



PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

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

APPROVED 05/21/2019

Summary of Actions

Prince George's County Historic Preservation Commission
Tuesday, April 16, 2019, 6:30 p.m.
4th Floor Board Room, County Administration Building

Commissioners Present: Donna Schneider, Vice Chair Lisa Pfueller Davidson, Susan Pruden, Royal Reff, Chairman John Peter Thompson, Eddy Campbell, Nathania Branch-Miles

Commissioners Absent: Yolanda Muckle, Aaron Marcavitch

HPC Counsel: Bradley Farrar, Esq.

Staff Present: Howard Berger, Jennifer Stabler, Tom Gross, Tyler Smith

Guest: Name/Organization

Agenda Item

Matt Tedesco
Kevin Kennedy

D.1./D.2.
D.2.

A. Call to Order

Chairman Thompson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Vice Chair Davidson read introductory remarks about the meeting and procedures into the record. Commissioners Muckle and Marcavitch had excused absences.

B. Approval of Meeting Summary – March 19, 2019

MOTION: Commissioner Schneider moved to approve the March 19, 2019 meeting summary. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pruden. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (7-0).

C. Historic Site Evaluation

1. Spring Hill, Historic Resource 87B-036-01, 16421 Aquasco Farm Road, Aquasco MD 20608

Mr. Gross presented the staff report. Spring Hill is a two-and-one-half-story, side-gable, frame dwelling constructed circa 1820, executed in a vernacular late-Georgian/Federal style. The resource sits within a 2-acre cleared area of an otherwise undeveloped 298.03-acre parcel. After a review of updated documentation and recent and vintage photographs of the building, staff concluded their presentation by recommending that Spring Hill could be found to have insufficient integrity to convey, represent, or contain the values and

qualities for which it is judged significant, and recommended that it should not be designated as a Historic Site and should be deleted from the Inventory of Historic Resources.

Commissioner Reff asked to view the picture of the Brookfield of the Berrys Historic Site and asked why Spring Hill didn't meet criteria under 1(A) of Subtitle 29-104(a). Mr. Gross explained staff's reasoning with regard to HPC Policy #1-87 and HPC Policy #1-89.

Chairman Thompson asked about the window alterations and wanted to confirm that this was to be considered a substantive change. Mr. Gross agreed that windows are a significant feature. Chairman Thompson asked about the altered condition of the building if it were to be designated and what the expectations of the property owner might be in terms of rehabilitation. Mr. Gross confirmed that the expectation would be that it would be maintained in its altered state until such time as changes were contemplated.

Commissioner Reff asked a follow-up question about HPC Policy #1-87. Mr. Gross explained HPC *Policy #1-87 Evaluating Integrity, Degree of Alteration, and Scarcity and Frequency* presents staff with the difficult task of balancing the historical significance of a property against its current condition in making a recommendation to the HPC. Commissioner Reff asked if staff was comfortable that the Inventory of Historic Resources included enough other similar Historic Sites. Mr. Gross stated "yes" that the Inventory did include other examples from the same period and architectural style. Mr. Gross noted that the two-story chimney pent was a unique feature of this structure in the county, but that feature alone was not enough to mitigate for the other alterations in the context of historic site evaluation.

MOTION: Commissioner Schneider moved that Spring Hill not be designated as a Historic Site and that it be deleted from the Inventory of Historic Resources in accordance with staff's recommendations. Commissioner Pruden seconded the motion.

Commissioner Reff stated he thought it could meet more than one criterion. Vice Chair Davidson acknowledged Commissioner Reff's remarks and appreciated staff's careful application of the criteria and policies. Vice Chair Davidson concluded that she did not see a compelling reason to go against staff's recommendations.

The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (6-0-1, Chairman Thompson voted present).

D. Referrals

1. 4-18009, Three Roads Corner, (adjacent to Marlow-Huntt Store Historic Site, 85A-033-14)

Dr. Stabler presented the staff report. The subject property comprises three parcels located on the east side of MD 5 in the southeast quadrant of its intersection with MD 381 and Accokeek Road in Brandywine, MD. The subject property is adjacent to the Marlow-Huntt Store Historic Site (85A-033-14). A Phase I archeological survey was conducted on the subject property in September 2018. Staff recommended the HPC recommend approval of Preliminary Plan 4-18009, Three Roads Corner, to the Planning Board with the condition that the applicant shall submit a Detailed Site Plan for the purpose of evaluating the effect of the orientation, mass, height, materials and design of the proposed development on the environmental setting of the Marlow-Huntt Store Historic Site, 85A-033-14.

Vice Chair Davidson asked if the owner of Marlow-Huntt Store had contacted staff with any concerns about the development. Dr. Stabler replied that they had not.

Mr. Tedesco, representing the property owner, noted that they sent the required notification to the owner of the Marlow-Huntt Store. Mr. Tedesco emphasized the ongoing transportation improvements in Brandywine and provided the commissioners with an illustration of the nearby intersection (Exhibit A). Mr. Tedesco took issue with the recommendation for a DSP of the entire property, arguing that the historic setting was already being dramatically altered by the continuing road work on MD 5. He explained that Parcel 1 is already required to submit a DSP because of the proposed gas station. Mr. Tedesco requested the condition require a DSP of only Parcel 1 and not Parcels 2 and 3.

Commissioner Reff asked for a few moments to review the presented documents about the transportation improvements.

Chairman Thompson restated the applicant's position that because of the interchange improvements the historic context was no longer extant. Chairman Thompson noted that many historic sites exist in a dramatically different context than at the time of their construction.

Mr. Tedesco noted the Chairman's remarks and reiterated that Parcel 1, the parcel closest to the Historic Site, would still be required to submit a DSP.

Vice Chair Davidson clarified the HPC's definition of Environmental Setting and said that the HPC was interested in mitigating what will happen within sight of the Historic Site, and that the DSP would allow the HPC to evaluate the effect of the adjacent development.

Commissioner Schneider asked what was going to be constructed on Parcels 2 and 3. Mr. Tedesco stated that it was zoned for commercial uses but they do not have tenants at this time.

Commissioner Reff asked if Parcels 2 and 3 would be reviewed by the HPC at any other stage of the development process. Mr. Tedesco clarified that it depended on the proposed use. The gas station, for example, would require a DSP which the HPC would review but if it was a permitted by-right use the preliminary plan would be the only plan the HPC would see.

MOTION: Commissioner Pruden moved to recommend approval of Preliminary Plan 4-18009, Three Roads Corner, to the Planning Board in accordance with staff's recommendations. Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (6-0-1).

2. CSP-18004, Clinton Market Place North (adjacent to Mary Surratt House Museum Historic Site, 81A-007)

Dr. Stabler presented the staff report. The subject property comprises 21.26 acres located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Piscataway Road and Brandywine Road in Clinton, Maryland. The subject application is adjacent to the Mary Surratt House Museum (81A-007), which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and is a Prince George's County Historic Site. The subject application proposes a mix of residential (single-family attached) or commercial retail uses in the northeast quadrant of the development. Chairman Thompson asked about the distance between the road and new construction. Dr. Stabler replied that there will be a sidewalk, tree plantings, a swale, additional tree plantings, and a small setback. A Phase I archeology survey is recommended on the subject property. Staff recommended approval of CSP-18004, Clinton Market Place North, with conditions. The five conditions were:

1. Prior to the approval of any detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate that the scale, mass, proportion, materials, and architecture for new construction appropriately relates to the character of the Mary Surratt House Museum Historic Site.

2. Prior to approval of the associated preliminary plan, Phase I (Identification) archeological investigations, according to the Planning Board's *Guidelines for Archeological Review* (May 2005), are recommended on the above-referenced property to determine if any cultural resources are present. Evidence of M-NCPPC concurrence with the final Phase I report and recommendations is required prior to signature approval.
3. Upon receipt of the report by the Planning Department, if it is determined that potentially significant archeological resources exist in the project area, prior to Planning Board approval of the final plat, the applicant shall provide a plan for:
 - i.) Evaluating the resource at the Phase II level, or
 - ii.) Avoiding and preserving the resource in place.
4. If a Phase II and/or Phase III archeological evaluation or mitigation is necessary, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and/or Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in a proper manner, prior to any ground disturbance or the approval of any grading permits.
5. Prior to the approval of the final plat, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees, shall provide a plan for any interpretive signage to be erected and public outreach measures (based on the findings of the Phase I and Phase II archeological investigations). The location and wording of the signage and the public outreach measures shall be subject to approval by the M-NCPPC staff archeologist. The plan shall include the timing for the installation of the signage and the implementation of public outreach measures.

Commissioner Schneider asked about the timing of the expansion of the road and where the expansion was placed. Mr. Tedesco responded that the road widening would be happening concurrently with the development and the land taken to widen the road would be from the subject property.

Commissioner Reff asked about a discrepancy in the slides showing a difference in the location of the commercial buildings.

Mr. Tedesco introduced Mr. Kennedy, who was also present and representing the Michael Company and property owner. Mr. Tedesco began by addressing questions about the right-of-way. All of the expansion is to be on the southern side of the road. Mr. Tedesco stressed that the distance from property to property was over 90 feet. Mr. Tedesco brought up the office building adjacent to the Surratt House to the north was razed and improvements were being planned in addition to the conveyance of 6 acres to M-NCPPC in another location adjacent to Cosca Park. The M-X-T zoning requires many more plans to be reviewed by the HPC. (Exhibit B)

Commissioner Reff asked if the applicant was in agreement with staff about relocating the tallest buildings. Mr. Tedesco clarified that they were neither in agreement nor in opposition. Chairman Thompson emphasized the HPC's opposition to the developing property creating a wall of new construction opposite the Surratt House. Chairman Thompson articulated the HPC's position about softening the development's impact on the Surratt House. Chairman Thompson also expressed the HPC's concern about the lack of a landscape buffer. Mr. Tedesco reassured the HPC that the Landscape Manual would require a 4.6 buffer which is an additional 20 to 30 feet. Chairman Thompson added that the HPC has worked very hard to make sure that the county's historic sites are not looking at back doors and back yards, so that when visitors

come from all over the world to the Surratt House they are not looking at someone's backyard barbeque pit across the street.

Kevin Kennedy from the Michael Company thanked the HPC and stated their appreciation for staff's work and the HPC's comments. He said that their reticence to commit to site plan changes was due to the mixed-use zoning and early stage of the development process. He assured the HPC that the developer was hearing their concerns. He also noted the Michael Company's commitment to a good presence and defined perimeter and willingness to work with the design elements of the Surratt House. Chairman Thompson acknowledged his comments and clarified that the HPC wanted to discuss all potential issues so that the applicant would not be surprised by any concerns later in the development process.

Commissioner Branch-Miles stated her concern for the size of the buildings placed directly across from the Surratt House. She also asked about the adequacy of parking and schools for the new development. Mr. Kennedy addressed the parking concern by explaining that the homes would naturally be facing Brandywine Road and the Surratt House and would be rear loading, having garages in the back.

Vice Chair Davidson asked about one of the presented plan's representation of the greenspace. She reiterated the other commissioner's comments about building heights directly across the street from the Surratt House. Vice Chair Davidson encouraged the applicants to consider the Surratt House an asset to the development.

Mr. Kennedy agreed and stated that they had embraced the idea, pointing out aspects of the project intended for the benefit of the Surratt House, including tearing down the office building on the corner. The applicants have plans to install landscaping on the Surratt House property and rebuild the perimeter fence so that the Surratt House can incorporate the additional lot as well as a proposal for a pavilion.

Commissioner Schneider asked about parking for the developing property. Mr. Kennedy stated that the residences would have garages.

Commissioner Reff noted that Mr. Kennedy had referenced the clear demarcation of properties earlier and asked about the dimensions and location of the fencing on the developing property. Mr. Kennedy replied that conceptually it would be approximately six feet tall and is usually located along the visible property frontage.

Chairman Thompson asked staff if the Surratt House had weighed in on the subject. Staff replied that they had not. Dr. Stabler added the comments of Laurie Verge, of the Surratt House Museum, to the record in support of lower-profile buildings directly adjacent to the historic site.

MOTION: Commissioner Schneider moved to recommend approval of CSP-18004, Clinton Market Place North in accordance with staff's recommendations. Commissioner Pruden seconded the motion.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he would abstain from the vote because the Michael Company belonged to an organization with which he was affiliated.

Commissioner Davidson suggested adding language from staff's conclusion to the HPC's recommendations. Commissioner Reff supported the idea. Chairman Thompson said that he would entertain a motion to amend. Mr. Farrar pointed out that the Historic Preservation Commission would have two more chances to review the project during the development process. The Commissioners were satisfied that the recommended language was adequate.

The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (5-0-1-1, Chairman Thompson voted present and Commissioner Campbell abstained).

E. UPDATE FROM DEPARTMENT OF PARKS & RECREATION

Mr. Gross presented the Update from the Department of Parks and Recreation. Vice Chair Davidson asked for an update on Glenn Dale Hospital given that it was in the news.

F. COMMISSION STAFF ITEMS

1. HAWP Staff Sign-Offs

No further questions.

2. Properties of Concern

No further questions. Mr. Gross stated that a concerned property owner contacted staff about trespassers at Admirathoria. Commissioner Branch-Miles asked about His Lordship's Kindness and noted that it was boarded up. Commissioner Schneider asked about Melwood Park. Mr. Gross noted the ongoing work at Melwood Park and confirmed that the HPC could get a more detailed report at the next meeting.

3. Referrals Report

No further questions.

4. Correspondence Report – No Correspondence Report

5. New Business/Staff Updates

Mr. Gross noted that the Annual Historic Preservation Reception will be held on May 23rd at 6:00 pm at Snow Hill in Laurel.

MOTION: Chairman Thompson moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pruden. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (7-0). The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Tyler Anthony Smith
Senior Planner
Historic Preservation Section