknown location in Forestville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pyles Family Cemetery (intersection of Allentown Road and Lanham Lane, Camp Springs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hatton Family Cemetery (MD 373, four miles southwest of TB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wall Family Cemetery (Lusby Road near Dyson Road and US 301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gywnn Family Cemetery, site of Locust Grove (Accokeek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Townshend Family Cemetery (MD 5 near T.B.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Townshend-Early Family Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baden Family Cemetery (near Brooks-Myers Church, Naylor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waring-Hollyday Family Cemetery (on Noble Oliver farm, Baden-Westwood Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Covington Family Cemetery (Aquasco Farm Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orme-Dale Family Cemetery (one mile below Horsehead on Horsehead Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watson Family Cemetery (east of intersection of MD 381 and MD 382)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wall Family Cemetery (near Eagle Harbor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREHISTORIC CONTEXT

Archeology is the scientific study of human cultures through the recovery, recordation, analysis, and interpretation of material objects. *Maryland’s State Historic Preservation Plan* (2005) lists themes that provide a framework for archeologists to describe and analyze cultural resources that are identified in archeological surveys. Readily recognized themes of prehistoric culture that can be informed by archeological data include subsistence strategies, settlement patterns, political organization, technological development, and environmental adaptation of local inhabitants. These themes also provide a basis for evaluating the significance of these resources.

The prehistoric period is divided into the following temporal ranges: Paleo-Indian (10,000–7,500 B.C.); Early Archaic Period (7,500–6,000 B.C.); Middle Archaic Period (6,000–4,000 B.C.); Late Archaic Period (4,000–2,000 B.C.); Early Woodland Period (2,000–500 B.C.); Middle Woodland (500 B.C.–900 A.D.); and Late Woodland (900–1,600 A.D.).

Paleo-Indian (10,000–7,500 B.C.): Prehistoric settlement during this stage consisted of seminomadic bands that hunted large game animals, such as mastodon, mammoth, moose, elk, and deer. Climatic conditions were cooler, and vegetation consisted of spruce, pine, fir, and alder trees. Sea level was much lower due to the glacial environment. Few Paleo-Indian sites have been identified in Prince George’s County, and many may exist in submerged environments. Large, fluted lanceolate-shaped projectile points are characteristic of this period.

Early Archaic Period (7,500–6,000 B.C.): During this phase, the glaciers continued to recede, and sea levels rose. Deciduous forests began to replace the coniferous variety of trees. A wider range of animal species inhabited the deciduous forests, and different types of points were developed to hunt the new types of game. Notched projectile points, such as the Kirk variety, began to appear. Sources of lithic materials came from greater distances, indicating the formation of some long-range trade networks.

Middle Archaic Period (6,000–4,000 B.C.): Temperatures continued to warm, and sea levels rose that formed inland swamps. New plant species appeared, and there were a greater variety of food resources available to Middle Archaic people. General foraging for plant foods supplemented hunting. Settlements consisted primarily of upland hunting camps and small base camps located close to the inland marshes where seasonal subsistence resources were available. Typical projectile point types from this period include Stanley Stemmed/Neville, Morrow Mountain I and II, Guilford, and Piscataway.

Late Archaic Period (4,000–2,000 B.C.): The climate during this period continued to warm and was drier. Sea levels continued rising and large, open grassy areas appeared. Faunal assemblages characteristic of today’s climate appeared during this period. Forests were largely composed of deciduous trees. Hunting and foraging continued on a seasonal basis, with settlements shifting to follow the available resources. Late Archaic populations began to exploit riverine resources to a greater degree, and semisedentary base camps began to form along rivers and streams. Trade networks became more extensive and projectile point types became more diverse.

Early Woodland Period (2,000–500 B.C.): Prehistoric populations became more sedentary during the Woodland period as the climate and sea level stabilized. Ceramic manufacture first occurs during this period and includes Accokeek wares that were tempered with sand and quartz and steatite varieties. Early Woodland settlements can be found near rivers and streams and frequently appear at the junction of freshwater and brackish water streams. Early Woodland populations established base camps where they exploited seasonal resources. Some of the long-range trade networks appear to have declined, as less nonlocal material appears in the archeological record.

Middle Woodland (500 B.C.–900 A.D.): More diverse ceramic forms were developed during the Middle Woodland period. A common ceramic tradition was the shell-tempered Mockley wares. Base camps moved into the broader floodplain areas where tidal and nontidal resources could be more easily exploited. Site size began to decrease during this phase, and local exchange networks extended into western Maryland and the New Jersey fall line. Pit
features, for underground storage, and shell middens also begin to appear during this stage.

Late Woodland (900–1,600 A.D.): The major development during this stage was the establishment of stable agriculture. Sedentary villages began to form in floodplain areas along the Potomac and Patuxent Rivers. Hunting, gathering, and fishing were still important sources of food procurement but were less important than in earlier phases. Ceramics were sometimes elaborately decorated. Settlement became more concentrated in villages, and because of the development of agriculture, there was a lesser need for satellite camps. Social and political life was more organized, and tribal societies emerged. Hostility between groups also increased as is evidenced by the presence of more fortified villages.

**Prehistoric Period Themes**—The 2005 Maryland State Historic Preservation Plan provides seven themes for prehistoric period sites.

**Subsistence Theme**—This theme explores the various strategies used by prehistoric populations to procure, process, and store food. Tool types and food remains provide important information on subsistence practices. Plant remains can provide information on past habitats. This theme examines how subsistence strategies changed over time and what resources were being exploited.

**Settlement Theme**—This theme can be used to explore how subsistence, political, demographic, and religious aspects of a culture system impacted how populations utilized their natural environment. Under this theme, house types, village plans, and the distribution of sites can be examined to explain the political and social aspects of a settlement.

**Political Theme**—This theme explores interactions between contemporaneous cultures and groups. Cultural aspects that can be examined under this theme include social organization and integration, kinship systems, fortification, intensification of production, migration, and resource redistribution. Types of sites that can provide information on this theme include fortified villages, burial grounds, and hamlets.

**Demographic Theme**—This theme explores population trends over time by examining the health, mortality, and distribution of populations. Physical anthropological data on diet, mortality, health, and stress can be obtained from skeletal remains, although the study of Native American human remains is a controversial issue. Settlement sites can also provide data on the size of the native population over time and their distribution across the landscape.

**Religious Theme**—This theme examines the spiritual beliefs and world view of native populations over time. Religious rituals are sometimes apparent in burial sites, as different types of material culture may have been placed in the graves of spiritual leaders. Special ceremonial structures or areas may also be identified within settlement sites.

**Technological Theme**—Various types of material culture were developed by native populations to exploit the natural environment in which they lived. Tool technologies evolved over time to adapt to the changing climate, flora and fauna. Food storage strategies also changed over time depending on the types of food sources exploited by native populations. Technological issues can be examined on almost any type of site.

**Environmental Adaptation Theme**—Geological studies can add to our understanding of the natural environment in which native populations existed. This theme explores how native populations adapted to and exploited the natural environment. Studies on changing sea levels, flora and fauna, and climate should be utilized to examine cultural and social changes in native populations. All site types can contribute information on this theme.
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**Preservation Organizations**

**Accokeek Foundation**
400 Bryan Point Road
Accokeek, MD 20607
301-283-2113

www.accokeek.org

The Accokeek Foundation is the steward of 200 acres of Piscataway Park, a national park located in Accokeek, Maryland, on the eastern shore of the Potomac River directly across from Mount Vernon. The property serves as an outdoor classroom for our educational programs, research, agricultural, and conservation projects. The Foundation also runs the National Colonial Farm. The park is open to the public throughout the year.

**Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)**
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 803
Old Post Office Building
Washington, DC 20004
202-606-8503

achp@achp.gov
www.achp.gov

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) is an independent federal agency that promotes the preservation, enhancement, and productive use of our nation’s historic resources and advises the President and Congress on national historic preservation policy. The goal of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), which established the ACHP in 1966, is to have federal agencies act as responsible stewards of our nation’s resources when their actions affect historic properties. The ACHP is the only entity with the legal responsibility to encourage federal agencies to factor historic preservation into federal project requirements.

**African-American Heritage Preservation Foundation (AAHPF)**
420 Seventh Street NW, Suite 501
Washington, DC 20004-2211

www.aahpfdn.org/

The African-American Heritage Preservation Foundation, Inc. (AAHPF), a not-for-profit 501(c)(3) organization that is dedicated to the preservation of African-American history and historical sites, was established in June 1994. AAHPF has been engaged in activities that include the preservation, maintenance, and public awareness of endangered or little-known African-American historical sites primarily in the mid-Atlantic and southeast regions. In addition, AAHPF acts as a nationwide resource center for community groups, preservationists, genealogical and historical societies, not-for-profit organizations and government entities requiring assistance in the preservation of African-American historical sites and history.

**African-American Heritage Preservation Group (AAHPG)**
c/o Prince George’s County Chapter, NAACP, Suite 115
9201 Basil Court
Largo, MD 20774
301-883-4941

The African-American Heritage Preservation Group (AAHPG) is a nonprofit, preservation advocacy organization that focuses on African-American heritage needs and opportunities in Prince George’s County, Maryland.

**African American Museum Consortium**
c/o 100 Community Place, 3rd Floor
Crownsville, MD 21032
410-514-7643

The Consortium of African and African-American Museums in Maryland (CAAAMM) is dedicated to strengthening Maryland organizations primarily committed to collecting, preserving, and exhibiting art, artifacts, and other material culture relevant to the African and African-American experiences.
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Afro-American Historical & Genealogical Society, Inc., Prince George’s County, MD Chapter
P.O. Box 44252
Fort Washington, MD 20749

www.pgcm.aahgs.org

The Prince George’s County, Maryland Chapter of AAHGS was organized in July 1994 and chartered April 28, 1995. As a nonprofit volunteer organization, our objectives are to promote black history in Prince George’s County, encourage the historical and genealogical studies of African-Americans currently residing in the county, and support the goals and objectives of our national society. To reach these objectives, AAHGS-PGCM conducts activities such as workshops, speaker forums, discussion groups, on-site research, speakers bureau, exhibits, and networking.

Alice Ferguson Foundation and Hard Bargain Farm Environmental Center
2001 Bryan Point Road
Accokeek, MD 20607
301-292-5665

www.fergusonfoundation.org
webmail@fergusonfoundation.org

The Alice Ferguson Foundation was established in 1954 as a nonprofit organization chartered in the state of Maryland. Its mission is to provide experiences that encourage connections between people, the natural environment, farming, and the cultural heritage of the Potomac River Watershed, which lead to personal environmental responsibility. Hard Bargain Farm, as we know it today, is very similar to the way it was in the early 1920s when Alice and Henry Ferguson first lived there. The Alice Ferguson Foundation conducts educational programs for elementary school children concerning the environmental, agricultural, and historical features of the area, including the Accokeek Creek archeological site, a National Historic Landmark.

Aman Memorial Trust
4703 Annapolis Road
Bladensburg, MD 20710
301-927-7150

The Aman Memorial Trust was established in 1984 to preserve and maintain historic buildings and monuments in and about the Town of Bladensburg, for the benefit of the general public and the community. It owns the George Washington House at 4302 Baltimore Avenue.

Anacostia Trails Heritage Area (ATHA)
c/o City of Hyattsville, 4310 Gallatin Street
Hyattsville, MD 20781
301-887-0777

www.anacostiatrails.org

Founded in 1997, ATHA is dedicated to preserving, renovating, enhancing, and publicizing the rich history, unmatched cultural facilities/off erings, and recreational sites filled with nature’s beauty within Prince George’s County. ATHA is located in northern Prince George’s County and includes the following 15 communities: Beltsville, Berwyn Heights, Bladensburg, Brentwood, College Park, Colmar Manor, Cottage City, Edmonston, Greenbelt, Hyattsville, Laurel, Mount Rainier, North Brentwood, Riverdale Park, and University Park. The area also includes five National Register Historic Districts and a state-designated arts district.

The Archaeological Conservancy, Eastern Region
8 East Second Street, Suite 200
Frederick, MD 21701
301-682-6359

Tac_east@verizon.net
www.americanarchaeology.com

The Archaeological Conservancy, established in 1980, is the only nonprofit organization dedicated to acquiring and preserving the best of our nation’s remaining archaeological sites. Based in Albuquerque, New Mexico, the Conservancy also operates a regional office in Maryland.

The Archeological Society of Maryland, Inc.
Mid-Potomac Chapter
704 Cabin John Parkway
Rockville, MD 20852
301-424-8526

www.marylandarcheology.org

The Archeological Society of Maryland, Inc. (ASM) is a statewide organization of lay and professional archaeologists devoted to the study and conservation of Maryland archeology. The goals of the ASM are:
• Discovery, investigation, and conservation of Maryland’s archeological resources.

• Proper recording of archeological sites.

• Respect for the fragile and nonrenewable nature of archeological sites.

• Creation of bonds between avocational and professional archeologists.

• Development of opportunities for working with professional archeologists through directed fieldwork, analysis, and reporting.

• Public dissemination of information about Maryland’s buried heritage.

• Publication of the results of all excavations undertaken by the Society.

In support of these goals, ASM sponsors a variety of activities, including fieldwork, publications, meetings, and events.

**Association for Gravestone Studies (AGS)**  
101 Munson Street, Suite 108  
Greenfield, Massachusetts 01301  
413-772-0836  

[info@gravestonestudies.org](mailto:info@gravestonestudies.org)  
[www.gravestonestudies.org](http://www.gravestonestudies.org)

The AGS was founded in 1977 for the purpose of furthering the study and preservation of gravestones. AGS is an international organization with an interest in grave markers of all periods and styles. Through its publications, conferences, workshops, and exhibits, AGS promotes the study of gravestones from historical and artistic perspectives, expands public awareness of the significance of historic grave markers, and encourages individuals and groups to record and preserve gravestones. At every opportunity, AGS cooperates with groups that have similar interests.

**The Association for Preservation Technology International (APT) National Chapter:**  
3085 Stevenson Drive, Suite 200  
Springfield, Illinois 62703  
217-529-9039  

[info@apti.org](mailto:info@apti.org)  
[www.apti.org](http://www.apti.org)

**Washington, DC Chapter:**  
P.O. Box 7798  
Washington DC 20044-7798  
202-257-0482  

[apt_dc@yahoo.com](mailto:apt_dc@yahoo.com)  
[apt.dc.org.googlepages.com](http://apt.dc.org.googlepages.com)  
[www.apti.org/chapters/washington/index.cfm](http://www.apti.org/chapters/washington/index.cfm)

The Association for Preservation Technology International (APT) is a cross-disciplinary, membership organization dedicated to promoting the best technology for conserving historic structures and their settings. Membership in APT provides exceptional opportunities for networking and the exchange of ideas.

**Bowie Heritage Committee**  
c/o City of Bowie City Hall  
Bowie, MD 20715  
301-262-6200  

[www.cityofbowie.org/Committees/heritage.asp](http://www.cityofbowie.org/Committees/heritage.asp)

The Heritage Committee engages in activities relating to the heritage of Bowie and the surrounding area, including the conservation, preservation, and beautification of the city and the properties which are part of the city’s heritage.

**Broad Creek Historic District Local Advisory Committee**  
c/o St. John’s Church, 9801 Livingston Road  
Fort Washington, MD 20744  
301-248-4290  

The Broad Creek Historic District Local Advisory Committee assists and advises the Prince George’s County Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) in the performance of its duties, serves as the liaison between the historic district and the HPC, and provides information on preservation techniques and programs to residents of the district.
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Center for Heritage Resource Studies (CHRS)
1111 Woods Hall, University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
301-405-0085
www.heritage.umd.edu

The Center for Heritage Resource Studies was established to bring scholars and practitioners together to support a comprehensive approach to the study of heritage. The Center’s research and educational efforts are formulated in ways that can be readily applied by those who are responsible for the management of historic, cultural, and environmental resources. In this way, the activities of the Center contribute substantially to an increased awareness of the need for responsible heritage development.

Coalition to Protect Maryland Burial Sites, Inc.
P.O. Box 1533
Ellicott City, MD 21041
410-860-2364
www.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~mdcpmbs/coalition01.htm

The Coalition to Protect Maryland Burial Sites, formed in 1991, is committed to the protection of human burial sites from unauthorized and unwarranted disturbance, by man or nature. The organization is composed of individuals and groups committed to the preservation of burial sites, including historians, genealogists, archaeologists, cultural preservationists, Native Americans, legislative members, and, particularly, native Marylanders who care about their heritage and ancestors.

The Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology (CNEHA)
www.smcm.edu/soan/cneha

CNEHA, founded in 1967, is a nonprofit organization dedicated to archaeological scholarship in the American northeast. Its purpose is to encourage and advance the collection, preservation, and dissemination of knowledge derived from the practice of archaeology on historic sites. CNEHA is concerned with the entire historic time period from the beginnings of European exploration in the New World to the recent past.

Cultural Heritage Tourism
www.culturalheritagetourism.org

This web site has been developed as a resource for organizations and individuals who are developing, marketing, or managing cultural heritage tourism attractions or programs.

The Cultural Landscape Foundation
1909 Que Street NW
Second Floor
Washington, D.C. 20009
202.483.0553
Fax 202.483.0761
www.tclf.org

The Cultural Landscape Foundation (TCLF) is the only not-for-profit (501(c)(3)) foundation in America dedicated to increasing the public’s awareness and understanding of the importance and irreplaceable legacy of its cultural landscapes.

Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR)
National Society:
1776 D Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
202-628-1776
www.dar.org

The DAR, founded in 1890 and headquartered in Washington, D.C., is a nonprofit, nonpolitical volunteer women’s service organization dedicated to promoting patriotism, preserving American history, and securing America’s future through better education for children.

Maryland Society:
4701 Roland Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21210
www.marylanddar.org
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DAR Chapters in Prince George’s County:

Governor Robert Bowie Chapter—Bowie
Suzanne Louise Earing
13531 Forest Drive
Bowie, MD 20715-4393
301-805-2848

Harmony Hall Chapter
Fort Washington, Maryland

www.marylanddar.org/HarmonyHall

Marlborough Towne Chapter – Upper Marlboro
Joan Hammitt Walker, 1710 Brown Station Road
Upper Marlboro, MD 20774-9238
301-350-0010

Toaping Castle Chapter – Hyattsville
Maria William Cole, 1316 Paddock Lane
Bowie, Maryland 20716-1808
301-218-7658

www.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~mdtccdar/index.htm

Foundation Center

www.foundationcenter.org

Established in 1956 and today supported by close to 600 foundations, the Foundation Center is a national, nonprofit service organization recognized as the nation’s leading authority on organized philanthropy and connecting nonprofits and the grant makers.

Friends for Historical Preservation of Fairmount Heights

Kacee Godwin Saxon 6000 Lee Place
Fairmount Heights, MD 20743

Friends of Belair Estate

c/o Nancy Dixon Saxon 6000 Lee Place
Fairmount Heights, MD 20743

www.cityofbowie.org/LeisureActivities/Museum/
belair_mansion.asp

The City of Bowie operates the Belair Mansion and the Belair Stable Museum and curates these collections and exhibits. The Museum staff is assisted by the Friends of Belair Estate. The Belair Mansion (circa 1745) was home to Samuel Ogle, Provincial Governor of Maryland. Restored to reflect its 250-year-old history, the mansion is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Friends of College Park Airport

1909 Corporal Frank Scott Drive
College Park, MD 20740
301-864-5844

www.collegeparkairport.org
www.pgpparks.com/places/historic/cpam

The Friends of College Park Airport founded the airport museum and support the museum and its activities. The College Park Aviation Museum, an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution, is located on the grounds of the world’s oldest continuously operating airport. The airport is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Friends of the Greenbelt Museum

P. O. Box 1025
Greenbelt, MD 20768
301-507-6582

www.greenbeltmuseum.org/index_files/Page356.htm

The Greenbelt Museum opened in 1987 as part of Greenbelt’s 50th anniversary celebration. The Friends of the Greenbelt Museum formed a nonprofit corporation and restored an original Greenbelt row house that was purchased by the City of Greenbelt as a museum. The Friends of the Greenbelt Museum, Inc. (FOGM) support and operate the Greenbelt Museum in partnership with the City of Greenbelt. The City of Greenbelt employs a full-time Curator/Director of Historic Programs, and the FOGM supports a half-time Education/Volunteer Coordinator.

Friends of Montpelier

9401 Montpelier Drive
Laurel, MD 20708
301-953-1376

www.pgpparksandrec.com/Things_To_Do/History/
Montpelier_Mansion.htm

The Friends of Montpelier works with museum staff to offer tours, concerts, festivals, reenactments, exhibits, lectures, and seminars at Montpelier Mansion, now
a museum. Montpelier is a fine example of Georgian architecture, popular in Maryland in the late eighteenth century. Montpelier Mansion sits on approximately 70 acres of parkland. The house was constructed between 1781 and 1785 and hosted many distinguished guests, including George Washington and Abigail Adams. Montpelier Mansion is a National Historic Landmark. It is located at 9650 Muirkirk Road in Laurel.

**Friends of North Brentwood, Inc.**
c/o Gateway CDC, 4102 Webster Street
North Brentwood, Maryland 20722

www.gatewaycdc.org

The Friends of North Brentwood, Inc. was originally organized to establish a museum for the Town of North Brentwood, the oldest incorporated African-American community in Prince George’s County. The organization has expanded its scope to recognize and share the historical and cultural contributions of all African-American communities that have existed throughout the county. Since its founding in 1998, the organization has worked diligently in partnership with the Town of North Brentwood and civic organizations across the county to broaden support for the development of a museum and cultural center that would identify, collect, document, interpret, and preserve the oral history and material culture of African-Americans.

**Hyattsville Preservation Association, Inc. (HPA)**
P.O. Box 375
Hyattsville, MD 20781

www.preservehyattsville.org/

The HPA consists of homeowners and friends who are committed to the preservation and promotion of the excellence of American architectural design and the unique qualities of the City of Hyattsville, Maryland. HPA members dedicate their personal resources and energies to the preservation and restoration of our community’s historic homes and neighborhoods. Regular meetings and newsletters highlight topics of home design and repair, community issues, gardening, historic preservation, and the benefits of inclusion in a National Register historic district.

**Huntington Heritage Society, Inc.**
P.O. Box 183
Bowie, MD 20719-0183

www.cityofb Bowie.org/LeisureActivities/Museum/Railroad_Museum.asp

The Huntington Heritage Society, Inc. works to preserve the physical and oral history of the Huntington section of Bowie. The Huntington Heritage Society also works with the City of Bowie, Maryland Museums Division, to operate and furnish the Bowie Railroad Station and the Huntington Railroad Museum.

**Lakeland Community Heritage Project**

www.lakelandchp.com

The Lakeland Community Heritage Project is dedicated to preserving, recording, and sharing the rich past of the Lakeland community, a century old African-American community of College Park, Maryland.

**Laurel Historic District Commission**

City Hall, 8103 Sandy Spring Road
Laurel, MD 20707
301-725-5300

www.laurel.md.us/comm.htm

The City of Laurel Historic District Commission was created and established by Ordinance No. 535, passed by the Mayor and City Council on November 10, 1975. The Commission’s seven members are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. There are six designated historic districts within the city. Prior to the construction, alteration, reconstruction, moving, or demolition of any structure within the designated historic districts, changes that would affect the exterior appearance of a structure, visible or intended to be visible from an adjacent public way in the district, are reviewed by the Commission.
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The Laurel Historical Society
817 Main Street
Laurel, MD 20707
301-725-7975
www.laurelhistory.org

The Laurel Historical Society was organized in 1976 as the Laurel Horizon Society. Since then it has worked to preserve the cultural and historical heritage of greater Laurel. Throughout its history the Society has worked to ensure that the Laurel Museum and the Society’s collection are maintained to the highest professional standards. An interpretive plan and collections policies and procedures ensure that the artifacts entrusted to our care are preserved, recorded and remain accessible through exhibits and to researchers.

Main Street Maryland (MSM)
410-209-5813
www.NeighborhoodRevitalization@mdhousing.org

MSM is a comprehensive downtown revitalization program created in 1998 by the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development. The program strives to strengthen the economic potential of Maryland’s traditional main streets and neighborhoods. Maryland communities meeting the following criteria may apply for participation in the Main Street Maryland program: A minimum population of 1,000 based on the most recent U.S. Census survey, commitment to employ a program manager for a minimum of three years, commitment to organize and maintain a volunteer board of directors and committees made up of public and private sector individuals, commitment to provide a program budget for a minimum of three years, must be a Designated Neighborhood approved by the State of Maryland, must have a defined central business district with a significant number of historic commercial buildings.

Maryland Association of Historic District Commissions (MAHDC)
P.O. Box 783
Frederick, MD 21705
410-514-7635
www.mahdc.org

MAHDC is a statewide alliance formed in 1981 to assist historic preservation commissions and local governments. Its purpose is to help commissions throughout the state operate effectively by providing training, resources, and information. MAHDC produces a commissioner’s handbook of information essential to HDCs; Renovator’s Roundtable, a detailed educational program for HDCs and historic property owners; and a quarterly newsletter that addresses current preservation issues. It also sponsors various workshops and seminars.

Maryland Association of History Museums, Inc. (MAHM)
844 Pratt Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410-837-1793
www.mahm.org

The MAHM is an alliance of historical, cultural, and educational institutions that represents more than 220 heritage museums in the state. MAHM provides services and technical assistance, administers Maryland Historical Trust museum mini grants, and advocacy for Maryland’s heritage museum community.

Maryland Commission on African American History and Culture
301 W. Preston Street, Suite 1500
Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 767-7925
http://www.africanamerican.maryland.gov/

The commission serves as the statewide clearinghouse for preserving evidence of and documenting the African-American experience in Maryland. It specializes in research assistance and collection of historical materials—art objects, memorabilia, manuscripts, photographs, and other articles of significance to African-American history and culture. For the community at large and the educational systems and institutions within the state, the
commission provides exhibits, programs, and resource materials. The commission also participates in a continuing statewide survey to locate and identify sites, buildings, and communities of historical and cultural importance to the African-American experience in Maryland.

**Maryland Commission on American Indian Affairs**  
301 West Preston Street, Suite 1500  
Baltimore, MD 21201  
410-767-7631 and 800-735-2258 (TTY)  
www.americanindian.maryland.gov

As the official statewide agency for Native Americans, the commission initiates and supports activities that affect Native Americans in Maryland and furthers the understanding of Native American history and culture.

**Maryland Historical Society**  
201 West Monument Street  
Baltimore, MD 21201-4674  
410-685-3750  
www.mdhs.org

The Maryland Historical Society serves the people of Maryland and those interested in Maryland history, through stewardship of comprehensive library and museum collections that are central to the state’s history, by promoting scholarship through publications, and by providing educational services at its own campus and throughout the state. Founded in 1844, it is the state’s oldest cultural institution.

**Maryland Historical Trust (MHT)**  
100 Community Place  
Crownsville, MD 21032-2023  
410-514-7600  
www.marylandhistoricaltrust.net/

MHT was formed in 1961 to assist the people of Maryland in identifying, studying, evaluating, preserving, protecting, and interpreting the state’s significant prehistoric and historic districts, sites, structures, cultural landscapes, heritage areas, cultural objects, and artifacts, as well as less tangible human and community traditions. The MHT is the principal operating unit within the Division of Historical and Cultural Programs, which is an agency of the Maryland Department of Planning.

**Maryland Humanities Council**  
108 West Centre Street  
Baltimore, MD 21201-4565  
410-685-0095  
www.mdhc.org

MHC is a private nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization formed in 1974 to promote public participation in the humanities throughout the state. It is an affiliate of the National Endowment for the Humanities and offers grants, technical assistance, and other services.

**Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (The)**  
Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation  
6600 Kenilworth Avenue  
Riverdale, MD 20737  
301-699-2255  
www.pgparksandrec.com/Parks_and_Rec_Home.htm

Prince George’s County Planning Department  
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive  
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772  
301-952-3680  
www.pgplanning.org/Planning_Home.htm

Founded in 1927, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission is a bicounty agency serving Prince George’s and Montgomery counties in Maryland, located just to the north and east of Washington, D.C. The original purpose of the Commission, or M-NCPCC, was to practice “long-range planning and park acquisition and development.” Since its inception, however, the Commission’s responsibilities have expanded to include administration of Prince George’s County’s public recreation program.

**Maryland Traditions**  
www.marylandtraditions.org

Maryland Traditions was created in 2001 by two state agencies—the Maryland Historical Trust and the Maryland State Arts Council—with additional funding from the National Endowment for the Arts. It collaborates with and promotes folklorists and cultural specialists at various institutions.
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**NAACP National Headquarters:**
4805 Mount Hope Drive  
Baltimore, MD 21215  
410-580-5777  
[www.naacp.org](http://www.naacp.org)

**Prince George’s County Branch:**
9201 Basil Court  
Largo, MD 20774  
301-883-4941  
[www.naacc-umarlboro.org](http://www.naacc-umarlboro.org)

The mission of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination.

**National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAPC)**
706-542-0169  
[www.uga.edu/napc](http://www.uga.edu/napc)

The NAPC is the only organization devoted to representing the nation’s preservation design review commissions. NAPC provides technical support and manages an information network to help local commissions accomplish their preservation objectives. The Alliance also serves as an advocate at federal, state, and local levels of government to promote policies and programs that support preservation commission efforts.

**National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers**
Suite 342  
Hall of the States  
444 N. Capitol Street NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
202-624-5465  
[www.ncshpo.org](http://www.ncshpo.org)

The National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO) is governed by a board of directors elected by the member states. The National Historic Preservation Act names the NCSHPO as the point of contact for the State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs). The president of the NCSHPO is an ex-officio member of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

**National Park Service (NPS)**
[www.nps.gov](http://www.nps.gov)

The NPS cares for national parks, a network of nearly 400 natural, cultural, and recreational sites across the nation. The treasures in this system—the first of its kind in the world—have been set aside by the American people to preserve, protect, and share the legacies of this land.

**National Park Service: Archeology Program**
1849 C Street, NW (2275)  
Washington, DC 20240  
[www.nps.gov/archeology](http://www.nps.gov/archeology)  
[www.cast.uark.edu/other/nps/nadb](http://www.cast.uark.edu/other/nps/nadb)  
(National Archeological Database)

The federal archeology program encompasses archeological activities on public land, as well as archeological activities for federally financed, permitted, or licensed activities on nonfederal land. Archeological interpretation programs, collections care, scientific investigations, activities related to the protection of archeological resources, and archeological public education and outreach efforts are aspects of the program.

**National Park Service: Heritage Preservation Services (HPS)**
1849 C Street, NW (2255)  
Washington, DC 20240  
202-513-7270  
[NPS_HPS-info@nps.gov](mailto:NPS_HPS-info@nps.gov)  
[www.nps.gov/history/hps/index.htm](http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/index.htm)  
[www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/](http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/)  
(Technical Preservation Services)

HPS helps the nation’s citizens and communities identify, evaluate, protect, and preserve historic properties for future generations of Americans. Located in Washington, D.C., the division provides a broad range of products and services, financial assistance and incentives, educational guidance, and technical information in support of this mission. Its diverse partners include state historic preservation offices, local governments, tribes, federal agencies, colleges, and nonprofit organizations.
National Park Service: National Center for Preservation Technology and Training (NCPTT)
645 University Parkway
Natchitoches, LA 71457
(318) 356-7444
ncptt@nps.gov
www.ncptt.nps.gov

NCPTT advances the application of science and technology to historic preservation. Working in the fields of archeology, architecture, landscape architecture, and materials conservation, the center accomplishes its mission through training, education, research, technology transfer, and partnerships.

National Park Service: Teaching with Historic Places (TwHP)
nr_twhp@nps.gov
http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/twhp/

TwHP uses properties listed in the National Park Service’s National Register of Historic Places to enliven history, social studies, geography, civics, and other subjects. TwHP has created a variety of products and activities that help teachers bring historic places into the classroom.

National Trust for Historic Preservation
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-588-6000 (National Office)
202-588-6050 (Southern Field Office)
sfo@ntrust.org (Southern Field Office)
www.nationaltrust.org

The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a private, nonprofit membership organization dedicated to saving historic places and revitalizing America’s communities. Recipient of the National Humanities Medal, the Trust was founded in 1949 and provides leadership, education, advocacy, and resources to protect the irreplaceable places that tell America’s story. Staff at the Washington, D.C., headquarters, six regional office, and 29 historic sites, work with the Trust’s 270,000 members and thousands of preservation groups in all 50 states.

Old Town College Park Preservation Association
7400 Dartmouth Avenue
College Park, MD 20740
301-864-6709

Promotes the preservation of College Park’s older neighborhoods.

Oxon Hill Manor Foundation Endowment
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
301-405-1000
advancement.umd.edu/celebration/showScholarship.php?main_id=263

Incorporated in 1979 to restore Oxon Hill Manor (currently owned and operated by M-NCPPC), the Oxon Hill Foundation raised funds for the restoration and preservation of historic properties. In 2001 the Oxon Hill Manor Foundation Endowment was created to provide financial support to University of Maryland students, by way of assistantships, to allow them to engage in hands-on historic renovation and restoration projects within the State of Maryland.

Preservation Action
401 F Street, NW Suite 331
Washington, DC 20001
202-637-7873
mail@preservationaction.org
www.preservationaction.org

Preservation Action is a 501(c)(4) nonprofit organization created in 1974 to serve as the national grass-roots lobby for historic preservation. Preservation Action seeks to make historic preservation a national priority by advocating to all branches of the federal government for sound preservation policy and programs through a grass-roots constituency empowered with information and training and through direct contact with elected representatives.
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**Preservation Directory**
7017 N. Alma Avenue
Portland, OR 97203
503-223-4939

[www.preservationdirectory.com](http://www.preservationdirectory.com)

Preservation Directory.com is an online resource for historic preservation, building restoration, and cultural resource management in the United States and Canada. Preservation Directory’s goal is to foster the preservation of historic buildings, historic downtowns and neighborhoods, cultural resources and to promote heritage tourism by facilitating communication among historic preservation professionals and the general public.

**Preservation Maryland**
24 West Saratoga Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-685-2886

[PM@preservationmaryland.org](mailto:PM@preservationmaryland.org)
[www.preservemd.org](http://www.preservemd.org)

Preservation Maryland is the state’s oldest historic preservation organization. Founded in 1931 as the Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities, Preservation Maryland is a nonprofit organization dedicated to preserving Maryland’s historic buildings, neighborhoods, landscapes, and archaeological sites through outreach, funding, and advocacy.

**Preservation Trades Network**
P.O. Box 249
Amherst, New Hampshire 03031-0249
866-853-9335

[www.iptw.org](http://www.iptw.org)

The Preservation Trades Network (PTN) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit membership organization founded to provide education, networking, and outreach for the traditional building trades.

**Preserve America**

[www.preserveamerica.gov/06maryland.html](http://www.preserveamerica.gov/06maryland.html)

Preserve America is a federal initiative that encourages and supports community efforts to preserve and enjoy cultural and natural heritage. The goals of the program include a greater shared knowledge about the nation’s past, strengthened regional identities and local pride, increased local participation in preserving the country’s cultural and natural heritage assets, and support for the economic vitality of our communities. Since the program’s inception in 2003, the First Lady of the United States has served as the Honorary Chair of Preserve America.

**Prince George’s County Genealogical Society**
P.O. Box 819
Bowie, MD 20718-0819

[pgccs@juno.com](mailto:pgccs@juno.com)

The Prince George’s County Genealogical Society, founded in 1969, is the oldest county genealogical society in continuous existence in the state. Its objectives are to collect, preserve, and disseminate genealogical knowledge and information, particularly the material that deals with Prince George’s County, Maryland. The Society is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) educational and cultural organization. Contributions, gifts, and endowments are tax deductible. The Society meets at the Greenbelt Public Library the first Wednesday of every month at 7 p.m., except in July, August, and January.

**Prince George’s County Historic Preservation Commission**
County Administration Building, Fourth Floor
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772
301-952-3520


The County Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), appointed by the County Executive, administers the provisions of the Prince George’s County historic preservation ordinance and the County’s preservation tax credit program. The HPC’s responsibilities are to regulate the historic resources, sites, and districts listed in the County Inventory of Historic Resources.
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Prince George’s County Historical and Cultural Trust, Inc.
P.O. Box 85
Upper Marlboro, MD 20773
pgchct.blogspot.com/

The Prince George’s County Historical and Cultural Trust is a county-chartered, independent nonprofit organization whose mission is to foster a sustainable and diverse community through advocacy and education by engaging our civic and government leaders in a collaborative process that empowers the residents of Prince George’s County to explore and preserve our cultural heritage. The trust was created through Division 11, Sec. 2-174, Prince George’s County Code, and members are appointed by the County Executive.

Prince George’s County Historical Society
P.O. Box 14
Riverdale, MD 20738-0014
301-220-0330
pgchslibrary@aol.com
www.pghistory.org

The objectives of the Prince George’s County Historical Society are to:

- Foster an understanding and appreciation of the history and heritage of Prince George’s County; collect, record, organize, restore, and preserve historical data, artifacts, and all associated materials relative to Prince George’s County and the State of Maryland.

- Promote and encourage research into all aspects of Prince George’s County history and heritage.

- Acquaint and make available to members and the general public historical data and all associated materials relating to Prince George’s County through programs and publications arranged or sponsored by the society.

- Encourage and participate in the protection and preservation of historic sites and structures in Prince George’s County. The society holds its board meetings once a month at various historic locations and maintains the Frederick DeMarr Historical Library of county history on the lower level of the Greenbelt Library branch of the Prince George’s County Memorial Library System.

Prince George’s County History Consortium
www.princegeorgesmuseums.org

The Prince George’s County History Consortium is composed of historical and cultural sites and museums dedicated to preserving and sharing our rich and diverse heritage.

Prince George’s Heritage, Inc.
Magruder House
4703 Annapolis Road
Bladensburg, MD 20710
301-927-7150
info@PrinceGeorgesHeritage.org
www.princegeorgesheritage.org/

Prince George’s Heritage, Inc. is a nonprofit corporation dedicated to the preservation of the history, culture, and traditions of Prince George’s County. Originally established as the County Advisory Committee to the Maryland Historical Trust in 1977, Prince George’s Heritage has expanded its role to become a leader in historical and cultural preservation, education, and advocacy in Prince George’s County and the State of Maryland. The Prince George’s Heritage Grants program provides grants to support preservation, restoration, and educational projects. PGH, Inc. also works with other county heritage organizations to host the annual Prince George’s County Historic Preservation Month Reception in May.

Riversdale Historical Society
4811 Riverdale Road
Riverdale Park, MD 20737
301-864-0420
www.ci.riverdale-park.md.us/AboutRiverdalePark/TownGroups/Historical.html

The Riversdale Historical Society is devoted to the preservation and restoration of Riversdale, a plantation home built between 1801 and 1807 by the Stier and Calvert families. This National Historical Landmark is located at 4811 Riverdale Road, in the heart of Riverdale Park. Society members also act as docents for Riversdale,
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providing visitors a chance to learn about plantation life in the early 1800s.

Scenic Maryland, Inc.
P.O. Box 39095
Baltimore, MD 21212
410-377-0644

www.betztest.info

Scenic Maryland Inc. is a statewide nonprofit organization whose mission is to protect, enhance, and celebrate the natural, historic, and scenic beauty of Maryland.

Society for American Archaeology (SAA)
900 Second Street, NE #12
Washington, DC 20002-3560
202-789-8200

info@saa.org
www.saa.org

The SAA is an international organization dedicated to the research, interpretation, and protection of the archaeological heritage of the Americas. With more than 7,000 members, the society represents professional, student, and avocational archaeologists working in a variety of settings including government agencies, colleges and universities, museums, and the private sector.

Society for Architectural Historians (SAH)
312-573-1365

info@saahq.org
www.sah.org

The SAH is an international nonprofit membership organization that promotes the study and preservation of the built environment worldwide. The Society’s 3,500 members include architectural historians, architects, preservationists, students, professionals in allied fields, and the interested public. Founded in 1940, membership in SAH is open to everyone, regardless of profession or expertise, who is interested in the study, interpretation, and protection of historically significant buildings, sites, cities, and landscapes.

Society for Commercial Archeology (SCA)
P.O. Box 45828
Madison, Wisconsin 53744-5828

office@sca-roadside.org
www.sca-roadside.org

Established in 1977, the SCA is the oldest national organization devoted to the buildings, artifacts, structures, signs, and symbols of the twentieth-century commercial landscape. The SCA offers publications, conferences, and tours to help preserve, document, and celebrate the commercial structures and architecture of the twentieth century.

Society for Historical Archeology (SHA)
9707 Key West Avenue, Suite 100
Rockville, MD 20850
301-990-2454

hq@sha.org
www.sha.org

Formed in 1967, the SHA is the largest scholarly group concerned with the archaeology of the modern world (A.D. 1400–present). The main focus of the society is the era since the beginning of European exploration. SHA promotes scholarly research and the dissemination of knowledge concerning historical archaeology. The society is specifically concerned with the identification, excavation, interpretation, and conservation of sites and materials on land and underwater.

Society for Industrial Archeology (SIA)
Society for Industrial Archeology
Department of Social Sciences
Michigan Tech
1400 Townsend Drive
Houghton, Michigan 49931-1295
sia@mtu.edu
www.ss.mtu.edu/ia/sia.html

The mission of the SIA is to encourage the study, interpretation, and preservation of historically significant industrial sites, structures, artifacts, and technology. By providing a forum for the discussion and exchange of information, the society advances an awareness and appreciation of the value of preserving our industrial heritage.
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**Surratt Society**
The Surratt House Museum P.O. Box 427
9110 Brandywine Road
Clinton, MD 20735
301-868-1121

[www.surratt.org/su_scty.html](http://www.surratt.org/su_scty.html)

Founded in 1975, the Surratt Society is a volunteer organization dedicated to the preservation and interpretation of historic Surratt House. The society encourages ongoing research into the role that this historic site played in the drama surrounding the assassination of Abraham Lincoln and life in mid-nineteenth century Southern Maryland.

**Traditional Building**
Traditional Building Magazine
45 Main Street, Suite 705
Brooklyn, New York 11201
718-636-0788

[www.traditional-building.com](http://www.traditional-building.com)

This site was created and is maintained by the editors of *Traditional Building* magazine, a bimonthly publication intended for the design and building trade. The magazine focuses on the restoration, renovation, and new construction of traditionally styled commercial, institutional, government, and religious architecture. The web site includes resources for those interested in traditional building, such as product databases and blogs.

**University of Maryland at College Park**
School of Architecture, Planning & Preservation
Building 145
College Park MD 20742
301-405-8000

[www.arch.umd.edu](http://www.arch.umd.edu)

The School provides a process through which students and the professional community can express their creativity, acquire technical capacity, accept social responsibility, and recognize a sense of history in order to make the decisions that shape the built environment.

**Vernacular Architecture Forum (VAF)**
P.O. Box 1511
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22803-1511

[secretary@vafweb.org](mailto:secretary@vafweb.org)
[www.vernaculararchitectureforum.org](http://www.vernaculararchitectureforum.org)

VAF was organized in 1980 to encourage the study and preservation of all aspects of vernacular architecture and landscapes through interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary methods. Vernacular architecture consists of buildings and landscapes with informal or traditional design sources or inspirations.
## Glossary of Terms


### A

**adaptive use**—The reuse of a building or structure, usually for a purpose different from the original. The term implies that certain structural or design changes have been made to the building in order for it to function in its new use. Examples might include a commercial building now used for apartments or a house now used as a funeral parlor.

**alteration**—Any act or process that changes any portion of the exterior architectural appearance or exceptionally significant interiors of a building, structure, or object, including, but not limited to, the erection, construction, reconstruction, or removal of any exterior feature.

**antebellum**—Latin, “before war”; used in archeology, architecture and history to refer to the period before the American Civil War. (See also postbellum.)

**archeology**—The scientific study of the physical remains of past human life, including prehistoric and historic societies.

**archeological site**—A concentration of archeological resources, including artifacts (human-made objects), ecofacts (bone, shell, plant remains), or modifications to the landscape (e.g., terraces, vegetative elements, mounds, trenches) that provide information on past human activities. Archeological sites may include structures; however, unlike historic properties, such as houses, the location of an archeological site is not always apparent. Archeological sites may qualify to become historic sites if they meet the criteria of Subtitle 29-104, after review by the Historic Preservation Commission and an amendment to the Historic Sites and Districts Plan or to an area master plan or sector plan.

**area of significance**—According to National Register criteria, the aspect of historic development in which a property made contributions, such as agriculture or government.

### B

**balustrade**—A railing, often constructed around porches, with a horizontal handrail on top and a row of individual vertical members (or balusters) below.

**boundary lines**—The delineation of a geographical extent or area.

**boundary justification**—An explanation to justify selection of boundaries.

**building**—A structure created principally to shelter any form of human activity, such as a house.

**burial grounds**—A term used to describe a tract of land for burial of the dead.

### C

**capital grant**—A grant that provides funding for the acquisition, preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation of a historic property. (See also noncapital grants.)

**catslide roof**—A roof with one side longer than the other, continuing at the same pitch over an extension to a building.

**cemetery**—A burial ground set apart that contains graves, tombs, markers, or funeral urns.
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Central Business Districts (CBD)—Commercial centers of cities or towns where shops and services are concentrated; also “downtowns.” (See also main street programs.)

Certified Local Government (CLG)—A local government, certified or approved by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), that has an appointed commission to oversee the survey and Inventory of Historic Resources, to review areas for historically significant structures, and to develop and maintain community planning and education programs. The Certified Local Government Program is a preservation partnership between local, state, and national governments focused on promoting historic preservation at the grass-roots level. The program is jointly administered by the National Park Service (NPS) and the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) in each state, with each local community working through a certification process to become recognized as a CLG. CLGs then become an active partner in the Federal Historic Preservation Program and the opportunities it provides.

certified rehabilitation—For investment tax credit rehabilitation work, project certification must include the fact that the structure is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (or eligible for listing) and approval of proposed rehabilitation work by the state historic preservation officer and the National Park Service as having met the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

character-defining feature—A prominent or distinctive aspect, quality, or characteristic of a historic property or historic district that contributes significantly to its physical character. Structures, objects, vegetation, spatial relationships, views, furnishings, decorative details, and materials may be such features. (See also significant features.)

circa—Latin for “around” and is used when an exact date is not known. For example, “The house was built circa 1840.” May also be abbreviated as “c.” as in “c. 1840.”

clapboards—Also called weatherboards, clapboards are the exterior covering of frame buildings in which overlapping wood boards are placed horizontally. Pronounced “klăb’erd.” (See also German siding.)

collection—The material remains that are excavated or removed during a survey, excavation, or other study of a prehistoric or historic archeological resource as well as the associated records that are prepared or assembled in connection with the survey, excavation, or other study.

Colonial Revival—An architectural style beginning in the late nineteenth century and continuing to the present day, which was inspired by the study of American colonial building styles. Examples of historic Colonial Revival buildings abound in College Park, University Park, Hyattsville, and across the county. Colonial Revival buildings frequently employ design cues such as columns, multipane windows, paneled doors, shutters, gable roofs, and brick chimneys.

community development—Refers to efforts to strengthen and develop communities within urban or suburban neighborhoods or towns. The term is related to main street programs, but community development efforts need not focus on central business districts or even on economic aspects of communities. Efforts to reduce crime, increase pedestrian safety, educate citizens about racial or ethnic diversity, create or celebrate local identity could all be described by this term.

conservation—(1) the skilled repair and maintenance of cultural artifacts, including buildings and historic or artistic materials, with the aim of extending their longevity and aesthetic qualities; (2) the term used in the European preservation movement to encompass historic preservation. It is also used in the U.S. to convey the wise use of existing resources. Urban conservation means maintaining the integrity of the built environment, and rural conservation encompasses the preservation of agricultural landscapes, including rural villages.

conservation district—An area that contains substantial concentrations of buildings that together create subareas of special architectural and aesthetic importance. The provision for county architectural conservation districts is established under Sections 27-213.18 through 27-213.22 of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance. An architectural conservation district must include at least ten contiguous acres and possess design characteristics that distinguish it from other areas of the county. Establishing architectural conservation districts may be an effective means of enhancing the architectural and character-defining features of an area without the level of review associated with historic district designation.
conservation technology—Equipment and methods used in the conservation of artifacts, historic buildings, and historic building components.

contributing—A classification applied to a site, structure, or object within a historic district signifying that it generally shares, along with most of the other sites, structures or objects in the historic district, the qualities that give the historic district cultural, historic, architectural, or archeological significance as embodied by the criteria for designating the historic district. These resources are of the highest importance in maintaining the character of the historic district. Typically, contributing resources have been modified very little over time. (See also noncontributing.)

cornice—A molded projection extending across the top of a wall or forming the top element of a door or window frame.

cultural landscape—a geographic area that includes cultural and natural resources associated with a historic event, activity, person, or group of people. Cultural landscapes exist in both rural and urban environments and can range from thousands of acres to houses with small yards.

cultural resource—“A building, structure, district, site, or object that is significant in...history, architecture, archeology, or culture” (William A. Murtagh, Keeping Time, page 214).

cultural resource management—Sometimes abbreviated as CRM, it is the administration or protection of a cultural resource or resources.

cultural resource survey—An inventory of sites, buildings, structures, or objects deemed to have local, regional, national, or international cultural significance. The purpose of such surveys is to have a record of what is significant in order to protect such resources from development or encroachment or to document the current appearance or condition for the record. Often such surveys lead to the nomination of properties to historic registers.

cruciform—Used here to describe the plan of a building, usually a church, in the shape of a cross; two straight line segments intersecting at right angles

curation—(1) Inventorying, accessioning, labeling, cleaning, and cataloging a collection (to be completed by the archeological consultant); (2) providing curatorial services means managing and preserving a collection according to professional museum and archival practices, including, but not limited to, storing and maintaining a collection using appropriate methods and containers and under appropriate environmental conditions and physically secure controls.

demolition-by-neglect—The destruction of a structure caused by failure to perform maintenance over a period of time.

design criteria—Standards of appropriateness or compatibility of building design within a community or historic district. Often in the form of a handbook, design criteria (also called design guidelines) usually contain drawings accompanying “do’s and don’ts” for the property owner. In some situations a Historic Preservation Commission or similar group has authority to administer the design criteria.

documented property—A property that has been surveyed but is not included in the Inventory of Historic Resources. They are not subject to the Historic Preservation Ordinance unless reviewed under Section 29-120.01.

easement—According to Black’s Law Dictionary, an easement is an interest in land owned by another person, consisting in the right to use or control the land, or an area above or below it, for a specific limited purpose (such as to cross it for access to a public road).

embodied energy—The amount of energy associated with extracting, processing, manufacturing, transporting, and assembling building materials. Historic buildings have significant embodied energy, which is why their rehabilitation and/or continued use is considered green or sustainable. (See also LEED.)

Environmental Setting—As defined in the Historic Preservation Ordinance, it is an area of land (including or within property boundaries) to which a historic resource
relates visually and/or historically and which is essential to the integrity of the historic resource.

ethnographic landscape—A relatively contiguous area of interrelated places that contemporary cultural groups define as meaningful because it is inextricably and traditionally linked to their own local or regional histories, cultural identities, beliefs, and behaviors. Present-day social factors such as a people’s class, ethnicity, and gender may result in the assignment of diverse meanings to a landscape and its component places.

F

façade—Any of the exterior faces of a building; often refers to the architectural front, which is distinguished from other walls by its degree of elaboration or is the location of the principal entrance.

Federal Historic Preservation Program—Administered by the National Park Service, it comprises a range of programs such as Rehabilitation Tax Incentives, Section 106 Review, and the National Register of Historic Places that encourage the preservation of historic properties in the United States and enforce the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act.

fish-scale shingles—Individual wood shingles with a curved end, which when laid together form the appearance of a fish’s scales.

Flemish bond—A brick wall with a pattern of alternating headers and stretchers at each course. Often, some of the headers are burned or glazed black to form a decorative pattern on the façade.

G

German siding—Also known as drop siding, it is a flat-faced board with a concave top and notched bottom. German siding is installed by nailing the notched bottom of the upper board over the concave top of the lower board in a staggered joint pattern. German siding is very common on nineteenth- and twentieth-century frame buildings throughout the county. (See also clapboard.)

Greek Revival—A style of architecture based on Classic Greek temples; used for both public buildings and houses, common in Prince George’s County from circa 1820–1860.

green—Having positive environmental attributes or objectives. Historic preservation and the reuse of historic buildings are considered to be green. (See also embodied energy, green building, LEED.)

green building—An environmentally sustainable building, designed, constructed, and operated to minimize impacts to the environment. Historic buildings can be considered to be green buildings, not only because of their embodied energy but because they often incorporate passive energy-efficient features, such as thicker walls and operable windows. Historic buildings are generally also durable and repairable, qualities considered to be green. (See also LEED.)

H

Heritage Areas—The bill authorizing Maryland Heritage Areas was approved by the 1996 Maryland General Assembly. Heritage Areas are designed to promote historic preservation and areas of natural beauty in order to stimulate economic development through tourism. Heritage areas are geographic areas or regions with a distinctive sense of place embodied in their historic buildings, neighborhoods, traditions, and natural features. They may be rural or urban places, where private ownership is anticipated to predominate, but where development can be creatively guided to attract tourism. Projects within “Certified Heritage Areas” are eligible for incentives, such as grants and tax credits. The Anacostia Trails Heritage Area encompasses over 83 square miles in the northwest portion of the county.

heritage conservation—See historic preservation.

heritage tourism—The function of traveling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present.

historic—Mentioned, celebrated, or having influence in history.

Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)—Architectural and engineering documentation programs of the National Park Service that produce a thorough archival record of buildings, engineering structures, and cultural landscapes.
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**Historic American Engineering Record (HAER)**—(See Historic American Buildings Survey.)

**historic community**—A documented community that may or may not meet the criteria for designation as a historic district and/or National Register listing. Also referred to as a documented property. (See also Appendix B of this document.)

**historic context**—An organizing structure for interpreting history that groups information about historic resources that share a common theme, common geographical area, and a common time period. The development of historic contexts is a foundation for decisions that affect the identification, evaluation, registration, planning, and treatment of historic resources.

**historic district**—A geographically definable area, urban or rural, that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development. County historic districts may be designated by the Historic Preservation Commission or (on appeal) by the County Council based on recommendations from the Historic Preservation Commission; National Register Districts are established by the National Park Service for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. County historic districts are protected by the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

**historic fabric**—The particular materials, ornamentation, and architectural features that together define the historic character of a historic building.

**historic preservation**—Also known as heritage conservation, is a professional endeavor that seeks to preserve, conserve, and protect buildings, objects, landscapes, or other artifacts of historic significance.

**Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)**—The Prince George’s County Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), appointed by the County Executive, administers the provisions of the Prince George’s County Historic Preservation Ordinance and the County’s preservation tax credit program. The HPC’s responsibilities are to protect the historic resources, historic sites, and historic districts listed in the county Inventory of Historic Resources.

**Historic Preservation Ordinance**—Subtitle 29 of the Annotated Code of Prince George’s County “Preservation of Historic Resources” establishes the Historic Preservation Commission and its powers and duties.

**historic preservation planning**—Refers to broad master plans for preservation, not specific plans being made for preservation of any one building. It encompasses all aspects of a preservation program: surveys, evaluation, designation, protective regulations, incentives—such as tax credits and grant programs, stewardship, heritage education, and heritage tourism.

**historic property**—A district, site, building, structure, or object significant in the history, upland or underwater archaeology, architecture, engineering, and culture of the state, including remains related to a district, site, building, structure, or object [Article 28, §5-301(d)].

**historic register**—Refers to any local, state, national, or international list of significant sites, districts, buildings, or objects. Examples include the National Register of Historic Places and the World Heritage List.

**historic register criteria**—Refers to the standards that a site, district, building, or object must meet in order to be listed in a historic register.

**historic resource**—(1) as defined in the Historic Preservation Ordinance, a historic resource is a historic property listed in the county Inventory of Historic Resources; (2) any site, building, structure, or object that is part of, or constitutes, a historic property; (3) anything of cultural or economic value, including the natural environment.

**historic road**—As documented by historic surveys or maps, historic roads maintain their original alignment and landscape context through views of natural features and historic properties.

**historic site**—In Prince George’s County, any individual historic resource that has been evaluated and designated according to the process called for in the Historic Preservation Ordinance and found to be significant is called a historic site. Historic sites are protected by the Historic Preservation Ordinance through the Historic Preservation Commission.

**Historic Sites Act of 1935**—A federal law (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467) that established a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects.
of national significance, for the inspiration and benefit of the American people.

**Historic Structure Reports (HSR)**—An analysis of a building’s structural condition involving written and photographic evidence. The purpose of an HSR is usually to provide a record of a building’s condition before beginning restoration or rehabilitation.

**infill**—The use of vacant land within a built-up area for further construction or development, especially as part of a neighborhood preservation or revitalization program.

**integrity**—The authenticity of physical characteristics from which historic resources obtain their significance. Integrity is the composite of seven qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. When historic properties retain integrity, they are able to convey their association with events, people, and designs from the past.

**intensive survey**—A systematic, detailed examination of an area designed to gather information about historic properties sufficient to evaluate them against predetermined criteria of significance within specific historic contexts.

**Inventory of Historic Resources**—The inventory of identified and protected historic resources in Prince George’s County as listed in the Historic Sites and Districts Plan.

**L**

**LEED** (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design)—An internationally recognized certification system established by the U. S. Green Building Council (USGBC). LEED certification allows developers to take advantage of a growing number of state and local government incentives and can help boost press interest in a project. Starting in 2009, LEED will incorporate language that encourages the preservation and reuse of older buildings. M-NCPPC has membership in the U. S. Green Building Council. (See also green, green building, sustainable, Smart Growth.)

**LEED-ND**—The LEED for Neighborhood Development Rating System integrates the principles of smart growth, urbanism, and green building into the first national system for neighborhood design. LEED-ND will incorporate language that encourages the preservation and reuse of older buildings, including historic buildings. (See also LEED.)

**locus** (loci, plural)—A specific limited location within an archaeological site where a concentration of artifacts or features has been identified.

**Lustron Homes**—About 2,680 porcelain-steel Lustron Homes were produced in America between 1949–1950 by the Lustron Corporation in Columbus, Ohio. The ranch-style houses usually had two or three bedrooms. Modern appliances, including dishwasher were included. Heating was provided with a ceiling radiant system. They cost about $10,000. The homes were shipped on a flatbed and required 350 man-hours to assemble. Most were built on a concrete base. All interior and exterior panels were of porcelainized steel construction; the exterior panels came in four colors: ‘Maize Yellow,’ ‘Dove Gray,’ ‘Surf Blue,’ and ‘Desert Tan’ and were designed for indefinite service without painting. The roof shingles were porcelain-coated steel as well. Carl Strandlund, an engineer noted for his war-time metal-working innovations, was the creator of Lustron Homes. There are three Lustron Homes located in the historic community of Hillcrest Heights (76A-044). Since 1996, approximately 24 Lustrons and one Lustron District have been listed on the National Register of Historic Places outside of Maryland.

**M**

**Main Street Programs**—Comprehensive revitalization programs to strengthen the economy, image, and appearance of traditional main streets, business districts, and neighborhoods. Refers most commonly, but not exclusively, to the services offered by the National Main Street Center of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

**Maryland Historical Trust (MHT)**—The state agency formed in 1961 to assist the people of Maryland in identifying, studying, evaluating, preserving, protecting, and interpreting the state’s significant prehistoric and historic districts, sites, structures, cultural landscapes, heritage areas, cultural objects, and artifacts, as well as less tangible human and community traditions. MHT is the principal operating unit within the Division of
Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan
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Historical and Cultural Programs, which is an agency of the Maryland Department of Planning. Maryland's State Historic Preservation officer (or SHPO) appointed by the Governor pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, is a member of the MHT staff.

Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties—A broad-based repository of information on districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of known or potential value to the prehistory, history, upland and underwater archaeology, architecture, engineering, or culture of the State of Maryland. The inventory was created shortly after the Maryland Historical Trust was founded in 1961 and now includes data on more than 8,000 archeological sites and 80,000 historic and architectural resources. Inclusion in the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties involves no regulatory restrictions or controls.

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, The (M-NCPPC)—Created by the Maryland General Assembly in 1927 to develop and operate public park systems and provide land use planning for the physical development of most of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties.

Maryland-Washington Regional District, The—Established by the Maryland-Washington Regional District Act, it is the geographical area for which M-NCPPC has subdivision authority and planning and zoning advisory responsibility.

mixed use—As distinguished from a single-use plan (as set out often in zoning regulations and laws), mixed use refers to a variety of authorized uses for buildings and structures in a particular area. This could appear as, for example, a property's being utilized in more than one way, such as a street level market and second-floor apartments.

muntin—A secondary framing member that holds individual panes of glass within a window or glazed door. (See also true divided-light sash.)

National Historic Landmark (NHL)—A district, site, building, structure, or object of national historical significance, designated by the Secretary of the Interior under authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 and entered in the National Register of Historic Places.

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA)—U.S. federal legislation that established the National Register of Historic Places and extended national historic preservation programs to properties of state and local significance. NHPA requires agencies to identify and manage historic properties under their jurisdiction or control; to consider actions that will advance the purposes of NHPA, and avoid, if possible, actions contrary to its purposes; to consult and cooperate with others in carrying out historic preservation activities and to consider the effects of their actions—including permit and assistance actions—on historic properties following a regulation issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the State Historic Preservation Officers, and the Tribal Historic Preservation Officers.

National Park Service (NPS)—The National Park Service is a bureau within the United States Department of the Interior. In addition to other activities, NPS helps communities across America preserve and enhance important local heritage. Grants and tax credits are offered to register, record, and save historic places. (See also Federal Historic Preservation Program.)

National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)—The list of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture maintained by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)—The NTHP is a private, nonprofit membership organization dedicated to saving historic places and revitalizing America's communities. The NTHP was founded in 1949 and provides leadership, education, advocacy, and resources to protect the irreplaceable places that tell America's story.

Natural Resources Inventory—The signed plan that reflects the county-regulated environmental features.

noncapital grants—Grants that provide support for research, survey, planning, and educational activities involving architectural, archeological, or cultural resources. (See also capital grants.)

noncontributing—A classification applied to a site, structure, or object within a historic district indicating that it is not representative of the qualities that give
the historic district cultural, historic, architectural, or archeological significance as embodied by the criteria for designating the historic district. Buildings constructed after the district’s period of significance or dating from the district’s period of significance but has undergone significant alterations, usually comprise this classification. *(See also contributing.)*

**object**—A material thing of functional, historical, or cultural value, typically primarily artistic in nature or relatively small in scale and simply constructed; it may be, by nature or design, movable yet related to a specific setting or environment; it may be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Examples include boundary markers, statuary, or monuments.

**open space conservation**—The range of techniques used to protect land from inappropriate development including education, land use plans, zoning laws, and easements. *(See also Smart Growth.)*

**ordinary maintenance**—For a historic site, ordinary maintenance is work that does not alter exterior features. Ordinary maintenance will have no material effect on the historical, architectural, cultural, or archeological value of a historic resource within a historic district. This definition applies to appurtenances and environmental settings. Ordinary maintenance is usually not subject to review by the Historic Preservation Commission.

**period of significance**—That period of time in which a historic property achieved significance. The period may be as short as one year, as in the case of an architecturally significant property built in a given year. A property can also have achieved significance during several distinct periods of time, as in the case of an archeological site. In the case of a historic district or a complex of buildings and features, the date of significance is the date of the oldest building within the boundaries of the property proposed for nomination. The ending date of the period of significance is the time by which significant development of the property, or the property’s importance, ended.
Pratt truss—A bridge truss with rectangular or trapezoidal panels formed by vertical posts, a top chord in compression and a bottom chord in tension; diagonal ties slope downward toward the center. See the Historic Sites Duvall Bridge (64-002), Governors Bridge (74B-001) and Queen Anne Bridge (74B-012) in Chapter 16.

preservation—The act or process of applying measures to sustain the existing form, integrity, and material of a building or structure and the existing form and vegetative cover of a site. It may include initial stabilization work, where necessary, as well as ongoing maintenance of the historic building materials.

preservation easement—A voluntary legal agreement that provides a significant historic, archeological, or cultural resource. An easement provides assurance to the owner of a historic or cultural property that the property's intrinsic values will be preserved through subsequent ownership. In addition, the owner may obtain substantial tax benefits. Once recorded, an easement becomes a part of the property's chain of title and usually “runs with the land” in perpetuity, thus binding not only the owner who grants the easement but all future owners as well. (National Park Service, Historic Preservation Tax Incentives, Technical Preservation Services). A preservation easement is conveyed to and held by a nonprofit organization or governmental agency, that has the right and obligation to monitor the property and enforce the terms of the easement. The terms and conditions of each easement are established by the document creating the easement and may vary in purpose and nature of restrictions, though they may contain similar terms.

Queen Anne—A style of architecture popular in the United States from about 1880–1910. Distinctive essential features of American Queen Anne style include an asymmetrical façade; dominant front-facing gable, round, square, or polygonal tower(s); shaped and Dutch gables; a porch covering part or all of the front façade, including the primary entrance area; a second-story porch or balconies; pedimented porches; differing wall textures, such as patterned wood shingles shaped into varying designs, including resembling fish scales, wooden shingles over brickwork, etc; dentils; classical columns; spindle work; oriel and bay windows; horizontal bands of leaded windows; monumental chimneys; white painted balustrades; and slate roofs.

reconstruction—The act or process of reproducing by new construction the exact form and detail of a vanished building, structure, or object, or a part thereof, as it appeared at a specific period of time.

Reconstruction or Reconstruction Era—In U.S. history, the period 1865–77 after the Civil War during which the nation was reunited under the federal government after the defeat of the Southern Confederacy.

rehabilitation—The act or process of returning a property to a state of utility through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions or features of the property that are significant to its historical, architectural, and cultural values.

Rehabilitation Tax Incentives—Programs that offer tax credits for the certified rehabilitation of certified historic buildings. Federal tax incentives are administered by the National Park Service, state tax incentives are administered by the Maryland Historical Trust, and the Historic Preservation Commission approves property tax credits in Prince George's County.

relocation—The act of moving a historic resource. Relocation is discouraged because the significance of properties is often intrinsic to their historic setting. A historic building should be moved only as a last resort to avoid demolition.

remodeling—(See renovation.)

renovation—The process of repairing and changing an existing building for contemporary use so that it is functionally equal to a new building. The terms renovation and remodeling are generally not used in historic preservation, unless the renovation occurred within the property’s period of significance.

repointing—(See pointing.)

restoration—The process or product of returning, as nearly as possible, an existing site, building, structure, or object to its condition at a particular time in its history,
using the same construction materials and methods as the original, where possible.

revival—The term used to describe later interpretations of historic architectural styles. If the building was designed after the original style period, “Revival” is added to the style name. Examples include Greek Revival and Colonial Revival.

sash—The perimeter frame of a window, including the horizontal rails and vertical stiles that hold the glass panes; it may be movable or fixed.

setback—On a parcel of land, the distance between the street and the front of a building or between a building and the side or back property lines.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, The—A set of ten standards established by the National Park Service to serve as general guidelines for preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction projects nationwide. They can be applied to all types of structures, buildings, and sites.

Section 106 review—Refers to the best known part of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) that requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their federally funded activities and programs on significant historic properties. “Significant historic properties” are those that are included in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places. The purpose of Section 106 is to balance historic preservation concerns with the needs of federal undertakings. This review process ensures that federal agencies identify any potential conflicts between their undertakings and historic preservation and resolve any conflicts in the public interest.

sense of place—The sum total of those parts by which a particular site, area, or neighborhood imparts a distinctive character unique to its locality.

SHPO or State Historic Preservation Office.—(See Maryland Historical Trust.)

significance—The importance of a historic property as defined by the National Register or Subtitle 29 criteria in one or more areas of significance; in particular, for archeological sites, it means retaining integrity of context.

significant features—Those features of a historic building or site that give it its historic character. Examples of significant features include, but are not limited to, windows, roof materials and configuration, porches, and archeological resources. Significant features can also include finishes, such as paint or other decoration. (See also character-defining features.)

simulated divided light sash windows (SDLs).—(See also true divided light sash windows (TDLs).)

Smart Codes—The Maryland Building Rehabilitation Code Program encourages private investment in existing buildings and communities through a new construction code that streamlines and harmonizes the code requirements for rehabilitation work. The Building Rehabilitation Code became effective on June 1, 2001, and applies to buildings of all types over one year old. Section 05.16.08 applies to historic buildings.

smart growth—An urban planning and transportation theory and initiative that concentrates growth in the center of a city to avoid sprawl and advocates compact, transit-oriented, walkable, bicycle-friendly land use, including neighborhood schools, shopping, and mixed-use development with a range of housing choices. These are major characteristics of older neighborhoods. Historic districts comprising towns or cities that embody these characteristics and do not require people to rely on automobiles for transportation are considered models for smart growth. In Maryland, the five 1997 General Assembly legislation and budget initiatives, Priority Funding Areas, Brownfields, Live Near Your Work, Job Creation Tax Credits, and Rural Legacy, are collectively known as “Smart Growth.” Rehabilitation tax incentives are an important smart growth tool. (See also LEED, LEED ND.)

sustainability—According to a 1987 United Nations conference, sustainable developments are defined as those that meet present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs (World Commission on Environment and Development). Sustainability embodies “stewardship” and “design with nature.” Sustainable developments are those which fulfill present and future needs, while only using and not harming renewable resources and unique human-
environmental systems of a site, such as air, water, land, energy, and human ecology and/or those of other off-site sustainable systems (Rosenbaum 1993 and Vieria 1993).

**Stabilization**—The act or process of applying measures designed to reestablish a weather-resistant enclosure and the structural stability of an unsafe or deteriorated property, while maintaining the essential form as it exists at present.

**Stick style**—An architectural style popular in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in America; it sought to evoke the balloon framing used in houses in the era through the decorative use of plain trim boards, soffits, aprons, and other decorative features, while eliminating overtly ornate features, such as rounded towers and gingerbread trim. Recognizable details include the wraparound porch, spindle detailing, the “panelled” sectioning of blank wall, crown detailing along the roof peaks, and radiating spindle details at the gable peaks.

**Structure**—Any kind of human construction; often used to refer to an engineering work, such as a bridge or monument, as opposed to a building. For National Register purposes, it means a functional construction made for purposes other than creating shelter.

**Tax Credits**—(See Rehabilitation Tax Incentives.)

**True Divided-Light Sash Windows (TDLs)**—A window with individual panes of glass separated by muntins. Most houses with this style of window and built before the mid-twentieth century have true divided lights. After about 1955 simulated divided light sash became cheaper to manufacture and the most widely used type of window when the look of divided lights was desired.

**Vernacular Building**—A building designed without the aid of an architect or trained designer; also, buildings whose design is based on a particular ethnic and/or regional building tradition.

**Viewshed**—A viewshed is an area of land, water, or other environmental element that is visible to the human eye from a fixed vantage point. The term is often used in planning and archeology. In urban planning, for example, viewsheds tend to be areas of particular scenic or historic value that are deemed worthy of preservation against development or other change. Viewsheds are often spaces that are readily visible from public areas, such as from public roadways or public parks.

**Water Table**—The projecting decorative molding of a masonry wall at the point where the wall thickens, often just below the first floor joist.

**Windshield Survey**—A limited exterior survey of historic buildings and structures, sometimes conducted by driving through an area in a car; used to prepare a preliminary inventory of historic properties or other planning data.

**Wrought Iron**—Iron with a small amount of carbon used for decorative hardware and iron work.

**Zoning**—The process of dividing a political jurisdiction into geographic zones with different mixtures of allowable uses, sizes, siting, and forms of real property.
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, by virtue of Article 28 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, is authorized and empowered, from time to time, to make and adopt, amend, extend and add to a General Plan for Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George’s County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, held a duly advertised joint public hearing with the Prince George’s County Council, sitting as the District Council, on January 19, 2010 on the Preliminary Historic Sites and Districts Plan, being also an amendment to the 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan; 1993 Glenn Dale-Seabrook-Lanham and Vicinity Master Plan; 1993 Landover and Vicinity Approved Master Plan; 1984 Bladensburg, New Carrollton and Vicinity (FA 99) Approved Master Plan; 1994 Melwood/Westphalia Approved Master Plan; 1994 Planning Area 68 Approved Master Plan; 1997 College Park Metro-Rivardale Transit District Development Plan; 2000 Brantwood Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan and Design Guidelines; 2000 Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Road Metro Town Center & Vicinity; 2000 The Heights and Vicinity Approved Master Plan; 2001 Anacostia Trails Heritage Area Management Plan; 2001 Greenbelt Metro Sector Plan; 2004 Rivardale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan and Design Guidelines; 2004 Approved Prince George’s County Gateway Arts District Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment; 2004 Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas; 2005 Approved Section Plan and Sectional map Amendment for the Tuxedo Road-Advisor Street-Cherrytree Metro Area; 2006 Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity; 2006 Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the East Glenn Dale Area; 2006 Henson Creek-South Potomac Approved Master Plan; 2006 West Hyattsville Transit District Development Plan; 2007 Bladensburg Town Center Approved Sector Plan; 2007 Westphalia Approved Sector Plan; 2008 Capitol Heights Transit District Development Plan/Transit District Overlay Zone and Zoning Map Amendment; 2008 Branch Avenue Corridor Sector Plan and Endorsed Sectional Map Amendment; 2009 Port Towns Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment; 2009 Landover Gateway Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment; 2009 Marlboro Pike Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment; 2009 Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment; 2009 Subregion 6 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment;
WHEREAS, on April 8, 2010, the Prince George's County Planning Board, after said public hearing and due deliberation and consideration, and in consideration of the public hearing testimony, adopted the master plan with revisions, as described in Prince George's County Planning Board Resolution PGCPB No. 10-42, and transmitted the plan to the District Council on April 9, 2010, and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Council, sitting as the District Council for the portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District lying within Prince George's County, held work sessions on May 18, 2010 and June 1, 2010 to consider hearing testimony; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board made technical corrections to PGCPB Resolution No. 10-42 and forwarded a corrected resolution, PGCPB Resolution No. 10-42(C) to the Prince George's County Council on June 7, 2010; and

WHEREAS, on June 8, 2010, upon consideration of the testimony received through the hearing process, the District Council determined that the adopted plan should be approved as the functional master plan for historic resources for Prince George's County, Maryland, subject to the modifications and revisions set forth in Resolution CR-51-2010 DR-2;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission does hereby adopt said Historic Sites and Districts Plan as an amendment to the General Plan for Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District within Prince George's County as approved by the Prince George's County District Council in the attached Resolution CR-51-2010 DR-2; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of said Amendment should be certified by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and filed with the each Clerk of the Circuit Court of Prince George's and Montgomery Counties, as required by law.
CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 10-21 adopted by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on motion of Commissioner Cavitt, seconded by Commissioner Wells-Harley, with Commissioners Parker, Carrier, Alfandre, Cavitt, Presley, Vaughns, and Wells-Harley voting in favor of the motion, with no Commissioner voting against, with Commissioners Clark, Dreyfuss, and Squire being absent, at its regular meeting held on Wednesday, September 8, 2010, in Riverdale, Maryland.

Patricia Colihan Barncy
Executive Director

Reviewed and Attested To
For Legal Sufficiency

Andrea Green Checkley/George Johnson
Certificate of Adoption and Approval


The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Françoise M. Carrier
Vice-Chair

Samuel J. Parker, Jr., AICP
Chairman

Joseph Zimmerman
Secretary-Treasurer
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