



MCPB
Item # 11
1/06/05

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK & PLANNING COMMISSION


December 30, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

VIA: Gwen Wright Historic Preservation Supervisor
Countywide Planning Division
Montgomery County Department of Park and Planning

Jeff Zyontz, Chief
Countywide Planning Division
Montgomery County Department of Park and Planning

FROM: Clare Lise Cavicchi, Historic Preservation Planner 
Countywide Planning Division
Montgomery County Department of Park and Planning

SUBJECT: Public Hearing (Preliminary) Draft Amendment to the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation: Damascus-Goshen Historic Resources*
Worksession 1: Overview and Evaluation of Uncontested Resources

BACKGROUND

This current evaluation of historic resources is being done in conjunction with the update of the Damascus Master Plan. This amendment to the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation* considers resources in Planning Areas 11 (Damascus and Vicinity) and 14 (Goshen-Woodfield-Cedar Grove and Vicinity). In addition, the amendment includes several resources in nearby Planning Areas that have been nominated by citizens or requested for expedited evaluation by citizens. In all, there are 56 individual sites and two historic districts under consideration.

The resources in this amendment were evaluated by the Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission, which held two public hearings and seven worksessions on this group of properties over approximately a six-month timeframe. The recommendations in the Public Hearing (Preliminary) Draft Amendment reflect the HPC's deliberations.

Because of the large number of resources, staff has scheduled two worksessions with the Planning Board on this amendment. At the January 6th worksession, staff will first present an overview of the history of the Damascus area so as to provide a context for the recommendations on individual resources. Then,

staff will address several broad preservation questions that were raised by Board members at the December 2nd public hearing. Finally, staff will present recommendations for two groups of historic resources: 1) resources that are recommended for designation on the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation* where the owner has not actively contested designation; and 2) resources that staff recommends for removal from the *Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites*. At the January 20th worksession, staff will present recommendations on the contested resources.

HISTORY AND CONTEXT

A detailed history of Damascus and Goshen is included in the Public Hearing (Preliminary) Draft Amendment on pages 1 through 8. Staff will not repeat that history in this staff report, but does wish to emphasize some of the context that derives from that history.

For much of its history, the Damascus area has been a remote and challenging region. The soil was difficult to farm. Early settlers recognized the problems of establishing farms in this area. With good reason, an early land grant here was named *Trouble Enough Indeed*. Land in the Damascus region was worth much less than elsewhere in the county. In 1879, an acre of land in Sandy Spring could fetch \$100, while in Damascus it was worth no more than \$25. In addition, farmers could not enjoy the benefit of the C&O Canal or the B&O Railroad for getting goods to market. Typical of remote areas, traditions died hard. While other parts of the county had long stopped growing tobacco, Damascus farmers continued to grow this crop through the 1930s.

The town of Damascus was a small settlement until road improvements made in the mid 20th century. Through the 19th century, it was one of the smallest towns in the county, comparable in size to other crossroads communities of Laytonsville, Dickerson, and Boyds.

Because of all of these factors, it is important to understand that the architecture found in this region is reflective of the hardscrabble nature of the area. Large estates and grand manor houses were not typical of this region. Houses are plain in form and style.

However, this simple character is actually what defines the history of Damascus. To accurately reflect for future generations the forces that shaped the Damascus area, it is important to preserve some of these modest resources. The preservation of farmsteads that represent this region will contribute to the sense of place that is Damascus.

PLANNING BOARD INQUIRIES ON PRESERVATION TOPICS

At the Public Hearing, the Planning Board asked for information on a number of overarching preservation topics, which are not specific to the Damascus-Goshen amendment. These topics included: 1) information about the preservation of farm outbuildings, specifically about the scenario in which a large farmstead is subdivided with the historic resource – including outbuildings – being retained on a smaller lot; 2) information about what constitutes architectural integrity (i.e. if original windows have been replaced, can a building still be considered historic?); 3) information about the economic costs of historic preservation and how these costs are addressed; and 4) information about how a historic district differs from an individually-designated historic site.

1. FARMSTEAD PRESERVATION

Over the past 25 years, many historic resources that were originally farms have been designated on the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation*. Quite a few of these farms have subsequently been subdivided and the historic farmstead purchased by new owners who are not interested in traditional farming

operations. There have been many innovative uses for historic outbuildings that range from a different kind of farm use (such as stables for horses) to artist's studios to guest houses. At the worksession, staff will provide images of a number of properties, including the following historic resources that are already designated on the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation* and that include a dwelling house and barns on reduced acreage.

23/115 Willow Grove, 16301 Batchellor's Forest Road

This farmstead includes a house and barns on 8.94 acres. The property includes a barrack barn, poultry house and three-car garage. The owners use the barns to shelter horses and goats.

23/104 Berry-Mackall Farm, 17017 Georgia Avenue

This property includes a house and outbuildings on 3.26 acres. Mary Morris has lived here since 1943. The carriage house is used as a guesthouse. Part of the property is rented seasonally to a Christmas tree outfit.

24/29 Samuel Thomas Magruder Farm, 14800 Seneca Road

Rick Gault and Nancy Slomowitz purchased the property in 1997. It's about 5 ½ acres, with house, caretaker's cottage, bank barn and garage/stable. The couple has restored the cottage as a guest house, and fixed up the stable for storage. They plan next to restore the barn to keep a couple of horses. They are proud owners of the historic property, opening it for a house tour in 1999.

23/102 Olney Manor Farm, 17510 Prince Phillip Drive

The farm was integrated into Olney's Hallowell subdivision. Located on a 6.5-acre lot, the property sold in 2003 to new owners. It includes the 1937 dwelling, tenant house, bank barn, and corn crib.

23/90 Riverton, 1201 Gold Mine Road

The property is six acres. There are several small outbuildings in addition to the dwelling house. In 2000, the owners moved a mill from Claysville to this site for use as a garage, workshop, and guesthouse.

14/55 Avalon, 21000 Blunt Road

The farmstead buildings are located on two parcels. The historic dwelling and smokehouse are on a 3.52-acre parcel and the barns are on an adjacent two-acre parcel. A house was built in 1996 on the barn parcel. The owner has vintage cars that he stores in the barn. The barns include a bank barn, horse barn, and corn crib.

12/38 Greenwood, 20201 Darnestown Road

The Greenwood house and bank barn are on a five-acre parcel. The Hobbs bought the property in 2002. They've recently restored the barn.

25/8 Mt Prospect, 12314 Riding Fields Road

This resource includes a house, hay barn, and corn crib on 14 acres. The current owner, Dr. Soraya Karmand purchased the property, has just restored the house, and is the process of moving in.

25/9 Harrison Ward Farm, 13501 Travilah Road

The property is a four-acre parcel on Travilah Road with a house, bank barn, corn crib and garage. Jack and Joanna Devine bought this farmstead five years ago. They have recently restored the barn, doing much of the work themselves, with the help of their three children. The Devines have told staff that they enjoy the character of the barns and currently use them for storage.

2. ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY

This issue is a thorny one and comes up frequently in historic preservation discussions. The National Park Service has good information on architectural integrity in terms of preservation and the following information comes directly from the NPS website:

Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance...The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property's physical features and how they relate to its significance.

Historic properties either retain integrity (this is, convey their significance) or they do not. Within the concept of integrity, the National Register criteria recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity.

To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. Determining which of these aspects are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where, and when the property is significant.

SEVEN ASPECTS OF INTEGRITY:

- Location
- Design
- Setting
- Materials
- Workmanship
- Feeling
- Association

What this means is that a property may have lost some features – for example, replaced windows – but may still be historic if the overall building still conveys its significance due to other aspects of integrity, such as location, setting, historical association, etc.

Even after a building is designated on the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation*, the Historic Preservation Commission can approve many kinds of changes to the building – as long as these changes do not impede the ability of the building to convey its significance.

3. ECONOMIC COSTS OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

There has been much discussion about the economic costs of historic preservation and how these costs are addressed. Some of the testimony at the Board's Public Hearing raised the question of whether historic designation constitutes a "taking". This is one of the most frequently raised issues in designating private property as historic and thus subjecting it to government regulation. The term "taking" derives from a provision in the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution that states that private property shall not "be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Some courts have suggested that, in exceptional situations, the effect of the historic designations could be so economically severe as to amount to a taking. Courts have yet to identify such situations or to provide firm guidance on such potential "hardship" situations. However, as defined in the Supreme Court's Penn Central decision and a District of Columbia decision discussed below, the judicial test for hardship is quite difficult to meet. Several state courts have defined hardship narrowly, holding, for

instance, that an owner who is willing to offer property for sale at its fair market value cannot establish a case for hardship.

In *Penn Central Transportation Company v. New York City*, 438 U.S. 104 (1978), the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the designation of Grand Central Terminal in New York City and the denial of a permit for the demolition of portions of the structure to make way for the construction of a high-rise office building. The Court stated:

On this record, we conclude that the application of New York City's Landmarks law has not effected a "taking" of appellants property. The restrictions imposed are substantially related to the promotion of the general welfare and not only permit reasonable beneficial use of the landmark site but also afford appellants opportunities further to enhance not only the Terminal site proper but also other properties.

This decision is cited frequently in historic preservation situations for the principle that an owner who can obtain a "reasonable return" or a "reasonable beneficial use" from his property does not have a valid taking argument.

In addition, in *900 G Street Associates v. Department of Housing and Community Development*, 430 A.2d 1387 (1981), a District of Columbia court stated:

The basic question presented in this case is: at what juncture does the diminishment in value allegedly resulting from the governmental restriction on the use of property constitute an "unreasonable economic hardship" to the owner, which is here synonymous with an unconstitutional "taking?" . . . if there is a reasonable alternative economic use for the property after the imposition of the restriction on that property, there is no taking, and hence no unreasonable economic hardship to the owners, no matter how diminished the property may be in cash value and no matter if "higher" or "more beneficial" uses of the property have been proscribed.

Finally, the Supreme Court included in the Penn Central decision language recognizing the permissible goals that American cities seek to implement by enacting local preservation ordinances:

Over the past 50 years, all 50 States and over 500 municipalities have enacted laws to encourage or require the preservation of buildings and areas with historic or aesthetic importance. These nationwide legislative efforts have been precipitated by two concerns. The first is recognition that, in recent years, large numbers of historic structures, landmarks, and areas have been destroyed without adequate consideration of either the values represented therein or the possibility of preserving the destroyed properties for use in economically productive ways. The second is a widely shared belief that structures with special historic, cultural, or architectural significance enhance the quality of life for all. Not only do these buildings and their workmanship represent the lessons of the past and embody precious features of our heritage, they serve as examples of quality for today. Historic conservation is but one aspect of the much larger problem, basically an environmental one, of enhancing--or perhaps developing for the first time--the quality of life for people.

Although the courts have found that historic designation is not a "taking", it is clear that preserving and maintaining historic buildings is not cost-free. Because of this Montgomery County has had a 10% Historic Preservation Property Tax Credit program since 1984 and the State of Maryland has had a 20% Historic Preservation Tax Credit since the mid-1990s. These program help to offset approved rehabilitation costs for designated historic structures and can provide significant financial incentives for property owners – especially when used in combination.

For the Montgomery County Historic Preservation Property Tax Credit, the money rebated to citizens in the county over the last several years is as follows:

Year	Amount	# of Applications
2003	\$161,180.44	104
2002	\$193,492.57	106
2001	\$148,698.94	104
2000	\$106,353.12	78
1999	\$73,929.10	72
1998	\$98,549.67	91

In addition, there is no statistical evidence that historically-designated properties lose value at the time that they are sold. In fact, a 1999 study by the Maryland Association of Historic District Commissions, which looked at six historic areas around the state in great statistical detail, actually found that “over the long-run (18-22 years) properties in the six historic districts [in the study] have on average appreciated 28.9% faster than properties in the same jurisdiction outside the historic districts.”

4. HISTORIC DISTRICT VERSUS INDIVIDUALLY-DESIGNATED HISTORIC SITES

Again, staff feels that important information on this topic is to be found on the National Park Service website. The NPS defines a historic district this way:

A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

A district derives its importance from being a unified entity, even though it is often composed of a wide variety of resources. The identity of a district results from the interrelationship of its resources, which can convey a visual sense of the overall historic environment or be an arrangement of historically or functionally related properties. For example, a district can reflect one principal activity, such as a mill or a ranch, or it can encompass several interrelated activities, such as an area that includes industrial, residential, or commercial buildings, sites, structures, or objects. A district can also be a grouping of archeological sites related primarily by their common components; these types of districts often will not visually represent a specific historic environment.

Within a historic district, one may find buildings of outstanding historic significance and others which may be less significant, but which contribute to the overall character of the district. Many districts also include a small number of non-contributing or out-of-period buildings which are included within the boundaries of an otherwise cohesive district.

An individually-designated historic site must be significant in its own right and should “stand alone” in meeting the Historic Preservation Ordinance criteria for designation.

In terms of how the Historic Preservation Ordinance is applied to a historic district versus an individually-designated site, the only difference is language in the ordinance that states:

In the case of an application for work on an historic resource located within an historic district, the commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historical or design significance or for plans involving new construction, unless such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding historic resources or would impair the character of the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON DESIGNATION

1. Resources that are recommended by both MNCPPC Historic Preservation staff and by the Historic Preservation Commission for designation on the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation* and where the owner has not actively contested designation:

Resource #	Name of Resource		Address	
11/3	WILLIAM BOWMAN HOUSE/HOOD FARM	26531	HOWARD CHAPEL	DR
11/6-4	DRUID CLODFELTER HOUSE*	9810	MAIN	ST
11/10	KINGSTEAD FARM	11411	KINGSTEAD	RD
11/24	GRAFTON DUVALL/FRANK DUVALL FARM	25005	JOHNSON FARM	DR
11/29	IRA JONES FARM*	25601	KINGS VALLEY	RD
14/3	ETCHISON HOUSE	8251	DAMASCUS	RD
14/14	BOWEN-WOODFIELD FARM	24227	HAWKINS LANDING	RD
14/32	KING FARM	9333	WATKINS	RD
14/53	THOMPSON HOUSE	9821	WIGHTMAN	RD
15/116	INEZ ZEIGLER McABEE HOUSE*	9342	HOLSEY	RD
20/41	BENSON HOUSE*	9710	WIGHTMAN	RD
20/42	SARAH POSEY HOUSE*	9631	WIGHTMAN	RD

* Property is not currently on the *Locational Atlas*.

11/3 William Bowman House, 26531 Howard Chapel Drive

The William Bowman Farm (#11/3), 26221 Howard Chapel Road, dates from the 1840s. Like other early residences described above, the house was built to face a waterway. In this case, the dwelling faces Scotts Branch that feeds into the Patuxent River. William H. and Sarah Miller Bowman operated a large tobacco farm. In 1850, they owned 340 acres, of which 260 acres were cultivated. The farm remained in the family for close to a century.

The farmstead is significant for representing agriculture of this time period. The dwelling has a two-story gallery porch once common in this area. Of the few examples of these porches still extant, most have been partially or completely enclosed. The multi-purpose bank barn has a high level of integrity and is highly represent of the 1840s era. In 1850, Bowman had horses, cattle, sheep, swine, and stored wheat, corn, and oats, as well as the primary crop of tobacco. The comprehensive farmstead includes smokehouse, corn crib, tenant house, equipment shed, and early 20th century cow barn with decorative concrete block. The resource meets criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, and 2d. The recommended environmental setting is the current parcel (P400) of 238.37 acres, subject to reduction at the time of subdivision. At the time of subdivision, the following features should be included: the dwelling house, smoke house, concrete block cow barn, bank barn, corn crib, equipment house, and the headwaters of Scott's Branch. The vista of the farmstead from Howard Chapel Road is significant.

11/6-4 Druid Clodfelter House, 9810 Main Street

Addition to *Locational Atlas*

This outstanding Tudor Revival residence dates from 1942. The residence is constructed of brick with stone trim. The prominent brick chimney has a shouldered stack with decorative iron letter "C". There

is a basement garage on the one story west side. This residence is one of the largest and best-designed mid-20th century houses in Damascus. The architect is unknown. The house is located on a 1.75 acre lot planted with several mature trees.

Druid and Dorcas Miles Clodfelter acquired the property in 1941 from Reuben and Gertrude Poole. The land was assessed at \$400. In 1942, improvements were added, assessed at \$8,500. The Clodfelters' son, Druid, Jr, inherited the property in 1986. Druid Clodfelter built the Druid Theatre (a *Master Plan* site), begun in 1945 and completed in 1947. He owned the theater until 1977.

Consultants conducting Section 106 reviews for transportation projects in the Damascus area have found this resource to be National Register eligible. This resource meets criteria 1a, 1d, 2a and 2c. The recommended environmental setting is parcel P777, being 1.75 acres (58,370 square feet).

11/10 Kingstead Farm, 11411 Kingstead Road

The Kingstead Farm is significant historically and architecturally. The resource was the early 19th century homestead of John Duckett King, the original settler of the King family who were influential in the early settlement of the Damascus region and whose descendants extended throughout upper Montgomery County. The farmstead represents an important evolution from tobacco farming, to dairy farming, to cattle breeding. It is one of the few remaining viable cattle operations in this region today.

Architecturally, the Kingstead Farm complex includes a timberframe bank barn and concrete block dairy barns and milk house that are highly representative of construction methods used for farming buildings in the late 19th and early 20th century. Located in the heart of Kings Valley and at a crossroads, the farmstead is a prominent local visual feature. The King family has proposed an addition on the dwelling house that staff finds to be compatible with the historic structure.

This resource meets criteria 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2d, and 2e. The parcel P202 is bisected by Kings Valley Road. The recommended environmental setting is approximately 25-30 acres that includes the entire complex of buildings and borders on Kings Valley Road and extends to Little Bennett Creek. The setting excludes property on the east side of Kings Valley Road and excludes the road right of way. The vista of the farmstead from Kings Valley Road is significant. Non-contributing buildings include three metal barns built in the late 20th century (see plan) and silos built after 1950. The King family does not oppose designation.

11/24 Grafton Duvall/Frank Duvall Farm, 25005 Johnson Farm Drive

This resource includes an outstanding early farmstead. John Duvall (1774-1858) established a farm in this area in the early 1800s. His son Grafton (b1814) resided here. Dating from the early to mid 1800s are the dwelling, log smokehouse, bank barn. The original two-room dwelling has a center chimney typical of northern county houses. The substantial dairy barn was built in 1945 and expanded, showing the success of this industry during this era. The resource meets criteria 1a, 1d, 2a and 2d. The environmental setting includes P948, and the bank barn and dairy barn on outlot A. The setting is approximately three acres, which includes the dwelling house, smokehouse and corn crib on the one-acre parcel P948 and includes the dairy barn and bank barn on an adjoining parcel of approximately two acres, and excludes the one-acre P887 (25001 Johnson Farm Drive).

11/29 Ira Jones Farm, 25601 Kings Valley Road, Addition to *Locational Atlas*

The resource was identified as part of a survey of Twentieth Century agricultural buildings, in 1987. The resource includes a dwelling house, built in 1912, and a bank barn, built c1921. The center-cross gable residence has a standing-seam metal roof and a full-width porch. The three-bay house has vinyl siding, yet it retains its 2/2 sash windows and the gable window which have Gothic-influenced triangular heads. The house rests on a stone foundation. The significance of the resource is in the gambrel-roof

bank barn that is recognized as the first example of a self-supporting truss roof in the Damascus area. The other gambrel roof barns in the area were built 1930 and later. The Jones Farm is owned by the King family of Kingstead Farm. The farmstead is historically part of the King family, having been built by Ira Jones and Amy King Jones (1881-1955). Amy was the daughter of Rufus Filmore King, and great-granddaughter of John Duckett King.

The resource meets criteria 1a, 1d, and 2a. Staff recommends an environmental setting of approximately four acres to include the dwelling house, barn, and frontage on Kings Valley Road, and to exclude the right of way for Kings Valley Road. The King family does not oppose designation.

14/3 Etchison-Warfield House, 8251 Damascus Road

The Etchison-Warfield House is an early 19th century log dwelling that epitomizes early Montgomery County architecture in its blending of Germanic and English building traditions. The structure has suffered from neglect. It has lost its stone chimney. A Greek Revival kitchen wing no longer stands. The building, however, has a high level of integrity, especially on the interior. Especially noteworthy are the plaster walls on exterior front and rear walls and the interior trim, including high-style mantel, chair rails and baseboards. The dwelling has been compared with The Oaks, of Laytonsville, (MP site #23/36), c1797-1814, which shares such features as chair rails and loft partition walls. The property was owned by the Etchison family through most of the 19th century and has been owned by the Warfields since 1893. The Etchison-Warfield House meets criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, and 2e. The recommended environmental setting is 56 acres (P555), subject to reduction at the time of subdivision. At the time of subdivision the features to be included are the log dwelling house, the summer kitchen south of the house, and small outbuilding east of the driveway.

14/14 Bowen-Woodfield Farm/Upper Seneca Farm, 2427 Hawkins Landing Road

The Bowen-Woodfield House is highly representative of a progressive-era farmstead. The house is above average in conveying an architectural styling popular in the early twentieth century but found in Montgomery County mainly in Chevy Chase and Bethesda. Noteworthy detailing includes bracketed eaves, molded window cornices, and corbelled chimneys. The farmstead was operated by James Bowen, a New York native, and his wife Eliza in the late 1800s and early 20th century. In 1920, the Bowens conveyed the farm to Grant E. Woodfield, who established a 186-acre dairy farm.

This resource meets criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, and 2d. The property was subdivided in 2002. The recommended environmental setting includes two parcels: the 11-acre parcel P308, containing the dwelling house, carriage house, and dairy barn, and Outlot A, containing equipment sheds and corn crib. The owners do not oppose designation.

14/32 King Farm, 9333 Watkins Road

This farmstead is highly representative of the growth of the Great Seneca Creek area around the turn of the 20th century. The 151-acre farmstead was established in the late 1890s. Watkins Road was platted in 1905, connecting Woodfield Road with the Wildcat Road-Brink Road corridor. The King Farm prospered and expanded to 233 acres by 1913. The house, with its three-story tower, is a noteworthy example of Victorian era architectural styling. With its prominent setting on an open knoll overlooking Watkins Road and the Magruder Branch, the resource is a local landmark.

This resource meets criteria 1a, 1d, 2a, and 2e. The recommended environmental setting is the entire 6.48 acres, not including the right of way for Watkins Road. Contributing buildings are the dwelling house and spring house. The barn is non-contributing.

14/53 Thompson House, 9821 Wightman Road

John and Mary Wightman built the house soon after they acquired the property in 1904. The Wightmans were white farmers who employed Prathertown residents on their 141-acre property. The property was subdivided sometime after 1965. The Queen Anne-influenced house is quite grand for this area. The house has been altered with new siding and new windows. This resource meets criteria 1a and 1d, having historical significance for its association with the Prathertown community. The recommended setting is parcel P775, being 0.49 acres. The setting excludes the right of way for Wightman Road. The owner is in favor of designation.

15/116 Inez McAbee House, 9342 Holsey Road, Addition to *Locational Atlas*

This resource represents the history of the Friendship community and the significant role of Inez Zeigler McAbee. According to tradition, the dwelling was the home of John Holsey on land bought from the Mullinix family in 1835. The Holseys and other African Americans who settled in the area were known to be slaves on the Mullinix plantation. The log dwelling was moved about 200 yards in the early 1900s, and it has been altered with new windows, siding, and an addition. Yet, since the importance of the building is in its historical associations, the physical changes are not significant. Inez Zeigler McAbee was inducted into the County's Human Rights Hall of Fame for her work as a civil rights activist. She is the great-great-ganddaughter of John Holsey. The house has remained in the same family for some 170 years.

Staff finds that the property meets criteria 1a, 1c, and 1d. The recommended environmental setting is the parcel P848, being 0.8 acres. This setting excludes the right of way for Holsey Road.

20/41 Benson House, 9710 Wightman Road, Addition to *Locational Atlas*

The Planning Board and HPC received a great deal of public testimony about the community of Prathertown. A history of the community, written by the nominator and others, is attached. There are four resources under review. Only one of them is identified on the *Locational Atlas*, the Wightman House [Thompson House], #14/53. Staff recommends designation of these resources as part of a thematic grouping of historic resources. Like many African-American communities, Prathertown was a kinship community established after the Civil War. The emancipated Prathers bought nearly seven acres of land from William Benson in 1883. Wilsons, Boyds and Fraziers were later residents. The Benson House and the Wightman House were the residences of white farmers who sold land to the Prathers and provided employment. The Posey House was the residence of an African American family in Prathertown. The Black and White Inn represents the commercial enterprise.

The Benson House is an early 20th century frame structure associated with William H. Benson. The Bensons bought 2 acres in 1864. In 1882-3, the Bensons sold seven acres to the Prathers who established Prathertown. The house probably dates from c1900-1910. Alterations include a one-story west addition (post-1975), vinyl siding, and replacement windows. The resource meets criteria 1a and 1d. The recommended setting is parcel P947, being 30,492. The setting excludes the right of way for Wightman Road.

20/42 Sarah Posey House, 9631 Wightman Road, Addition to *Locational Atlas*

The Sarah Posey House dates from c1910. According to tradition, John and Mary Wightman built the house for farm workers. Sarah J. Posey bought the house with over an acre of land in 1916. The resource represents an African American residence dating from an era of restricted ownership. Sarah Posey was a midwife who delivered babies for Prathertown residents and John Posey operated a sawmill on the adjoining lot. The house has been little altered. Though it has cementitious siding, the house has its original windows, and patterned tin shingle roof. The prominent location of the house and its generous proportions make this a physically noteworthy historic resource in the area. The resource

meets criteria 1a, 1d, and 2a. The recommended environmental setting is the parcel P970 of 0.6 acres (27,007 square feet). The setting does not include the right of way for Wightman Road.

2. Resource recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission for designation, but not recommended by MNCPPC Historic Preservation staff:

Resource #	Historic Name		Address	
14/61	SOMERSET O. JONES HOUSE	8615	LOHAVEN	DR

14/61 Somerset Orme Jones House, 8615 Lockhaven Drive

This house was the tenant farmhouse for Somerset Orme Jones, who actually resided at a property on Brink Road (*Atlas* Resource #14/57, that is also recommended for removal from the *Atlas*) and who was the son of Richard Jones. Somerset Jones was elected to the State House of Delegates in 1875 and 1883 and was a founder of the First National Bank of Gaithersburg (1891).

Though an attractive residence and well maintained, the house has had several major additions over the years, including a multi-paned bay window on the main elevation.

Staff is not persuaded that this resource has architectural or historic significance and does not recommend this resource for designation. The HPC recommends the resource for designation as a fine example of an antebellum tenant house with Italianate style detailing. The owners, who support designation, are to be commended for their stewardship of this property.

3. Resources recommended by both MNCPPC Historic Preservation staff and the Historic Preservation Commission for removal from the *Locational Atlas*:

Resource #	Historic Name		Address	
10/13	BROWNSVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT		CLARKSBURG	RD
11/2	MILTON BOYER HOUSE	26643	HOWARD CHAPEL	DR
11/4	NATHAN BURDETTE HOUSE	9700	HIGHVIEW	AVE
11/5	SHECKLES HOUSE	10025	LOCUST	DR
11/11	LUTHER G. KING FARM	11711	KINGSTEAD	RD
11/13	YOUNG CEMETERY		SWEEPSTAKES	RD
11/15	KEMP-BIGGS FARM	24621	TANDEM	DR
11/17	EZEKIEL MOXLEY HOUSE	25008	WOODFIELD	RD
11/20	WIDOW HAMMOND FARM	9200	DAMASCUS	RD
11/22	GEORGE GUE FARM	9100	DAMASCUS	RD
11/25	HOWARD DAY HOUSE	9400	HAWKINS CREAMERY	RD
14/2	REZIN DUVALL HOUSE	25804	BOWMAN ACRES	LN
14/4	DUVALL HOUSE	8120	JONNIE	LN
14/6	JERRY WILLIAMS FARM	7810	DAMASCUS	DR
14/11	SCOTT-ETCHISON HOUSE	7211	HAWKINS CREAMERY	RD
14/13	MOBLEY-HOWARD FARM	8311	HAWKINS CREAMERY	RD

14/20	LORENZO WATKINS FARM	10820	WATKINS	RD
14/21	J. RUFUS PURDUM HOUSE	10710	WATKINS	RD
14/22	PURDUM CEMETERY		WATKINS	RD
14/28	JOHN CASSASSA FARM	23000	DAVIS MILL	RD
14/29	JOSHUA RIGGS FARM	22821	RIDGE	RD
14/33	FRANKLIN KING [CHAS COLEMAN] FARM	9010	WATKINS	RD
14/35	JOHN ALLNUTT HOUSE	22522	LAYTONSVILLE	RD
14/39	BROOK GROVE CHURCH	7700	BRINK	RD
14/44	WATERS FARM	9601	HUNTMASTER	RD
14/50	BENSON-SIBLEY FARM	10715	BRINK	RD
14/52	DR. WASHINGTON WATERS HOUSE	21600	DAVIS MILL	RD
14/56	GOSHEN SCHOOL HOUSE	9001	HUNTMASTER	RD
14/57	RICHARD JONES HOUSE	9201	BRINK	RD
14/62	CHLOE THOMPSON [STEWART] HOUSE	22	DELTA	CT

DEMOLISHED RESOURCES – Given that these structures no longer exist, staff recommends removal of the following resources from the *Locational Atlas*.

- The **Milton Boyer House** (11/2) at 26643 Howard Chapel Drive was demolished in the fall of 1997.
- Sometime after placement on the *Locational Atlas*, the **Sheckles House** (11/5) at 10017 Locust Drive was demolished.
- An arson fire seriously damaged the **John Cassassa Farmhouse** (14/28) about 1985, and the house and outbuildings were subsequently demolished.

FAMILY CEMETERIES - The Historic Preservation Commission has established a policy of only designating family cemeteries if they are on the same property as one or more standing structures that have historic or architectural significance, or if the cemetery is the burial site of an outstanding individual.

- The **Young Family Cemetery** (11/13), owned by M-NCPPC, is located in the Upper Magruder Branch Stream Valley Park, off Sweepstakes Road.
- The **Purdum Cemetery** (14/22) is on a 32 acre parcel on Watkins Road, near Kings Valley Road.

LACK OF HISTORIC OR ARCHITECTURAL SIGNIFICANCE AND/OR SUBSTANTIAL ALTERATIONS – Staff feels that the following structures do not merit designation or have been altered so significantly that they no longer retain historic significance and should be removed from the *Locational Atlas*:

10/13 Browningsville Historic District

As recently as 1989, Browningsville was evaluated by staff for its eligibility for designation and was found to have potential merit. Unfortunately, the condition of the buildings have deteriorated over the last 15 years such that staff no longer finds the district merits designation. A primary building in the district is the Browningsville School. This building has had gaping holes in the roof that have severely damaged its structure. Two buildings have been demolished (27444 and 27452) and one is abandoned (27458). The **Browningsville School**, discussed below, is recommended for retention on the *Locational*

Atlas. The recommendation for designating the **Browningsville Hall** as an individual site will be discussed at the next worksession.

11/4 Nathan Burdette House, 9700 Highview Avenue

This dwelling has been altered and is in poor condition. The front porch with chamfered posts and scroll brackets documented in the 1970s has been replaced. The house is additionally altered by a new front door and vinyl siding. Better examples of this house type are recommended for designation. The bank barn described in the 1970s has been demolished.

11/11 Luther King Millers House and Mill Site, 11711 Kingstead Road

The miller's house has been substantially altered with a front concrete block addition, front enclosed porch, and replacement windows. There are other much better examples of miller's houses that have been designated. The King family is better represented by other sites already designated or recommended for designation. The mill structure is no longer standing. Luther King's contribution to the local economy is recognized in the distillery site that is preserved in Little Bennett Regional Park and interpreted through signs and brochures.

11/15 Kemp-Biggs House, 24621 Tandem Drive

When this property was included in the *Locational Atlas*, there were a bank barn, tile silo, and several other outbuildings. Today, only some loafing sheds remain. The bank barn was destroyed by fire in 1979. The dwelling house is a center cross-gable structure that has artificial siding and fixed shutters and a porch that does not appear to be original.

11/17 Ezekial Moxley House, 25008 Woodfield Road

Physical evidence does not support the earlier claim that this residence includes a log structure. The dwelling has had many alterations, including addition of aluminum siding and window replacement. The slate roof described in earlier documentation is no longer in place. No longer extant are outbuildings that had included a bank barn, log tobacco house and other log outbuildings.

11/20 Widow Hammond Farm, 9200 Damascus Road

The extant structures for this resource are a tenant house and a log outbuilding on a 15-acre parcel. The main dwelling and bank barn have been demolished. The one-room deep tenant house is partially constructed of log. The house has a center hall plan. The east room and stair hall are contained within the log structure. Alterations to the house include side and rear additions, vinyl siding, new portico with metal posts, and new windows replacing the original 6/6 sash. A dilapidated log outbuilding was at one time used as a residence, though its original purpose is unknown.

11/22 George Gue Farm, 9100 Damascus Road

Sarah Ellen Bowman Gue, wife of George Gue, inherited 180 acres from her father, Aden Bowman in 1868. Sarah grew up on the farm that her brother inherited, the Rezin Bowman Farm, due south (#11/21). The 20th century house is vaguely Colonial Revival in appearance and asbestos shingle siding and altered front and rear porches with decks. The bank barn is a fine building, but staff does not find it merits designation on its own. A plain concrete-block and frame cow barn stands nearby. The large dairy barn photographed in 1974 is no longer standing. Other farms recommended for designation better represent agricultural buildings and the Bowman family. A subdivision plan has been submitted for this 124-acre property that proposes a 4.2-acre lot around the standing structures.

11/25 Howard Day House

A portion of this dwelling is constructed of log. The integrity of this resource has been dramatically impaired by significant alterations including several additions, window replacement, and artificial siding.

14/2 Rezin Duvall House, 25804 Bowman Acres Lane

This property includes a house and outbuilding and a non-contributing barn. The house has been altered with vinyl siding and replacement windows. A bank barn is no longer standing. Other properties better represent 19th century farmsteads and the Duvall family.

14/4 Duvall Farm, 8120 Jonnie Lane

This center cross gable house stands on a 69,000 square foot lot. The 1903 house does not have the front porch characteristic of this type. Other alterations include stucco siding and a side addition. The Rezin Bowman House, #11/21, recommended for designation, is a better example of this house type.

14/6 Jerry Williams Farm, 7810 Damascus Road

This resource includes a center cross gable house, a bank barn and a dairy barn. The house has been greatly altered with siding, replacement windows and an enclosed front porch. The dairy barn and bank barn are in poor condition.

14/11 Scott-etchison House

This resource consists of a center-cross gable house on 14.8 acres. A double-crib log barn was demolished after 1979. The frame house is altered with artificial siding, replacement windows, replacement porch and brick rear addition.

14/13 Mobley-Howard, 8311 Hawkins Creamey Road

This farmstead includes a dwelling house, bank barn and smokehouse. The house has been built and expanded in three separate periods, is covered with vinyl siding, and has a replacement door and surround. It was originally a three-bay side gable structure built in 1893. It was expanded in 1909 and again in 1974-84. The property was once a 110-acre farm and is now 6.38 acres. Historic outbuildings are a smokehouse and a bank barn. The property has neither architectural nor historical significance.

14/20 Lorenzo Watkins Farm, 10820 Watkins Road

This resource was once a noteworthy farmstead. Unfortunately the house has been greatly altered since the Watkins family sold the farm in 1999. The main block includes a log section, on the north end, and featured Greek Revival cornice returns and Gothic Revival bargeboard. A two-story gallery porch on the east side has been largely enclosed and the remaining open section replaced. Windows have been replaced and siding installed. The present main entrance is through a one story addition on the north end. The resource includes a noteworthy complement of outbuildings, but without an intact dwelling, their significance is diminished. Better examples of farmsteads with intact dwellings are recommended instead.

14/21 J. Rufus Purdum House, 10710 Watkins Road

This resource includes a dwelling house and a small outbuilding on a 69,260 square-foot lot. Large picture windows now flank the front door. The remaining windows have been replaced and the house covered with aluminum siding.

14/29 Joshua Riggs Farm, 22821 Ridge Road

The house was built about 1902 by Burwell Linthicum, replacing a c1839 log house built by Joshua Riggs. The residence has been altered with stucco siding, and replacement windows and doors. A clapboard outbuilding, likely a smokehouse, has had windows and doors installed. Linthicum also built a bank barn (illustrated in *Places from the Past*) that collapsed after mid-1970s. A springhouse was located near Davis Mill Rd. The property has had a succession of owners since 1940.

14/33 Franklin King Farm, 9010 Watkins Road

The resource is a dwelling house and several small outbuildings including a dairy, poultry houses and a garage, on 11.67 acres. A barrack barn photographed in July 2002 is no longer standing. The house had been abandoned for many years when it was surveyed in 1989. In 1990, the present owner began renovation work. The house has vinyl siding, replacement doors and windows and replacement porch.

14/35 Allnutt House, 22522 Laytonsville Road

This residence, said to date from the 1870s, was remodeled in the 1940s to its present Colonial Revival appearance. A garage has been attached to the north side of the house. The frame dwelling, a concrete and terra cotta stable, and a concrete equipment building are located on 10 acres.

14/39 Brook Grove Church, 7700 Brink Road

The congregation was established in 1871. The structure dates from 1955 and was sided with stoneface siding in 1960. The original 1871 structure was destroyed by fire and replaced by a second church in 1879. This building was demolished and replaced by the present structure. The cemetery includes gravestones from as early as 1896 of families including Dorsey, Prather, Williams and Riggs. The Brooke Grove community included a school (1889-1955), southeast of the church, and a lodge hall with general store (late 1800s), northeast of church. Staff does not find the church eligible for designation.

14/44 Waters House, 9601 Huntmaster Road

This resource has had many alterations. The dwelling has aluminum siding, replacement windows and an asphalt shingle roof. The property is said to have housed three generations of the Waters family. The earliest portion of the main dwelling is said to be the rear section, dating from the mid-19th century. Front and rear porches of it have been enclosed and/or replaced. The front block dates from the 1920s. A log outbuilding may have been an earlier dwelling. Its integrity was impaired when it was moved from its original location. The property includes a barrack barn and a smokehouse. Immediately behind the house is a five-car garage. The Waters family is represented by the already designated Zacchariah MacCubbin Waters House (14/43), located nearby.

14/50 Benson-Sibley House, 10715 Brink Road

At the time of listing on the *Atlas*, the Benson-Sibley Farm had a standing tobacco barn which appears to have been the main reason for inclusion. The tobacco barn is no longer extant. The bank barn collapsed during a recent severe storm. The remaining buildings are a dwelling house, smokehouse and a milk house. While the architecture of the house has some interest in its Craftsman-influenced style, staff finds that it is not significant enough to merit designation and the window replacement has impaired the structure's integrity.

14/52 Dr. Washington Waters House/Sycamore Hollow, 21600 Davis Mill Rd

The Waters family has owned this property for many generations. While the dwelling is an example of a traditional telescope-plan house, there have been many changes to the dwelling. The earliest section is the easternmost portion that was a one story and loft log building. The internal stone chimney has a base that is 6 feet deep and 11 feet wide. This portion was altered by a polygonal bay window on the south side, an attached garage (1960) on the east, and dormer windows (1974). The center section includes log construction that was probably built in at least two stages, divided by a chimney. There are some 6/6-sash windows in this section. The lower level has been used as a kitchen. This portion of the house suffered from extensive fire damage in 1988. The main Greek Revival block was built about 1800 and rebuilt following a fire in 1840. The house was the residence of Dr. Washington Waters, who served in the State House of Delegates in the 1850s and was one of five county representatives on the State Constitutional Convention of 1850 and 1851. Staff finds that because of the level of accumulated changes, the house is not eligible for designation.

14/56 Goshen School, 9110 Huntmaster Road

The one-room frame school, dating from about 1900, has been encased in new additions. A concrete block dwelling was constructed on the front of the school. The original structure was used as a school for 16 years until its use as such was supplanted by the construction of the Laytonsville Elementary School.

14/57 Richard Jones House and Cemetery, 9201 Brink Road

Like other early houses, the Richard Jones House was built to face the local waterway, in this case, the Goshen Branch of Great Seneca Creek. John Jones and Anne Smith Waters are said to have built the original structure about 1820. It was likely a three bay side-gable structure. The family included 10 children, the youngest of whom continued to reside here until her death in 1929. Nearby, the family cemetery is located on a separate parcel (P510). The house has had many alterations and additions, including one from 1950, that have virtually encased the original structure.

14/62 Chloe Pope Thompson House (Albert Stewart House), 22 Delta Court

This resource includes a frame residence on a one-acre lot. The original house was built about 1861 and has been expanded several times over the years. There are replacement windows and siding. The owners have recently replaced a non-historic two story portico with a more sympathetic one story front porch. Staff finds that the residence does not meet the criteria for designation.

4. Resource Recommended For Retention On *Locational Atlas And Index Of Historic Sites*:

Resource #	Historic Name		Address	
10/13-2	BROWNSVILLE SCHOOL	27431	CLARKSBURG	RD

10/13-2 Browningsville School, 27431 Clarksburg Road

The Historic Preservation Commission and MNCPPC Historic Preservation staff recommend that the Browningsville School be retained on the *Locational Atlas*. Staff has heard proposals by citizens to preserve the Browningsville School by moving it to a new location. The relocation of a structure is not a first choice for preservation. In this case, this once-public building is inaccessible even for viewing from the public right of way and is in essentially the back yard of a resident's property. In this case, moving the building could be a valid option for its preservation. Unfortunately, the building is in such poor condition, that it may no longer be possible to move it. Staff would support efforts to appraise the condition of the structure and pursue options for its preservation.