

LAUREL HILL HOUSE



Historic Structure Report & Treatment Options



LAUREL HILL HOUSE



Historic Structure Report & Treatment Options

for
Fairfax County, Virginia

June 2008

**Frazier Associates, Architects & Planners
&
Lardner/Klein Landscape Architects, P.C.**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS



Laurel Hill House Committee

Gretchen Bulova,
Fairfax County History Commission
Irma Clifton,
Lorton Heritage Society
Willie Evans Jr.,
Lorton Heritage Society
Neal McBride,
Lorton Heritage Society
Laurie Nesbitt,
Regent, Fairfax County Chapter, NSDAR
Kenena Spalding, *Citizen*
Patricia Winch, *Citizen*

Fairfax County Staff

Thomas Howard,
*Staff Aide, Office of Mount Vernon District
Supervisor Gerald W. Hyland*
Linda Cornish Blank,
*Historic Preservation Planner, Department of
Planning and Zoning (DPZ)*
Chris Caperton,
Laurel Hill Project Coordinator, DPZ
Leanna Hush O'Donnell,
Planner III, DPZ

Fairfax County Staff, *continued*

Bob Betsold,
*Section Manager, Special Projects Branch, Planning
and Development Division, Fairfax County Park
Authority (FCPA)*
Kirk Holley,
*Manager, Special Projects Branch, Planning and
Development Division, FCPA*
Michael Riererson,
*Manager, Resource Stewardship Branch, Resource
Management Division, FCPA*
Aimee Wells,
*Archaeologist, Cultural Resource Management and
Protection Section, FCPA*

The following organizations were kept apprised of the study:

Laurel Hill Project Advisory Citizens
Oversight Committee
Fairfax County Architectural Review Board
Virginia Department of Historic Resources
Fairfax County Department of Transportation
Fairfax County Facilities Management Department



FRAZIER ASSOCIATES
ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING

213 NORTH AUGUSTA STREET, STAUNTON, VA 24401
PHONE 540.886.6230 FAX 540.886.8629
www.frazierassociates.com



Lardner/Klein Landscape Architects, P.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Executive Summary.....	1
------------------------	---

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of Report	3
B. Location of Property	4
C. Preservation Objectives	6
D. Methods of Evaluation.....	6

II. DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY

A. Historical Summary of Laurel Hill Property	7
B. Laurel Hill Property Timeline	9
C. Architectural Evolution of the Laurel Hill House	10
D. Building Description and Condition Assessment.....	15
1. Architectural Description and Condition Assessment.....	15
2. Structural System Description and Condition Assessment	38
3. Building Systems Description and Condition Assessment.....	42
4. Hazardous Materials Description and Condition Assessment	42
5. Site Description and Condition Assessment.....	43
E. Evaluation of Significance	47

III. TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Definitions.....	49
B. Preservation Policies	50
C. Architectural Treatment Options	51
D. Site/Landscape Treatment Options	68
E. Criteria to Analyze Options	69
F. Explanation of Cost Estimates	71

TABLE OF CONTENTS



IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY73

V. DRAWINGS

A. Site Plan.....	75
B. Proposed Building Construction Sequence Plan	76
C. Existing Conditions/Historic Analysis Floor Plans	78
D. Existing Conditions Elevations.....	87
E. Design Options - Drawings	91
1. Option 1 - Plan	91
2. Option 1 - Elevation	92
3. Option 2 - Plan	93
4. Option 2 - Elevation.....	94
5. Option 3 - Plan	95

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)	97
Appendix 2 - Secretary of Interior's Standards	125
Appendix 3 - Meeting Notes	127
A. Laurel Hill House Study: Meeting #1: 08/03/07.....	129
B. Laurel Hill House Study: Meeting #2: 10/30/07	139
C. Laurel Hill House Study: Meeting #3: 01/22/08	151
Appendix 4 - Comments Received.....	159
A. Fairfax County Park Authority Comments:.....	161
B. Comments by Neal McBride.....	185
C. Comment Request to VA Dept. of Historic Resources, Fairfax County Architectural Review Board and Lorton Heritage Society	199
D. Lorton Heritage Society Comments.....	213
E. Donna Beach Comments (Lindsay family descendant).....	217
Appendix 5 - Scope of Work.....	221

LAUREL HILL HOUSE

Historic Structure Report and Treatment Options



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



The Laurel Hill House is located within the Adaptive Reuse Area of the former Lorton Prison site in Fairfax County. The Adaptive Reuse Area is approximately 80 acres and is also part of a larger 511-acre District of Columbia Workhouse and Reformatory Historic District that was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in February 2006.

The Laurel Hill House is listed as a contributing structure to the historic district. It is currently owned by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors.

Originally built circa 1787, it was the home of Major William Lindsay, who served in the Virginia Militia during the American Revolution. Beginning in the early 1900s, the house became part of the Lorton Prison site and served as home to the Superintendent of Lorton Prison. It has a significant relationship to two adjacent cultural resources being considered for improvements by Fairfax County: the former Lorton Reformatory and Penitentiary and the 1930s era neoclassical gardens (that are associated with the Laurel Hill House). Please refer to separate studies for information regarding these related projects.

The building is of wood frame construction with a masonry foundation. It is 1 1/2 stories with a partial basement and upper story spaces created by roof dormers. The area of the house is approximately 3900 square feet (not including the basement).

The structure of the circa 1787 original house still exists, but it has been absorbed within and obscured by numerous additions and alterations. Some of the additions have acquired architectural significance in their own right and are important because they reflect how the building has changed over time. The latest additions, such as the shed dormers and south bathroom addition, have questionable architectural significance. Interior alterations that date from the period of time when the house was used by the adjacent reformatory have damaged, removed or replaced most of the original interior historic fabric.

The house has been vacant since the 1970s and has received only minimal maintenance. As a result, the overall condition of the building ranges from fair to poor. In general, all of the finishes within the building are in need of restoration, repair or replacement. In addition, all of the building systems are in need of replacement. The exterior of the building also is in need of substantial work. An engineering evaluation found the structure of the building to be in serviceable condition.

Three treatment options were developed after receiving input from a committee consisting of County Staff and local citizens. Treatment Option 1 proposes a restoration of the eighteenth century house with a new addition designed to accommodate modern needs. Treatment Option 2 proposes a rehabilitation of the building in its current configuration. Treatment Option 3 proposes an interpretation of the site and foundation after a selective demolition of the house down to the masonry foundation.

Estimated total project cost for Option 1 is estimated to be \$1,515,000 (\$497 per square foot).

Estimated total project cost for Option 2 is estimated to be \$1,772,000 (\$382 per square foot).

Estimated total project cost for Option 3 is estimated to be \$366,000 (\$79 per square foot).