

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 1

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

1. NAME AND LOCATION OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: Waterford Historic District

Other Name/Site Number: Virginia Department of Historic Resources # 401-0123

Street and Number (if applicable): Various

City/Town: Waterford

County: Loudoun

State: Virginia

2. SIGNIFICANCE DATA

NHL Criteria: 1, 4 and 5

NHL Criteria Exceptions: None

NHL Theme(s): III. Expressing Cultural Values
5. architecture, landscape architecture, and urban design
V. Developing the American Economy
VII. Transforming the Environment
(conservation/historic preservation)

Period(s) of Significance: 1733-1936 (Criteria 4 and 5)
1931-1992 (Criterion 1 – Historic Preservation)

Significant Person(s) (only Criterion 2):

Cultural Affiliation (only Criterion 6):

Designer/Creator/Architect/Builder:

Historic Contexts:

XVI. Architecture
V. Historic District
XXXIII. Historic Preservation
B. Regional Efforts: The South

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement. We are collecting this information under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467) and 36 CFR part 65. Your response is required to obtain or retain a benefit. We will use the information you provide to evaluate properties nominated as National Historic Landmarks. We may not conduct or sponsor and you are not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. OMB has approved this collection of information and assigned Control No. 1024-0276.

Estimated Burden Statement. Public reporting burden is 2 hours for an initial inquiry letter and 344 hours for NPS Form 10-934 (per response), including the time it takes to read, gather and maintain data, review instructions and complete the letter/form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate, or any aspects of this form, to the Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, Mail Stop 242, Reston, VA 20192. Please do not send your form to this address.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

3. WITHHOLDING SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Does this nomination contain sensitive information that should be withheld under Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act?

___ Yes

__X__ No

4. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. Acreage of Property: 1,420 acres

2. Use either Latitude/Longitude Coordinates or the UTM system:

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates:

Datum if other than WGS84:

(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

Latitude:

Longitude:

OR

UTM References:	Zone 18N	Easting 275837.51577	Northing 4341982.88639
	Zone 18N	Easting 272703.74066	Northing 4342139.81097
	Zone 18N	Easting 272632.97548	Northing 4339000.77960
	Zone 18N	Easting 275743.00372	Northing 4338942.51608

3. Verbal Boundary Description:

The boundaries of the Waterford Historic District are identical to those approved in the National Register of Historic Places Inventory-Nomination Form for the Waterford Historic District (NR #69000256), as approved June 3, 1969 and the same as the boundaries for the National Historic Landmark District, as approved April 15, 1970.

4. Boundary Justification:

The Waterford Historic District boundaries remain unchanged from the 1970 National Historic Landmark listing. That boundary was established to encompass the intact area visible from the main streets of the village that encompasses the village proper and the sparsely built surrounding agricultural and forested lands. The expanded period and areas of significance included in this additional documentation do not affect the boundary.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 3

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

5. SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT AND DISCUSSION

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Waterford Historic District was first listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1969 and designated a National Historic Landmark in 1970, as an intact eighteenth- and nineteenth-century “Quaker village” that had been “virtually unchanged” since the nineteenth century. Situated in the Catoctin Valley of north-central Loudoun County in Virginia’s Piedmont region, the district totals 1,420 acres and includes both the densely built, unincorporated village of Waterford and the expansive rural area of dispersed farmsteads that surrounds the village core. The original nomination for the Waterford Historic District, like others of its era, was brief and did not include many components required of National Historic Landmark nominations today. This amended nomination expands and builds upon the original justification for the Waterford Historic District’s designation as a National Historic Landmark in 1970. This documentation identifies the nationally significant aspects of Waterford; it is not intended to be a comprehensive evaluation of all relevant historic contexts, areas of significance, and potentially applicable National Register of Historic Places criteria.

The Waterford Historic District is significant under National Historic Landmark **Criteria 4 and 5** as an exceptionally well-preserved example of a common settlement type—an agricultural service village—that emerged in rural areas during the American market revolution of the first half of the nineteenth century, especially in grain-based farming regions like the non-plantation Upland South.¹ Though villages serving farm communities are common throughout the United States and still form much of its cultural fabric today, early forms of these agricultural villages, originating in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and still exhibiting their architecture, setting, and layout from that era, rarely survive intact—especially without substantial later intrusions or loss of their rural settings. Waterford is exceptional for its retention of not only of its village core, including its early street patterns and architecture, but also the surrounding open space and agricultural area. Waterford survives as an intact agricultural service village landscape able to evoke the economic, architectural, aesthetic, and cultural patterns characteristic of America’s pre-urbanized history.

The Waterford Historic District is also nationally significant under National Historic Landmark **Criterion 1**, for the sustained and creative twentieth-century historic preservation campaign that ensured its present high degree of integrity. Waterford’s remarkably intact village architecture and expansive agricultural setting survives with such high integrity due to a multipronged and intensive campaign that employed several emerging preservation approaches and a diverse set of preservation tools. Spearheaded by private citizens that, in 1943, formed the community non-profit, Waterford Foundation, this decades-long collaborative effort represents a laboratory for experimental private preservation strategies that resulted in the conservation of a living landscape where most properties, unlike in a museum restoration like Colonial Williamsburg, have remained in private ownership.

The district has two **periods of significance** that overlap. The period of significance for the village formation and development as an agricultural service village (Criterion 4 and 5) begins in 1733, which marks Amos Janney’s establishment of a dispersed Quaker settlement that would become the village of Waterford, and ends in 1936, the year the Town of Waterford was unincorporated, an administrative act that symbolically reflects the end of its era as an active agricultural service village. The second period of significance encompasses the period when a

¹ Waterford and northern Loudoun County are on the northeast fringes of the “Upland South,” which, in contrast to the “Upper South,” is typically defined based on landforms, especially encompassing greater Appalachia. Northern Loudoun County is situated in the Piedmont of Virginia, and more importantly, shares much of the same mixed-farming, grain-oriented Pennsylvania influence as the Shenandoah Valley and other parts of the region often referred to by scholars of 18th century Virginia as the “backcountry.” The culture and economies of these areas sharply contrast with plantation-based regions in Tidewater/Southside Virginia.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 4

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

series of sustained preservation campaigns (Criterion 1) secured the district's historic character. This second period began in 1931 with Edward and Leroy Chamberlin's first house restoration in the village and ends in 1992 with the completion of a series of pioneering studies that outlined new strategies that would guide the conservation of Waterford's National Historic Landmark district in the face of expanding suburbanization emanating from nearby Washington, DC. This later preservation campaign included innovative efforts to preserve the district's agricultural lands, open spaces, and overall viewsheds. The last of these pioneering preservation strategies, *Linking the Past to the Future*, was published in 1992, and reflected the emerging field of cultural landscape studies and rural landscape conservation.

As a result of almost a century of historic preservation efforts, the Waterford Historic District retains a high level of **integrity**—including integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. Beyond the remarkably well-preserved architecture in the village core, Waterford's natural features—including hedgerows, tree lines, waterways, and viewsheds—have also been sensitively conserved and continue to represent an authentic rural agricultural service village set within farmlands. Additionally, beyond the preservation of its historic resources, the very limited modern infill, especially within the historic core, is notable. The integrity of the district is, in fact, due as much to the lack of twentieth and twenty-first century development in the village core and surrounding agricultural lands as it is to the high degree of integrity found in the individual historic buildings. Waterford's exceptional significance is thus partially derived from its overall appearance—including evocative viewsheds within and outside the village in nearly every direction. The intact views and vistas add greatly to the authentic feel of a rural village as it might have appeared during the nineteenth century, featuring only houses, a few small businesses in the village core, and historic farms and meadows enveloping the village core. As a result, the Waterford Historic District's integrity is exceptionally high.

CRITERIA 4 AND 5

The Waterford Historic District is significant under **Criteria 4 and 5** as an example of an exceptionally well-preserved and intact agricultural service village in the non-plantation Upland South. In the decades between the American Revolution and the U.S. Civil War, the young, agrarian United States witnessed a market and transportation revolution. During this period, Americans increasingly farmed and produced goods not for self-consumption and subsistence, but for their commodity value in the market. During this period, Americans participated in larger economic exchange networks fueled by improved transportation routes, technological innovation, and a growing spirit of competitiveness, individualism, and acquisitiveness. While these forces led to increased manufacturing (especially in the northeastern United States) and an intensification of slavery-based cotton farming (especially in the deep South), the many vast grain-based and mixed-farming regions of the United States witnessed fundamental transformations as well. In the non-plantation Upland South, increased profits from commercial wheat and flour production enabled farmers, and others whose livelihoods depended on the wheat market, to participate in the market revolution, improving their material circumstances and driving increased consumerism.² Coupled with population growth, this increased exchange activity and growing wealth spurred the development of complex and interconnected settlement systems comprised of hamlets, villages, and towns in most agrarian areas of the Upland South.³ Agricultural service villages like Waterford emerged as critical nodes of local commerce that transcended the limited functions of farms and hamlets, frequently serving as the primary centers of exchange, religious worship, education, and social interaction for vast territories of family farms.

² Kenneth E. Koons and Warren R. Hofstra, "Introduction: The World Wheat Made," in *After the Backcountry: Rural Life in the Great Valley of Virginia, 1800-1900* by Kenneth E. Koons and Warren R. Hofstra eds., (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000), xviii-xix.

³ Koons and Hofstra, "Introduction," xviii-xix.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 5

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Though such villages, in various physical and functional manifestations, emerged in many parts of the United States before the Civil War, few have enjoyed such a remarkable degree of preservation of their overall form and appearance as Waterford.

Though Waterford eventually reached and maintained the status of a large agricultural service village, the historic district clearly displays several distinct stages of village building from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These visible stages aptly illustrate the evolution of settlements during the market revolution, demonstrating an important community and economic development pattern that has parallels through 18th and 19th century America. While the village was “designed” in only the loosest sense, it organically evolved in at least four distinct phases—from a dispersed settlement with only a small hamlet, to a linear village, to a larger village with a formal street-grid expansion—and each of these vernacular village forms remains visible on the landscape today. The fourth development phase represents village refinement and diversification during the second half of the nineteenth century—a period that left a strong imprint on Waterford without fundamentally altering its overall size, functions, or general appearance. Waterford’s diverse collection of historic buildings—including both high-style and vernacular dwellings and outbuildings built of log, frame, stone, and brick—underscores the district’s broad spectrum of surviving buildings and landscape features, which illustrate typical settlement and growth patterns of an eighteenth- and nineteenth-century agricultural service village.

Settlement Typologies in the Non-Plantation, Upland South

Analyzing Waterford as a “type” of village—or as a vernacular “form”—offers some challenges, including limited scholarship on small-town development patterns in the non-plantation South. Cultural historian Lisa Tolbert noted in 1999 that “the small-town South remains obscure,” and, in both form and function, small Southern towns were still “an abstraction—somewhere on a continuum between rural and urban space.”⁴ Since that time, additional studies have only chipped away at the obscurity of small Virginia towns. Historian Christopher Hendricks’ 2006 examination of colonial “towns” in backcountry Virginia, which includes a brief section on Waterford, largely focuses on town development as planned, entrepreneurial designs that began with substantial gridded street plats and significant ambitions from the beginning.⁵ Yet it is clear that many smaller settlements—hamlets and villages—were born in more organic ways, growing slowly from a mill seat, or at a crossroads exchange, or from a dispersed community of worship, evolving slowly over time due to economic imperatives and shifts in transportation technology. A closer examination of these smaller, more organic settlements would shed important light on the cultural geography and economic development of the Upland South. To that end, the work by historical geographer Robert D. Mitchell on the Shenandoah Valley is the most useful for understanding settlement patterns in Waterford and northern Loudoun County.⁶ These two adjacent areas share much in common—including their settlement chronologies, Pennsylvania influences, and wheat-centric economic systems. The latter—the heavy reliance on commercial wheat farming—was the main catalyst for the rapid growth of villages and towns in much of the Upland South and distinguished the settlement patterns of these Upland regions from those in the more plantation-based economies of the Tidewater and Deep South.⁷ Historical geographer Charles J. Farmer has, in fact, powerfully demonstrated just how different Virginia’s settlement patterns were south of the Appomattox River during the eighteenth century. That plantation-based region, argues Farmer, almost completely failed to develop hamlets, villages, or towns, since country stores (typically located

⁴ Lisa C. Tolbert, *Constructing Townscapes Space and Society in Antebellum Tennessee* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 2 and 5.

⁵ Christopher E. Hendricks, *The Backcountry Towns of Colonial Virginia* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006), 37-40, 51-56.

⁶ Robert D. Mitchell, “The Settlement Fabric of the Shenandoah Valley, 1790-1860: Pattern, Process, and Structure,” in *After the Backcountry: Rural Life in the Great Valley of Virginia, 1800-1900* by Kenneth E. Koons and Warren R. Hofstra eds., (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000).

⁷ Koons and Hofstra, “Introduction,” xviii-xix.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 6

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

on plantations) almost exclusively met the trade requirements for each locality.⁸

Robert Mitchell, drawing on decades of scholarship, identifies four primary settlement types in the Shenandoah Valley—and the “non-plantation South” more generally—developing mostly between 1790 and 1860: 1) dispersed farms; 2) hamlets; 3) villages; and 4) towns.⁹ Mitchell’s typology relies heavily on population size and distance from other settlements, but like other historical geographers, he also considers the economic functions of these various settlement types. Mitchell and other geographers characterize these settlement units not as isolated developments, but as individual parts of complex and dynamic economic and social systems, serving distinct functions within a larger geographic web. Mitchell’s typology and definitions, based on a region that developed contemporaneously with Loudoun County and with very similar economic and social systems, provides a useful model for understanding Waterford’s role within its larger settlement hierarchy.¹⁰

Dispersed Farms

Arguably the most important and fundamental settlement pattern in grain-based agricultural regions, though not nucleated or “urban” in any way, were the predominant networks of dispersed farms—which were the economic drivers of entire regional economies. In such regions, like the Shenandoah Valley and Loudoun County, farm households were “dispersed over the landscape to form open-country neighborhoods” and “served as the main units of production and local exchange.”¹¹ These scattered, one-family household units “formed the basic social, reproductive, and living arrangements through which virtually every member of farm society interacted with the wider community,” creating “relatively fluid constellations that expanded and contracted with human life cycles.”¹²

Hamlets

Hamlets represent the first and smallest form of clustered settlement, often located along important transportation routes—generally at the intersection of country roads, ferry crossings, or at mill seats.¹³ In addition to a few dwellings, hamlets usually contained “three to four nonfarm functions,” such as a store, artisan’s shop, mill, or schoolteacher.¹⁴ The population of hamlets typically ranged from about 20 to 150.

Villages

Agricultural service villages were larger and more populous than hamlets, containing 150 to 500 residents, with a more diverse range of occupations. Villages typically provided a much more complex array of economic and social functions, serving the needs of both the farm families immediately surrounding the village, as well as those of more distant farmers dispersed among outlying hamlets. Villages often contained at least “one or two streets that contained no farm units” and featured several stores, a church or meetinghouse, a post office (after 1800), an inn and tavern, and residences of several professional people.¹⁵ Mitchell notes that some larger villages were incorporated by legislative charter, especially those villages “already operating as, or [that] would become, a

⁸ See Charles J. Farmer’s “Persistence of country trade: the failure of towns to develop in Southside Virginia during the eighteenth century,” *Journal of Historical Geography*, Vol. 14, Issue 4, 1988, 331-341.

⁹ Mitchell, “The Settlement Fabric,” 40.

¹⁰ American geographers have been highly influenced by “central place” theory, originating in Germany in the early-twentieth century with theorists like Walter Christaller and August Lösch, but have also rejected many of its universal claims, demonstrating that the “ahistorical” approach of these theories—not rooted in time or actual geography—fails to explain the nuances of development at particular times and places.

¹¹ Mitchell, “The Settlement Fabric,” 40.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Karl B. Raitz, “Towns and Villages,” in *The New Encyclopedia of Southern Culture: Volume 2: Geography*, edited by Pillsbury Richard and Wilson Charles Reagan, University of North Carolina Press, 2006, 142.

¹⁴ Mitchell, “The Settlement Fabric,” 34.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 7

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

county or parish seat.”¹⁶ Whether incorporated or not, villages exhibited “qualities of centrality,” defined by Christaller as “the surplus importance of a place, or the ability of a place to provide goods and services in excess of the needs of its own residents.”¹⁷ This surplus provides a critical distinction between hamlets and larger villages, since it “provides the basis for a trading hinterland” and “reciprocity between town and country,” a key feature of the settlement dynamic in the non-plantation, agrarian South.¹⁸

Towns

Besides greater geographical scale and a larger population size (ranging from 500 to 999 residents, or, for “large towns,” more than 1,000), Mitchell’s definition of “towns” in the Shenandoah Valley also suggests that “governmental roles” and “the presence of a professional working class” set them apart from large villages. The large professional class in towns often included politicians, lawyers, bankers, surveyors, and engineers, and thus contributed to a generally higher social and economic class of workers.¹⁹ Towns in the Upland South, unlike their counterparts in many Northern areas, did not require “a significant industrial contribution” to their urbanization.²⁰ Though not the case with all towns, legislative charters by the state of Virginia further distinguished some as county seats. Like other towns, county seats contained a combination of “commercial, artisanal, and administrative functions,” as well as a courthouse square, where countywide governmental functions were carried out.²¹ Mitchell points out that the status of county seat, “combined with transportation centrality in the form of highway and later railroad connections, could transform the town into a bustling community of twenty to thirty thousand people.”²²

Waterford: Building & Sustaining an Important Agricultural Service Village

By around 1800, Waterford had clearly achieved what later historians and geographers would classify as “village” status—meeting many criteria for such a designation and far surpassing many hamlets in Loudoun County in its size, population, and economic and social functions. Yet the village of Waterford’s growth into the key agricultural service village in northern Loudoun County occurred over a century, developing in four major stages, each of which left a distinct physical imprint on Waterford: a phase of dispersed settlement with a small hamlet, the development of a linear village, the creation of a gridded village addition, and a long period of infill and refinement within the existing village framework. Since each of these stages was additive and mostly did not overwrite previous developments, they are all legible and still well-preserved on the village landscape today.

Native Lands (Pre-European Contact – 1722 C.E.)

The land where Waterford now stands and the surrounding Virginia Piedmont have sustained indigenous populations for thousands of years prior to English colonization at Jamestown. Our knowledge of these early pre-contact groups is based largely on archaeological evidence and oral tradition. Modern descendants of these ancient indigenous residents remain in Virginia today and trace their origins to these lands.

Based on archeological evidence, indigenous cultures developed throughout Virginia, beginning approximately 12,000 years ago when the earliest Paleoindian hunters migrated into the region, and continued through the Archaic (8,000 to 1,200 B.C.E.) and Woodland (1,200 B.C.E. to 900 C.E.) periods. These pre-contact groups

¹⁶ *Idem*, 36.

¹⁷ *Idem*, 35-36.

¹⁸ *Idem*, 36.

¹⁹ *Ibid*; Raitz, 143.

²⁰ Mitchell, “The Settlement Fabric,” 45.

²¹ *Idem*, 36.

²² *Ibid*, 36.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 8

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

practiced subsistence strategies structured around the seasonal exploitation of game and other resources. Agriculture first emerged in Virginia during the Late Woodland Period, around 1,000 years ago.²³

Native cultures continued to flourish through the time of initial contact with Europeans. By approximately 950 C.E., the Shenandoah Valley and northern Piedmont of Virginia were inhabited by an indigenous group described by present-day archeologists as the Earthen Mound Burial Culture. During the seventeenth century, their cultural descendants, the Siouan-speaking Mannahoacs and Monacans, lived near the upper Rappahannock River in areas west of the fall line and east of the Blue Ridge Mountains. Their hunting territory likely extended through the land in and around Waterford and north to the Potomac River.²⁴ Contact with European colonizers and traders spread devastating diseases such as smallpox into the interior along well-traveled corridors. Because of widespread mortality linked to European diseases and to inter-tribal warfare in the area, by the late seventeenth century, areas of Virginia that had once been heavily populated by indigenous people saw a decrease in native populations; some indigenous groups resettled away from disease- and war-affected regions.²⁵

Today, the Monacan Indian Nation is a state-recognized tribe based in Amherst, Virginia. The tribe's ancestral lands comprise "the original territory of the Siouan-speaking tribe and its allies" that cover "more than half of present-day Virginia, including almost all of the Piedmont region and parts of the Blue Ridge Mountains." As of the early 21st century, the tribe had about 1,600 members and is "one of the oldest groups of indigenous people still existing in its ancestral homeland."²⁶

In 1722, Virginia Colonial Governor Alexander Spotswood negotiated the Treaty of Albany with the Iroquois to end the warfare between the Iroquois and southern tribes. The treaty established the Blue Ridge Mountains as the boundary between the Virginia Colony and the Iroquois Confederacy, making European colonizers feel it was "safe" to claim and occupy the land that is now Loudoun County.

Phase I: Waterford as a Dispersed Settlement with Small Hamlet (1730-1780)

The first phase of Waterford's post-contact development reflected a general settlement pattern that was common in the region—one that did not result in a dense residential cluster that would be considered a village or town today. Instead, the first European American settlers to inhabit the Waterford area established what was essentially a dispersed community of farms, featuring large tracts of land that collectively sprawled across the region, resembling irregular tiles or a patchwork quilt of farms. In the settlement that would become Waterford, the only visible focal points of community were the mill constructed by Amos Janney, the meetinghouse built by the mostly Quaker settlers, and the road network that facilitated travel and exchange.

Seeking a "Competence"

As historian Warren Hofstra has demonstrated for similar settlements occurring at the same time in the nearby Shenandoah Valley, European settlement of the Virginia backcountry at this time was "a response to specific land-policy initiatives of the colonial government" that appealed especially to European immigrants streaming

²³ Virginia Department of Historic Resources, "First People: The Early Indians of Virginia," <https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/first-people-the-early-indians-of-virginia/> (accessed April 5, 2020).

²⁴ Ronald L. Heinemann, et al., *Old Dominion, New Commonwealth: A History of Virginia, 1607-2007* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007), 4.

²⁵ Michael McConnell, "Before the Great Road, Indian Travelers on the Great Warriors' Path," in *The Great Valley Road of Virginia: Shenandoah Landscapes from Prehistory to Present*, Warren R. Hofstra and Karl Raitz, eds. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010), 64-66.

²⁶ "History of the Monacan Indian Nation," Accessed 22 November 2021 <https://www.commonwealth.virginia.gov/virginia-indians/state-recognized-tribes/#d.en.7893>

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 9

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

through Pennsylvania and other groups who were economically frustrated by the lack of affordable land in the Mid-Atlantic. For many of these settlers, especially those escaping post-feudal, “dependent” land relations in Europe, “the most meaningful social distinction was not one of class, but one between dependence and independence.” Especially for the many Quakers who settled in northern Loudoun County (some of whom had lived in agricultural villages in Europe), they sought to avoid the constraints of living in close proximity and instead chose to “settle at some distance from one another in farmsteads set in the midst of contiguous fields.”²⁷ Achieving economic independence meant acquiring a “competence,” meaning “sufficient agricultural assets—land, stock, tools, and buildings—to sustain the yearly subsistence of the family and to ensure the long-term continuity of the family unit.”²⁸ As such, like in much of backcountry Virginia and elsewhere during the early-eighteenth century, Waterford’s first settlement period featured a “decentralized settlement system characterizing a people whose objective in taking up and developing the land lay in building a competence through household production and local exchange.”²⁹ For many of the Quaker families that settled in the Catoctin Creek region, the promise of good land at reasonable prices was an attractive option, especially for those who had been living in eastern Pennsylvania or western New Jersey localities where affordable land was already difficult to find.

Dividing the Landscape: Colonial Virginia’s Land Policy, Surveying, & Parceling the Land

Colonial Virginia’s land policy was highly attractive to potential settlers who wished to achieve such financial stability through farming. The Virginia policy for western lands during the eighteenth century “accommodated the desires of these people by awarding extensive powers of land ownership,” which “allowed for the private ownership of land in fee simple with exclusive rights to profit by labor on the land or devise land by deed or will,” but that also “imposed no requirements to establish towns or even clustered settlements.” The policy allowed—and even encouraged—population dispersal as individuals searched “for prime seats for farms, mills, ferries, and other locations crucial to production and exchange in a household economy.”³⁰ In the Opequon region of the northern Shenandoah Valley, Hofstra found that “the single greatest conclusion to be drawn” about settlement patterns there was that “they scattered,” and that “neither for the sake of protection nor for social and economic convenience did they cling together.”³¹ At another settlement to the west of Waterford, one that included 70 families and was also settled by Quakers who established a meeting in 1734, Hofstra found that they still “did not cluster around this meeting” and instead they “scattered,” with only a few family members living adjacent to the meeting site.³²

The shape and size of the land parcels granted to early settlers in the Waterford area—like Amos Janney and brother-in-law Francis Hague—helped to form the patterns of ownership and land use in the settlement. Land grants were comparatively small in this region since “the government made efforts to limit the number of extensive grants.” As such, most grants were less than 600 acres, with “three hundred being typical.”³³ Though several of the early grants in the Waterford region totaled over 300 acres (Amos Janney’s tract was 400 acres, and Francis Hague’s was 303), the grants were subdivided during the eighteenth century and the typical farm lot around Waterford became 150 to 200 acres. This allowed for, “agricultural units of a scale that could be profitably

²⁷ James T. Lemon, *Best Poor Man’s Country* (Place of Publication Not Identified: W. W. Norton & Co, 1976), 98.

²⁸ Warren R. Hofstra, “Private Dwellings, Public Ways, and the Landscape of Early Rural Capitalism in Virginia’s Shenandoah Valley,” in *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, Vol. 5 Gender, Class, and Shelter*, 1995, 212-213.

²⁹ Hofstra, “Private Dwellings,” 213.

³⁰ Hofstra, “Private Dwellings,” 213.

³¹ Warren R. Hofstra, *The Planting of New Virginia: Settlement and Landscape in the Shenandoah Valley*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006, 99.

³² Hofstra, *The Planting*, 101. This dispersed settlement, situated near present day Clear Brook, Virginia, was organized within the 2,373-acre landholding of Alexander Ross and his partner, Morgan Bryan.

³³ Hendricks, 11.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 10

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

farmed by a single family.”³⁴ The shape of such land patents varied considerably. There were general rules governing the appropriate methods of surveying and dividing the land, but in any locality, the geographic challenges, topographic features, and the proclivities of individual surveyors led to irregular outcomes. To acquire a land patent in backcountry Virginia, a settler had to select a piece of land, have the tract professionally surveyed, and then officially recorded. To prevent settlers from claiming irregular parcels that took advantage of all the best land in a locality, the shape of land patents was supposed to be as standardized as possible—using east-west and north-south lines, for example, and limiting water frontage to a length that was proportional to the size of the parcel. In practice, however, surveyors “routinely ignored their instructions and laid out irregularly shaped grants” and sometimes “rewarded friends or punished enemies by exaggerating or understating the size of holdings.”³⁵

This dispersed settlement pattern remains visible today in the farms that surround the core of Waterford’s village and comprise a key characteristic of the agricultural service village.

Towards Nucleation: The Early Hamlet of Waterford

The mill on Catoctin Creek served as a key focal point in Waterford when it was constructed by Amos Janney in the 1730s. The earliest references to the community called the area “Mill Town” or “Janney’s Mill.”³⁶ Mills were critical engines of development in newly settled areas across Colonial and Early-Republic America since they often served as both saw and gristmills. As settlers constructed their first dwellings and barns, they required sawn lumber for walls, flooring, and finish work. As they harvested their first grain crops, a gristmill was required to efficiently process corn and wheat into meal and flour for subsistence or exchange. The area just north of Janney’s new mill, around the present-day intersection of First, Bond, and Main Streets, soon featured the earliest cluster of buildings. The mill, as the nexus for economic activity, was a primary point of interaction during the first decades of settlement in the Waterford area.

Within a year or two of the mill’s construction, a Quaker meetinghouse was established about a half mile east of the mill, also on Amos Janney’s land, creating a social and spiritual focal point for the community—as well as an eastern, second node for the village. First constructed in 1741 (and rebuilt in stone in 1761), the Fairfax Meetinghouse was the place of worship for Quakers for many miles around. An early road (present day Water Street), running northwest-southeast, connected the mill site/settlement cluster and the Fairfax Meetinghouse, providing the first settlement axis for the village.³⁷

The buildings and landscape features of the dispersed settlement period (c. 1730-1780) are reflective of early colonial building patterns across the colony—the buildings were constructed using readily available materials, in this case primarily log and fieldstone. The forms that the buildings took were vernacular in nature, typically one-room hall plan, or two-room hall-parlor variations. Architectural evidence of Waterford’s early dispersed settlement period remains around the intersection of Main Street and Bond Street. It was not until the 1760s when a marked shift from impermanent (log) to permanent (brick and stone) construction occurred in the village.

Phase II: A Growing Hamlet—Waterford’s Linear Growth (1780-1800)

Around 1780, the growing hamlet surrounding the mill took on the name Waterford, and contained around 80 residents.³⁸ Waterford’s first significant expansion occurred after 1780, when a cousin of Amos Janney, Joseph

³⁴ Antoinette Lee, *Waterford National Historic Landmark: Its Significance and Protection*, Waterford Foundation, Inc.: Waterford, Virginia, 1989, 24.

³⁵ Hendricks, 10.

³⁶ Elizabeth Brabec, *Linking the Past to the Future: A Landscape Conservation Strategy for Waterford, Virginia*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, 1992, 27.

³⁷ Lee, 18.

³⁸ Hellman, 1; Scheel 10.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 11

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Janney, bought a 12-acre tract of land along Main Street from Francis Hague's heirs, subdividing the tract into building lots along both sides of what would become Main Street, including 15 on the south side, extending from the mill to the present village center at Second Street.³⁹ While a few houses on Main Street predated this subdivision, the surviving buildings there today suggest that the subdivision prompted the construction of several hybrid commercial-residential buildings during the 1780s and 1790s. The form of Janney's expansion was still partially dictated by the topography of the area, following the old road on the terrace above the Catoclin floodplain, but it now took on a new dimension of developmental intent and density. Representing entrepreneurial opportunity in a quickening of the agricultural market, Janney's acquisition, and subdivision of the parcel along the main thoroughfare served to accelerate a larger and denser settlement cluster within the community of dispersed farms. During this expansion, Waterford was becoming more commercially and architecturally diverse—now featuring about a dozen houses, and, in addition to its mill, a store, a blacksmith shop, a tannery, the meetinghouse, and many dispersed farms on the periphery of the hamlet.⁴⁰

Change and growth were not confined to the hamlet's core alone. Over the first century of settlement, the rural expanses surrounding the streets of Waterford were slowly subdivided into smaller farms, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the area adjacent to the village was comprised of family farms averaging 150 to 200 acres, resulting in a higher agricultural population encircling the village.⁴¹ The financial prospects of farmers in Waterford at the turn of the nineteenth century seem to have been generally promising. One writer in the nineteenth century claimed that farmland around Waterford was "equal to any in the state of Virginia" and "excellent wheat and corn land."⁴² Local farmers maintained and enhanced this rich farmland through the "Loudoun Method of Farming," which may have originated with settlers from southeast Pennsylvania and introduced a three-step fertilizing treatment of lime, manure, and clover to increase the fertility of the soil. This system was well-publicized by John Binns (writing from Clover Hill Farm just north of Waterford) in *A Treatise on Practical Farming*, published in 1803 that was acknowledged by Thomas Jefferson.⁴³

Waterford's growth, like that in other rural communities in the region, was a product of larger changes in the market, especially tied to the commercial production of grain and flour for broad markets.⁴⁴ This economic growth was likely spurred by an increase in grain prices internationally after the middle of the eighteenth century and a shift from subsistence-focused farming to more market-oriented farming practices. Farmers in the backcountry of the non-plantation, Upland South could now easily sell their surplus crops and milled products outside their own dispersed settlements and in return have access to more disposable income and, thus, more refined goods.⁴⁵ This trade was facilitated by east-west transportation routes linking Waterford to the Shenandoah Valley and to the Potomac River port cities of Alexandria and Georgetown.⁴⁶

³⁹ Hellman, 1; Scheel, 10; and John E. Divine, *When Waterford and I Were Young* (Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 1997), 25. Divine points out that the area "south of the scales across Liggett Street was used for many years as a tanyard. A 1785 deed description mentions as the Tanyard Branch a little spring-fed stream that crosses Main Street about a hundred yards south of the mill. . . . There were actually two tanneries in the general area—they may have overlapped for a time. The upper tanyard was owned first by William Hough (1744-1815) and son Joseph (1770-1806), and later by Joseph Bond. . . . The Houghs' operation was more modest than the one just downstream that followed; Thomas Phillips (c.1783-1842) and Asa Moore Bond (c.1804-1878), brother of Joseph, owned the later enterprise as partners. One local resident remembered it as a "great tannery full of tan bark and mysterious vats that looked black and terrible" to her as a child."

⁴⁰ Scheel, 10.

⁴¹ Scheel, 14-17.

⁴² Joseph, Martin, *A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer of Virginia, and the District of Columbia*. Charlottesville, VA: Moseley & Tompkins, Printers, 1835, 216.

⁴³ Scheel, 11.

⁴⁴ Hofstra, "Private Dwellings," 212.

⁴⁵ Hofstra, "Private Dwellings," 212.

⁴⁶ Brabec, "Linking the Past," 28.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 12

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Phase III: Waterford as an Agricultural Service Village with Gridded Addition (1800-1836)

Reliable population numbers are not available for Waterford before 1810 but based on the estimated tripling of the population from around 80 inhabitants in 1780 (still a “hamlet” by most typologies) to 266 in 1810 (the first year Waterford is separately enumerated in the U.S. Census), Waterford had rapidly transformed from a small hamlet into a substantial and growing village in just a few decades. Waterford undeniably possessed an economic and social gravity that would generate several more decades of growth. By 1800, according to an early twentieth century report, Waterford was now home to several stores, “a number of enterprising mechanics of various trades,” a tavern, and a new woolen factory.⁴⁷

Although chattel slavery was entrenched throughout Virginia and was the basis for much of the wealth generated throughout the state and beyond, the Pennsylvania and German migrants who settled in northwestern Loudoun County were less likely to own enslaved people than their counterparts in the eastern and southern parts of the county. By the early 19th century, there were both free and enslaved African American’s living in Waterford. In 1818, records show that a free African American, Nero Lawson, purchased a lot on Water Street; other documents record that limited numbers of Blacks were able to learn to read and write even though state law disallowed the teaching of enslaved people. Despite the influence of residents with Quaker and German origins and their general disinclination to slavery, many townspeople and farmers owned and hired enslaved people and African American’s were bought and sold along Main Street in the early- to mid-19th century.⁴⁸

As wealth increased and small villages like Waterford prospered nationwide, the results could be seen tangibly on the landscape in terms of new industry and stylish new dwellings.⁴⁹ In Waterford, the continued expansion of the local economy spurred a second linear extension of Main Street.⁵⁰ Around 1801, the same year the Virginia General Assembly officially established the Town of Waterford, Mahlon Janney extended Main Street up the steep hill to the east, where Main Street had dog-legged to the northeast to become what is now Water Street.⁵¹ Janney’s newest road did not, in fact, alter the overall layout of the village, but instead created a new fork that followed the same east-west development of the town. This allowed a total of 17 house lots to be subdivided along either side of the Main Street extension. Unlike the Joseph Janney subdivision, the new buildings were primarily domestic dwellings instead of hybrid commercial and residential structures. The buildings were often brick two-story structures built in the Federal style. Mahlon Janney even relocated from his previous residence on Bond Street to a new lot on the recently platted Main Street, where he built a two-story, five-bay, Federal style brick home. Mahlon Janney also established another gristmill in Waterford, south of the village along Ball’s Run around 1803.⁵² The gristmill, later known as the Schooley Mill, was used to process corn and limestone, freeing up Janney’s primary mill for merchant flour production.⁵³ These developments reflect the continued dominance of commercial wheat production that fueled Waterford’s expansion.

After Mahlon Janney’s 1801 subdivision, another major development signaled more ambitions for Waterford’s future village growth—the planning of a larger, gridded addition that would double the size of the existing linear

⁴⁷ Patrick A. Deck and Henry Heaton, *An Economic and Social Survey of Loudoun County*, Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia, 1926, 29.

⁴⁸ Souders, Bronwen and John, “Share with Us, Waterford, Virginia’s African-American Experience,” (Waterford Foundation, n.d.) Excerpt accessed 15 October 2021: <https://www.waterfordva-wca.org/history/waterford-afr-amer-slavery.htm>

⁴⁹ William Butler, “Another City Upon a Hill: Litchfield, Connecticut, and the Colonial Revival,” in *The Colonial Revival in America*, edited by Alan Axelrod, Winterthur, Delaware: The Henry Francis du Pont Museum, 1985, 18.

⁵⁰ Hofstra, “Private Dwellings,” 212.

⁵¹ “An Act to Establish Several Towns,” Section 6 and Section 7, passed by the Virginia General Assembly January 8, 1801.

⁵² Studio Ammons, “The Waterford Mill, Waterford Virginia: Historic Structure Report,” Petersburg, VA, May 24, 2013, 14. The fulling mill was known as the Moore and Farquhar Fulling Mill and served as a grist mill by the 1850s.

⁵³ Studio Ammons, 14.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 13

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

village. In 1809, Mahlon Janney was willed a property described as the “New Addition,” containing “21 acres and twelve agreeable to a survey made by Israel Janney . . . a plat thereof in possession to establish the addition.”⁵⁴ Whether the 1809 document referenced a full legal subdivision, or whether this was carried out after Mahlon Janney passed away in 1812, the major “New Addition” effectively doubled the size of Waterford on paper—establishing 64 new building lots on a newly gridded street plan to the south of Main Street and Market Hill, perpendicular to the village center.⁵⁵ Each new parcel was about a quarter acre, providing larger building lots than most earlier parcels along Main Street. This new section of town, aptly named “New Town,” created a gridded network of roads south of Main Street. Between High Street, which ran along the top of the ridge overlooking the Catoctin Creek floodplain, and Second Street, which ran along the bottom of that ridge, several steep cross streets were platted up the hill, including Mahlon Street, Patrick Street, Janney Street, and the southernmost road, Factory Street—connecting a second industrial cluster of buildings that had developed along Ball’s Run.⁵⁶ This gridded section of Waterford still responded to natural and topographic constraints, namely—to the west of Second Street, the floodplain of the Catoctin Creek, and to the east of High Street, another foothill. The platters of “New Town” had created the town grid on the slope between the agricultural fields above High Street and the unbuildable floodplain below Second Street.

Despite the ambition and optimism in establishing this newly gridded street system, population growth in Waterford leveled off—and perhaps even declined—between 1820 and 1830. Census data may be misleading, depending on what exact area was tabulated as “Waterford” from decade to decade, but those numbers indicate a substantial decline from 482 residents in 1820 to 386 people in 1830, nearly a twenty percent reduction.⁵⁷ Whatever the actual numbers, a combination of factors likely caused Waterford’s slowed growth after the first quarter of the 1800s. First, inexpensive fertile lands were opening for settlement in western states and territories, likely siphoning off a segment of Waterford’s population that sought new opportunities to the west. Some accounts suggest that many in Waterford’s Quaker community, disheartened over Virginia’s retention of slavery, moved to northeast Ohio and other territories in search of free societies and new opportunities.⁵⁸ At the same time, the village was bypassed by major new transportation systems that instead boosted nearby settlements. In 1830, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad reached Point of Rocks, Maryland, on the Potomac River about seven miles northeast of Waterford. Just two years later, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal also reached Point of Rocks. Furthermore, by 1832, west of Waterford, the completion of the Leesburg and Snicker’s Gap Turnpike—known as old Route 7 today—connected Leesburg to the Shenandoah Valley, leaving Waterford well-separated from a major east-west corridor. The completion of a north-south highway—today’s Route 15—between Point of Rocks and Leesburg in 1853 also bypassed Waterford, further isolating the village from the major transportation and commercial networks of the region.

Still, by 1835, a gazetteer published by Joseph Martin, as it described in detail the settlement ecosystem of Loudoun County, illustrated Waterford’s important status as one of only three villages in the county, and the only one in its northern region. Waterford possessed all the necessary components of a bustling agricultural service village typical of the Upland South—featuring several streets on which no farms were located, increased and diverse commercial establishments, several religious and educational institutions, as well as professionals such as physicians. The 1835 gazetteer listed six mercantile stores, four taverns, two churches, two “free schools,” two water-powered mills, three physicians, two house-joiners, two cabinetmakers, two hatters, one each of a boot and shoe manufacturer, a painter, a chair-maker, and a tailor.⁵⁹ Waterford was the second largest of the agricultural

⁵⁴ Will for Mahlon Janney, Loudoun County, Will Book K, page 119.

⁵⁵ Hellman, 2; Scheel 12.

⁵⁶ Scheel, 13.

⁵⁷ 1830 United States Census, Waterford, Loudoun County, Virginia, digital image, *Ancestry.com*.

⁵⁸ Scheel, 17-18.

⁵⁹ Scheel, 17-18.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 14

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

service villages in Loudoun County, with a population of 400 people residing in 70 dwelling houses.⁶⁰

Waterford, like the other two villages in Loudoun County during the early nineteenth century, offered goods, services, and social institutions for a primarily agrarian clientele dispersed over an expansive area of farms and hamlets. Waterford's role as one of the key processing centers in Loudoun County, which was one of the major producers of wheat and corn in the state of Virginia, underscores the importance of agricultural service villages in their respective territories. Though not represented in Martin's 1835 *Gazetteer*, the predominant and foundational settlement fabric of Loudoun County was the patchwork of family farms, which represented most of the county's land area and population (84%), and which relied on Waterford and other villages for critical goods and services.⁶¹

The only settlement in Loudoun County larger than any of these agricultural service villages was the county seat of Leesburg, which emerged early on as a center of government and a node of significant trade due to its location along major roadways. The population of Leesburg was 1,700 people, or approximately eight percent of Loudoun County's 21,939 residents in 1830, positioning it at the top of the settlement hierarchy.⁶² Middleburg (430 residents), Waterford (400 residents), and Hillsboro (172 residents) were the only three settlements large enough to be considered agricultural service villages based on Mitchell's typology, but at least two dozen hamlets existed at the time in Loudoun County—ranging in population from merely a handful of residents to 135 people in Unison. Some hamlets only contained a post office, while others contained dozens of dwellings, religious buildings, and a small handful of commercial functions.

Phase IV: Refinement of a Village—Incorporation, Infill, and Diversification (1836-1936)

Waterford was formally incorporated in March 1836 and subsequently self-governed by a council of nine "freeholders." The incorporation act invested the freeholders with the power to erect a town hall, a workhouse (poor house), a fire company, and a market house and jail on the town triangle.⁶³ It is not clear if a dedicated town hall, workhouse, or fire house were ever constructed, but by 1840, according to one source, the town's population had reached around 500—which, if accurate, would represent the peak size for Waterford village.⁶⁴ While some histories portray Waterford's fortunes during the second half of the nineteenth century as a "failure" to grow in size or to develop further manufacturing, the village is best understood as continuing to function as a healthy and evolving agricultural service village, through the Victorian era and into the early twentieth century. While the footprint of the village of Waterford did not change after the platting of "New Town" during the 1810s, the century between 1836 and 1936 witnessed the construction of at least 54 new primary buildings—demonstrating a high level of continued investment in the village. The additional buildings included three new churches, two new schools, a jail, a purpose-built post office, six new stores or small manufacturers, and many new houses. Of these, 35 were built between 1870 and 1910, including much of the village's preserved commercial core—one of its more iconic focal points today.

During the mid-nineteenth century, agriculture continued to drive the economy of Waterford, and farmers surrounding the village continued to produce large grain harvests for market. During the 1850s, Schooley's Mill processed corn meal, hominy, and lumber, and other manufacturers continued to operate in the Factory Street area.⁶⁵ Samuel Means, the prosperous owner of the large merchant mill at Waterford during the Civil War,

⁶⁰ Martin, 216.

⁶¹ 1830 United States Census, Waterford, Loudoun County, Virginia, digital image, *Ancestry.com*; Martin, 210.

⁶² 1830 United States Census, Waterford, Loudoun County, Virginia, digital image, *Ancestry.com*; Martin, 210.

⁶³ Scheel, 17.

⁶⁴ Scheel, 18.

⁶⁵ Lee, 29.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 15

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

reportedly owned 28 horses for hauling flour to Point of Rocks, Maryland.⁶⁶ By 1860, the population of Waterford according to the U.S. Census was 428.⁶⁷ As the Civil War loomed on the horizon, the village continued to bustle with several stores, manufactories, and an impressive array of trades—including blacksmiths, wheelwrights, saddlers, coopers, cabinet makers, carpenters, stone masons, tailors, millers, and even some specialty trades and professions like confectioners, doctors, and an ambrotypist (photographer).⁶⁸

Slavery existed in Waterford well before the Civil War. Though fewer in number than in other parts of Virginia and in many other southern states, enslaved people of African descent were forced to labor for the benefit of their White enslavers both on farms and businesses within the village. The more limited number of enslavers in the western portion of Loudoun County is likely related to the demographics of the early settlers (largely Pennsylvania Quakers) in these areas, as well as by the smaller farms sizes and less labor-intensive crops being cultivated.

Between 1830 and the Civil War, about 20 free Black families lived in Waterford—representing about one-fifth to one-quarter of the town’s population. Many of free African American men worked as skilled laborers, including as blacksmiths, mechanics, and in other crafts.⁶⁹ Still, there were enslaved African Americans living and working in the village and many neighboring farms used enslaved labor. Public auctions of enslaved persons occurred on Main Street in front of the taverns that lined what’s known as Arch House row (40158-40174 Main Street). An 1830 newspaper advertisement announced Klein’s Tavern (40174 Main Street) as the site of a sale of enslaved persons. Lewis Klein the owner of the tavern himself enslaved African Americans who worked at the tavern.⁷⁰

On May 23, 1861, the Waterford precinct voted 220-31 against secession from the United States, while nearby Leesburg voted 400-22 to join the Confederacy. During the Civil War Waterford was intermittently occupied by both Confederate and United States troops and a few minor skirmishes took place in or nearby the village. Sympathies were heavily divided throughout Loudoun County which bordered the United States-held state of Maryland across the Potomac River. In Waterford, most citizens supported the United States in the conflict. Still, substantial damage was done to both Union- and Confederate-sympathizers’ properties, especially on the surrounding farms. Both Confederate and United States troops were quartered in the village at various times, and at least two residents were kidnapped by Southern troops and held hostage for the return of imprisoned Confederate soldiers. Several African Americans from Waterford served with United States Colored Troops, including Henson Young who enlisted in Baltimore in 1864 and would later be one of the originally trustees of the African American school built in Waterford in 1867.⁷¹

In the decades following the turmoil of the Civil War, the villagers of Waterford, as well as the dispersed area farmers, set about rebuilding. The commercial production of wheat and corn in Loudoun County still fueled the economy as well as the rebuilding campaign.⁷² In the farms around Waterford, several barns and other agricultural outbuildings had been burned during Civil War torch raids. After the war, most of these structures were rebuilt, including those on the Talbott, Hague-Hough, and Clifton farms. Many of these barns were reconstructed on their

⁶⁶ Divine, 21.

⁶⁷ 1860 United States Census, Waterford, Loudoun County, Virginia, digital image, *Ancestry.com*.

⁶⁸ 1860 United States Census, Waterford, Loudoun County, Virginia, digital image, *Ancestry.com*. An ambrotypist is a person who captures positive photographs on wet plates.

⁶⁹ Scheel, 18.

⁷⁰ Souders, Bronwen and John, “Share with Us, Waterford, Virginia’s African-American Experience,” (Waterford Foundation, n.d.) Excerpt accessed 15 October 2021: <https://www.waterfordva-wca.org/history/waterford-afr-amer-slavery.htm>

⁷¹ John E. Divine, *When Waterford & I Were Young* (Waterford Foundation, 1994), excerpt accessed 19 November 2021: <https://www.waterfordhistory.org/history/waterford-african-amer-2/>

⁷² James William Head, *History and Comprehensive Description of Loudoun County*, Park View Press, 1908, 87.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 16

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

original fieldstone foundations, with post-Civil War timber framing.⁷³ In the village, a new one-room schoolhouse for Black children, Second Street School, was built in 1867 at the corner of Second and Janney Streets. It was one of nine such schools in Loudoun County largely organized by the African American citizens and partially sponsored by the United States Freedmen's Bureau and various Northern philanthropic organizations.⁷⁴

In 1875, Waterford, like many towns in the area, reincorporated due to the legal vagaries after the Civil War and as a way to raise taxes and update ordinances.⁷⁵ Waterford's new ordinances shed light on the new civic goals of the town's leadership during the Victorian era. All houses were required to have hitching posts, since horses could not be tethered to trees, gates, or fences. Further, despite Waterford's intimate relationship with farming and animal husbandry, any penned-in hogs that were offensive to neighbors could be removed by council vote. Ordinances stipulated that the main streets were to be 20 feet wide with five-foot wide sidewalks, graded, and of wood or some type of paving. Each owner had to remove debris, waste matter, and weeds from his property, and the construction of any building other than a dwelling had to be approved by the town council.⁷⁶ Likely related to this reincorporation, the small stone jail was built adjacent to the busy intersection of Main, Water, and Second Streets. In 1883, the impressive new Presbyterian Church was constructed in the Gothic Revival style on High Street. All these developments aimed for a more refined aesthetic, and a more urban sensibility, for Waterford village during the Victorian era.

Between 1885 and 1905, many new dwellings and other structures were built in Waterford village. Some demand for summer or country homes among wealthy newcomers may have helped fuel this activity.⁷⁷ Almost twenty new houses were built during these decades, especially filling in empty lots on both sides of Second Street, as well as newly subdivided lots on High Street, near the intersections with Main and Patrick Streets. Factory Street also transitioned to a residential area during this time, as the old manufactories and workshops there closed in the face of a rapidly industrializing and urbanizing nation. Many of these new houses were larger in scale, built in Victorian styles, and enjoyed larger lots of open space. Several older houses in town were "Victorianized" during this period through the addition of porches and architectural ornament.⁷⁸

In February 1888, *The Loudoun Telephone*, a newspaper based in nearby Hamilton, Virginia, published a short column summarizing life in Waterford. Though brief, and perhaps biased, the picture it painted was one of a quiet but stable village community, perhaps still hanging on to some social and financial traditions of an earlier agricultural village. It noted that:

Waterford is quiet—Socially there is nothing brilliant; the men attend the Farmers Club, the ladies go to their Household, both take a hand in an occasional quilting and the young folks hang over the front gate in the moonlight. Financially, there is nothing startling. The several stores seem to be doing a fairly good business and the Mills seem to be quite busy, but ready cash is not abundant. Religiously, the Town is experiencing no sensation at this time. Morally, there is occasion for the remark that Waterford is too near "The Point [of Rocks]" for its own good. In other towns of the county, I hear the charge that there is a good deal of drinking in Waterford—and I am afraid the town is not in position to bring suit for slander

⁷³ Lee, 31.

⁷⁴ Scheel, 20; *Friends Intelligencer* (Philadelphia, PA), November 23, 1867.

⁷⁵ Scheel, 20.

⁷⁶ Scheel, 21.

⁷⁷ As late as 1908, James Head noted that, "In common with the other towns and villages of the famous Loudoun Valley, Waterford is noted for its numerous and inexhaustible wells of the purest and best water, bracing air, and low mortality rate," which might explain part of the attraction of Waterford as a healthy country retreat. James William Head, *History and Comprehensive Description of Loudoun County*, Park View Press, 1908, 75.

⁷⁸ Lee, 31-33.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 17

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

on this score.⁷⁹

That the stores were “doing a fairly good business” and the mills appeared “quite busy” suggests that the agricultural community surrounding the village of Waterford, which had always been a source of its vitality, and thereby Waterford itself, was going strong.

Corresponding to the Victorian housing boom of 1885 to 1905, eleven new commercial, social, and manufacturing buildings were constructed during these same decades. Six of these new buildings were located at or near Waterford’s central intersection of Main, Second, and High Streets. In 1872, Loudoun Mutual Fire Company constructed a one-story, brick, Italianate style office at the corner of Second and Main Streets. Three years later, around 1875, a new tin shop was built on the parcel to the immediate southwest of Loudoun Mutual. Just around the corner, on Main Street, a new purpose-built post office was constructed c. 1880, replacing an older c. 1812 brick store.⁸⁰ Across the street from the tin shop, a new forge was also built in 1880, and in 1883, a general store (now known as Waterford Market) was constructed to the southwest of the tin shop. The last prominent commercial building constructed at this intersection was another store (now called the Corner Store), constructed c. 1900 in the Second Empire style on the triangular point between Second and Main streets. Over just twenty years, the commercial core of Waterford had been significantly transformed as it continued to serve a vital agricultural community.

By the 1890s, members of Waterford’s sizable Black community had constructed two new buildings of their own—a house of worship and a fraternal organization hall. First, the John Wesley Methodist Episcopal Church, constructed in 1891, was built on the site of a former livery stable on Bond Street. This gave the Black Methodists a dedicated place of worship in the village, whereas previously they had been holding service in the Second Street School. In 1893, the African American Lodge No. 2631 of the Grand United Order of Odd Fellows was constructed on Second Street, adjacent to the Second Street School.

All of these new buildings constructed just before the turn of the twentieth century signaled Waterford’s continued vitality and evolution as an important agricultural service village for northern Loudoun County, where its farmers produced impressive quantities of commercial corn and wheat for sale in local markets.⁸¹ One chronicler of Loudoun County still counted “383 inhabitants” in Waterford in 1908 (including 14 “merchants and mechanics”), but the Victorian building boom had run its course.⁸² The clear drop in population in the village is representative of larger settlement patterns in the region. Two factors contributed to a widespread decrease in population, affecting all of rural northern Virginia at this time—young people were increasingly moving to urban areas, lured by employment opportunities that were less arduous and more lucrative than farming, coupled with partial or total crop failures in the region.⁸³ Highlighting this continued demographic trend, the population of Waterford declined to 316 residents in 1920, and then by 1926, it dropped again to just 267 residents.⁸⁴ Perhaps unsurprisingly, despite a generally strong economy in the United States during the 1920s, Waterford witnessed only a few newly constructed houses during that entire decade.

By the middle of the 1920s, farmers in Loudoun County were shifting to agricultural production that relied less heavily on wheat and other grains, resulting in the increased obsolescence of small-scale milling operations like

⁷⁹ Quoted in Scheel, 22.

⁸⁰ Hellman, 21.

⁸¹ Head, 88.

⁸² Head, 75.

⁸³ Head, 86.

⁸⁴ 1920 United States Census, Waterford, Loudoun County, Virginia, digital image, *Ancestry.com*; Patrick A. Deck and Henry Heaton, *An Economic and Social Survey of Loudoun County*, Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia, 1926, 29.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 18

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

that in Waterford. Many of the farmers in Loudoun County had incorporated aspects of commercial dairying into their diversified farm operations or had switched their farms entirely over to dairy farming.⁸⁵ One report stated that “yearly, more farmers are installing dairies, as they realize that conditions in the county are unusually well adapted to dairy farming.”⁸⁶ Farmers were now dedicating a portion of their farmsteads to the production of ensilage and corn to feed their dairy herds. Out of the 95 counties in the state of Virginia, Loudoun County ranked fourth in the total value of dairy products produced.⁸⁷ While the farmers of Loudoun County were still producing substantial levels of corn and wheat—the county was in fact the top producer of corn in the state, and they ranked third in wheat production—these grains increasingly went either to feed dairy cows or for sale in markets outside of Loudoun County, in Baltimore or Washington, D.C.⁸⁸ This shift in agricultural production and distribution directly impacted the livelihoods of many residents in small agricultural service villages like Waterford. The ability to ship farm products farther away and faster was facilitated by the rise in commercial trucking. Automobile transportation, in general, greatly reduced the importance of local service villages, as many rural people could easily and quickly travel to towns and cities with more shopping and other attractions.

Like with so many small settlements in the United States, the Great Depression reinforced Waterford’s decline, affecting the farmers outside of town as well as the owners of the village’s houses and stores. By 1930, the population of Waterford had dropped slightly again to just 258 residents.⁸⁹ The variety of trades, services, and occupations found in the village had lessened, while non-specialized labor occupations increased.⁹⁰ Stores and mechanics still present in Waterford at that time included blacksmiths, grocers, a florist, a lawyer, a livestock dealer, a painter, tanners, laundresses, a broom maker, merchants, a miller, a sheriff, and a funeral director. Perhaps another indication of the end of the previous way of life in Waterford was the emergence of new occupations, as recorded in the 1930 U.S. Federal Census—including garage laborer, trucker, and telephone operator.⁹¹ These new occupations suggest that more residents were working outside the village in other towns or cities, perhaps in Leesburg.

After almost 200 years, Waterford seemed to have in many ways run its course as an agricultural service village. In a seemingly symbolic turn of events, in April 1929, the remaining Quakers in Waterford “laid down” the Fairfax Meeting due to a lack of an active congregation. The minutes of that last meeting lamented, “It is with feeling of sadness we close this mtg. [meeting], established here in 1743—186 years ago. The last and solemn mtg. is now concluded.”⁹²

The 1930s: A Turning Point—The Rise of a Preservation Economy in Waterford

The disincorporation of the Town of Waterford in 1936, formally approved by the Virginia General Assembly in 1937, was only the most visible and symbolic event marking the end of Waterford’s presence as an agricultural service village. The end of the Quaker meeting in 1929 also symbolically marked the end of an era for the Quaker-founded village, while the struggles of the Great Depression took their toll on the economic health of the town’s residents, as well as on the village’s infrastructure. By 1936, the streets were reportedly in very bad repair, and

⁸⁵ Deck and Heaton, 88.

⁸⁶ Deck and Heaton, 88.

⁸⁷ Deck and Heaton, 88.

⁸⁸ Deck and Heaton, 89.

⁸⁹ 1930 United States Census, Waterford, Loudoun County, Virginia, digital image, *Ancestry.com*.

⁹⁰ The most common occupation reported for the heads of households in 1930 was “none” (24%). This designation of no occupation often corresponded to people who were in their 60s-80s, another sign of an aging village. The next highest occupation was “laborer” (20%), and “farmer” (5%).

⁹¹ 1930 United States Census, Waterford, Loudoun County, Virginia, digital image, *Ancestry.com*.

⁹² The population of Waterford was now 333, 1920 United States Census, Waterford, Loudoun County, Virginia, digital image, *Ancestry.com*. Scheel, 22.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 19

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

the town government—which had not met formally in years—had no money for improvements. The Loudoun County board of supervisors suggested a solution to Waterford’s leaders: if they dropped their local incorporation, the county highway department would make much needed repairs to Second Street and lower Main Street. Thus, the “Town of Waterford” disincorporated that year, ending its formal status as a self-governing entity. Shortly thereafter, Waterford’s main streets were paved for the first time.⁹³ One last blow to the village of Waterford came in 1939, after over two centuries of milling on the Catoctin Creek, when the Waterford Mill ceased operations.

Yet, perhaps ironically, the 1930s also marked a more hopeful turning point for Waterford’s future—the coalescence of a preservation movement that would lead to Waterford’s restoration and conservation over many decades. Even during the Great Depression, a transformation was already underway—an awakening that would both reorient and rejuvenate the town. In that year, after a first successful restoration in 1931, brothers Edward and Leroy Chamberlin teamed up again to take on a large-scale restoration effort of eight buildings on Main Street. Photographs by the Historic American Buildings Survey in 1937 documented many neglected houses in need of intervention. Within five years (1943), the Waterford Foundation was formed to promote the history and preservation of the village. Over the next half century, private citizens and the Waterford Foundation would incorporate a range of established as well as innovative strategies—including purchasing and restoring properties, designating Waterford as a historic district, and encouraging preservation easements—that would result in a remarkably well-preserved village landscape that enjoys a nearly unrivaled level of protection for a district of privately-owned properties.

CRITERION 1

Preserving Waterford, 1931-1992

The campaign to restore, designate, and protect the historic village of Waterford is nationally significant as an important example of a sustained and innovative private preservation effort to conserve a comprehensive village landscape. Waterford’s remarkably intact village architecture and expansive agricultural setting survives with such high integrity due to this multipronged and intensive campaign that employed emerging preservation approaches and a diverse set of preservation tools. Spearheaded by private citizens and the community non-profit Waterford Foundation, this decades-long collaborative effort represents a laboratory for experimental preservation strategies that resulted in the conservation of a living landscape where most properties, unlike in a museum restoration, have remained in private ownership.

Waterford before Historic Preservation: “Derelict” and “Dozing”

After decades of economic stasis and then decline starting in the late-nineteenth century, Waterford was at a low point by the start of the Great Depression, and it was reflected in the landscape. Though highly preserved due to neglect, Waterford was described as “at death’s door—an unkempt, derelict ragamuffin of a spot on the map.”⁹⁴ This condition was recorded in January 1937, when a photographer from the National Park Service’s Historic American Buildings Survey captured a series of black and white photographs showing the village’s historic buildings. Visible in these images were dirt roads, ruinous stone walls, and buildings in various states of disrepair.⁹⁵ A few years later, another Depression-era program, the Federal Writers’ Project, described Waterford in quaint terms in its Virginia tour book, noting its “old houses ... set along lanelike [sic] streets,” but also noted

⁹³ Scheel, 22-23.

⁹⁴ Katharine Best, and Katharine Hillyer, “The Town of the Month: Waterford Virginia.” *Good Housekeeping Magazine*, October 1950, 4

⁹⁵ Lee, 42; Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, Historic American Building Survey, Reproduction number, HABS VA,54-WATFO, images 1-40.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 20

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

that the village was “dozing” along a “lazy” creek.⁹⁶ Without intervention, it is clear that Waterford would have experienced the continued decay and heavy architectural losses so common in other small, bypassed villages during the twentieth century. However, a different course for Waterford’s future was already being established—even as people were recording Waterford’s downtrodden condition.

“The Future was Set:” Early, Private Restorations by the Chamberlin Family

Private restorations and stewardship by homeowners have been at the core of Waterford’s historic preservation success since the early-twentieth century. The earliest preservation efforts in the village of Waterford began in the 1930s, through the ambitious private restoration efforts of two brothers—Edward and Leroy Chamberlin. Over a span of about 15 years, the brothers restored and rehabilitated 21 buildings within the boundaries of what is now the National Historic Landmark District.⁹⁷ This intervention turned the economic and aesthetic tide in Waterford, launching its long historic preservation movement—which would evolve substantially in its methods and complexity over the following half century.

The restoration of historic houses by philanthropic benefactors became a powerful trend in the United States during the early-twentieth century, a movement driven by many factors and sectors. As early as the 1860s, Americans were becoming increasingly bewildered by the effects of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration.⁹⁸ Disillusionment with the Civil War, displeasure about Reconstruction, and the financial panic of 1873 prompted Americans to reminisce about what seemed like a simpler time.⁹⁹ The Philadelphia Centennial of 1876 is generally credited with awakening interest in America’s colonial heritage, by promoting an interest in the nation’s past.¹⁰⁰ New England’s historic buildings were closely studied and given pride of place in the Colonial Revival Movement. Architects at the time erroneously thought that New England had the oldest buildings in the country, so therefore those buildings were the best material manifestation of American colonial history itself.¹⁰¹

By 1895, prominent architects were undertaking detailed studies of historic New England houses—of note are the works of Norman M. Isham and his partner Albert F. Brown. They preserved, renovated, and restored old New England houses. Isham and Brown also published their extensive measured drawings of historic structures, which also included detailed documentary research. *Early Rhode Island Houses* (1895) and *Early Connecticut Houses* (1900) were revolutionary works, which further propelled the Colonial Revival movement.¹⁰² Other architects continued to follow in Isham and Brown’s footsteps publishing large scale studies of colonial architecture (as well as undertaking important restoration work) including Fiske Kimball’s *Thomas Jefferson, Architect, Original Designs* (1916), *Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic* (1922) and J. Frederick Kelly’s *Early Domestic Architecture of Connecticut* (1924).¹⁰³ Professional architecture magazines were also devoted to the study of colonial architecture—throughout the 1910s and into the 1930s American journals had published measured drawings and general interior and exterior photographs of American colonial architecture. Including the *Architectural Record* (edited by Russell F. Whitehead), *Pencil Points* (also edited by Whitehead), the *Architectural Forum*, and *American Architect* all had long running series devoted to

⁹⁶ Lee, 42-43; Federal Writers’ Project, *The WPA Guide to Virginia: The Old Dominion* (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 2014, digital ed.), 544.

⁹⁷ This number was compiled from the list of individual acquisitions narrated in the article “A Blind Man, an Heiress and a Builder: The Remarkable Origins of Waterford’s Resurrection” published by the Waterford Foundation, Inc. in 2014.

⁹⁸ Butler, 19.

⁹⁹ Butler, 19.

¹⁰⁰ Dell Upton, “New Views of the Virginia Landscape,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 96, No. 4, 1988, 409.

¹⁰¹ Butler, 19.

¹⁰² Upton, 414.

¹⁰³ Upton, 409.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 21

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

the studying of colonial buildings.¹⁰⁴

The Colonial Revival and restoration fervor were not confined to just professionally trained architects. In fact, through several popular culture works, the style and sentiment of the era was deeply ingrained and consumed by the American public as well. Publications like the bi-monthly *The White Pine Series of Architectural Monographs* (1915-1932) (also edited and later published by Whitehead) as well as Wallace Nutting's photographic book series *States Beautiful* (1920s), which ranged from *Vermont Beautiful* to *Virginia Beautiful*, all propelled the fascination with and consumption of the colonial era in public culture.¹⁰⁵ Equally as impressive in promoting the colonial American image was the later series by the Works Progress Administration's Depression -inspired American Guide series, which focused on the eastern United States, placing major emphasis on seventeenth through early-nineteenth century architecture.¹⁰⁶

This fascination with the colonial past, especially tied to restoration of historic buildings, came to a crescendo in the early 1920s in Virginia. The establishment of Colonial Williamsburg in 1921, led by Reverend W.A.R. Goodwin and funded by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., created a philanthropic preservation phenomenon—prompting many wealthy benefactors to restore buildings or entire villages across the United States. At Williamsburg, Goodwin and Rockefeller preserved, restored, and reconstructed historic buildings in-situ in the former colonial capital of Virginia. Rockefeller, who had previously been involved in restoration projects in France, found the opportunity of restoring an entire town, and keeping it free of “inharmonious surroundings,” to be an irresistible opportunity.¹⁰⁷ To create a pure vision of the colonial past, more than seven hundred buildings that were constructed after 1790 were demolished, while several buildings that were no longer extant were reconstructed. Colonial Williamsburg was created squarely during the anxious Colonial Revival movement, when native-born Americans were expressing deep fears, notably about great waves of immigration.¹⁰⁸ Rockefeller even said that the project at Colonial Williamsburg “teaches of the patriotism, high purpose, and unselfish devotion of our forefathers to the common good.”¹⁰⁹ In other words, the vision of Goodwin and Rockefeller's Colonial Williamsburg emphasized the preservation of distinguished men and high-style architecture as cultural values that were admirable and worth emulating to the newly arriving masses of immigrants.

Other early philanthropists soon followed in similar fashion, creating open-air outdoor history museums by collecting historic buildings in a village setting, as opposed to the model of preserving and restoring buildings *in-situ* as practiced at Colonial Williamsburg. This early-twentieth century wave of outdoor history museums included Henry Ford's Greenfield Village in Michigan (1929), Mystic Seaport in Connecticut (1929), the Farmers' Museum in New York (1944), Old Sturbridge Village in Massachusetts (1946), the Shelburne Museum in Vermont (1947), Old Salem in North Carolina (1950), and Historic Deerfield in Massachusetts (1952).¹¹⁰ During the second half of the twentieth century, dozens of other open-air museums would be established across the United States in emulation of these early institutions. The goal of these museums was the same as Colonial

¹⁰⁴ “Chapter 3: Guidelines for Site Elements,” in *Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines* (2008), 42, <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7027/d-Chapter-3-Guidelines-for-Site-Elements>

¹⁰⁵ David Gebhard, “The American Colonial Revival in the 1930s,” *Winterthur Portfolio* 22, No. 2/3 1987, 111. *Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines*, 52, <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7027/d-Chapter-3-Guidelines-for-Site-Elements>

¹⁰⁶ Gebhard, 112; *Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines* (2008), 45, <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7027/d-Chapter-3-Guidelines-for-Site-Elements>

¹⁰⁷ Charles B. Hosmer, Jr., *Preservation Comes of Age: From Williamsburg to the National Trust, 1926-1949, Volume I* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1981), 19.

¹⁰⁸ Warren Leon and Margaret Piatt, “Living-History Museums,” in *History Museums in the United States*, Warren Leon and Roy Rosenzweig, eds. (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 66.

¹⁰⁹ Leon and Piatt, 67.

¹¹⁰ Leon and Piatt, 68; James Marston Fitch, *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1990), 42.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 22

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Williamsburg—to expose visitors to a simpler, often rural, American past in which traditional lifeways were preserved.

In Waterford, the Chamberlin brothers were uniquely positioned to undertake a large-scale, private restoration campaign, though on a smaller scale than some of these museum villages. Edward had married a wealthy heiress and possessed the means to finance such projects, while his brother Leroy was a contractor and real estate agent who identified suitable properties and oversaw the restoration projects.¹¹¹ Before undertaking any restorations in Waterford's village core, the Chamberlins focused on their own nearby residences. As early as 1909, shortly after Edward married Vera Moses—heiress to her father's multimillion-dollar Trenton, New Jersey, pottery works (Mercer Pottery)—they financed a series of restorations outside of the current National Historic Landmark District boundaries.¹¹²

After these family-related projects, the Chamberlins initiated a restoration campaign in the village of Waterford. Their preservation work there was multipurposed—to rehabilitate the buildings in town and resell them, as well as to provide work for a number of villagers who had lost their jobs during the Great Depression.¹¹³ They employed both White and Black workers from the town—though, ironically, many of their restoration efforts displaced people living in the houses, who were oftentimes African American.¹¹⁴ John Chamberlin—Waterford native, grandson of Leroy Chamberlin, and former president of the Waterford Foundation—recalls how “New Dealers” working for the federal government and otherwise educated people from outside of the community were attracted to Waterford and the dwellings that the Chamberlins were rehabilitating, setting in motion the slow gentrification of the village over the coming decades.¹¹⁵

The first house purchased (in October 1931) and restored by the family was Sunnyside, built c. 1850, located at 15570 Second Street.¹¹⁶ After the successful rehabilitation and resale of Sunnyside, Leroy began work on Fairfax Meetinghouse (15510 Loyalty Road) and the Meeting Schoolhouse, both of which he converted into residences. He also completed restoration of the Huntley (15578 High Street) and Talbott (40170 Main Street) farmhouses.¹¹⁷

By late 1937, the brothers teamed up again to renovate a series of houses along Main Street. They purchased the western half of the Hough House at 40125 Main Street and then acquired the property known as Mill End at 40090 First Street. The years 1937 to 1939 represented the Chamberlins' most rapid and productive restoration period, as they acquired several more properties, mostly along Main Street. The first, in 1937, was the “Arch House Row” (40158-40176 Main Street), a connected set of embanked buildings that all date to the first quarter

¹¹¹ Waterford Foundation, Inc., “A Blind Man, an Heiress and a Builder: The Remarkable Origins of Waterford's Resurrection,” in *Waterford Homes Tour and Craft Exhibit* (Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 2014), 53.

¹¹² The Chamberlins' first restoration was their mother's familial home, called Clifton, a five-bay Federal house, built c. 1800, located at 15980 Clarkes Gap Road. Next, Edward and Vera restored and remodeled their own home, called Greystone, dating to the 1730s and located at 16158 Clarkes Gap Road. Later, they converted the barn on the property into a private residence and named it Cresswell. Leroy Chamberlin and his wife, on the other hand, opted to build a new house, a timber-framed, English-style dwelling that they named Clearfield. “Col. Chamberlin Dead: Veteran of Civil War to Be Buried in Arlington,” *The Evening Star*, April 21, 1908; “Blind Man Weds Beautiful Girl,” *Passaic Daily News*, December 1, 1909; Waterford Foundation, Inc., “A Blind Man...,” 52; Address of Greystone was held in the Waterford Foundation, Inc. “Easements in Waterford Historic District,” file, Waterford Foundation Archives, Waterford, VA.

¹¹³ Jake Page, “Will Success Spoil Brigadoon?,” *American Land Forum Magazine*, Summer 1985, 45; Waterford Foundation, Inc., “A Blind Man...,” 52.; “For Pure Residential Character, Waterford Holds Unusual Place,” *The Evening Star*, August 10, 1957.

¹¹⁴ William Benton Virts, “My Waterford Virginia Years,” <http://www.virtsfamilies.com/showmedia.php?mediaID=75>, accessed December 10, 2019.

¹¹⁵ John Chamberlin, interview by Catherine Morrissey, January 6, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

¹¹⁶ Waterford Foundation, Inc., “A Blind Man...,” 52.

¹¹⁷ Waterford Foundation, Inc., “A Blind Man...,” 53.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 23

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

of the nineteenth century.¹¹⁸ Across the street, Edward purchased the William Irish Shop at 40153 Main Street for his personal cook, Minnie Jackson, to live. In 1938, the brothers acquired a lot across the street, on the southwest side of Main Street, to create the town's first communal septic system for the newly restored properties on Arch House Row. The brothers also installed a cistern and hand pump southwest of the old jail, to serve residents who did not have indoor plumbing. Also, in 1938, the Chamberlins purchased more buildings on Main Street, including the two-story log Camelot School (40145 Main Street), the Israel Griffith House (40148 Main Street), the two-story log McGeath House (40191 Main Street), and the brick and frame Sally Nettle House (40167 Main Street). In 1939, additional purchases by Edward included Wisteria Cottage (40129 Main Street), the Graham House (40171 Main Street), the Bank House (40149 Main Street), and the Pink House (40174 Main Street). In January 1940, Leroy had begun negotiations to purchase the Francis Pierpoint House at 40138 Main Street, but that real estate purchase never came to fruition.¹¹⁹

The Chamberlin family's restoration efforts in Waterford were cut short by the sudden passing of Edward Chamberlin on February 13, 1940.¹²⁰ Two obituaries for Edward discuss his restoration and preservation activities. The *Richmond Times Dispatch* noted that "Mr. Chamberlin had maintained an active interest in the civic welfare of Loudoun County," and that he had been "interested in the reconstruction of the town of Waterford."¹²¹ The *Loudoun Times-Mirror* also noted his role in the "rehabilitation of Waterford...which had won statewide recognition."¹²²

While Edward's untimely death ended the Chamberlin family's private restoration efforts in the village of Waterford, the brothers' imprint on the Waterford landscape was both extensive and transformative. They had acquired and rehabilitated many of the most high-profile buildings in the village, along its primary thoroughfares, and their restorations clearly provided a much-needed infusion of capital in its building stock and set the cultural tone in town moving forward. The Chamberlins' restoration campaign was also the catalyst for the formation of the Waterford Foundation.

Waterford Foundation, Incorporated: Organizational Advocacy

In 1943, with the formation of the Waterford Foundation, the restoration trajectory of the village shifted to an organized campaign driven by a non-profit preservation group, rather than a pair of motivated and well-resourced individuals. During the early 1940s, a group of concerned villagers began to meet to consider "the possibilities of continuing the restoration work of [the] Village, begun under the direction of the late Edward M. Chamberlin."¹²³ On September 10, 1943, at the Fairfax Meeting House, a group of eight Waterford residents met "with a deep feeling of obligation to serve and the desire to preserve, restore and improve the Village of Waterford"—officially forming the Waterford Foundation, Inc, appointing officers, and beginning initial planning for the organization.¹²⁴ Just five days later, the charter for incorporation of the Waterford Foundation was granted by the Virginia Legislature on September 15, 1943.¹²⁵ Over the course of the next several meetings in 1943 and 1944, the mission and goals of the foundation began to crystalize. The first goal was to restore as many buildings as possible within

¹¹⁸ Waterford Foundation, Inc., "A Blind Man...", 53.

¹¹⁹ Waterford Foundation, Inc., "A Blind Man...", 53-54.

¹²⁰ "E.M. Chamberlin Dies in Boston," *The Richmond Times Dispatch*, February 14, 1940.

¹²¹ "E.M. Chamberlin Dies in Boston," *The Richmond Times Dispatch*, February 14, 1940.

¹²² Waterford Foundation, Inc., "A Blind Man...", 54.

¹²³ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., September 1943, 1.

¹²⁴ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., September 1943, 1-2. Attendees included including Margaret B. McDaniel, Allen B. McDaniel, Fenton M. Fadeley, Mary P. Stabler, Winifrede E. Myers, Douglas N. Myers, Paul V. Rogers, and Pauline Rogers.

¹²⁵ "Arts and Craft Exhibit Marks Year's Activity by Waterford Folk," *The Loudoun News*, 1944 (news clipping held by the Waterford Foundation Archives).

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 24

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

the village—sometimes through outright acquisition of the property.¹²⁶ The second goal was to encourage and promote traditional handicrafts through an annual craft exhibition called the Waterford Exhibit of Arts and Crafts, later renamed the Waterford Fair.¹²⁷ The profits from the fair would, in turn, also help fund the Foundation's purchase and restoration of historic buildings in Waterford.¹²⁸ Lastly, a third goal, as advanced by Leroy Chamberlin, was "to assemble all the historical data concerning Waterford and interesting folk lore and anecdotes about the early days of the village and the people who used to live there."¹²⁹ Over the ensuing decades, the Waterford Foundation would employ a variety of evolving and increasingly sophisticated approaches to advancing historic preservation in the village.

Though not the first organization of its kind, the Waterford Foundation was a highly successful example of the early nonprofit preservation organizations that emerged during the first half of the twentieth century in the United States. After stewardship of historic places by private property owners, private nonprofit organizations have played the largest role in the preservation of historic resources in America.¹³⁰ These local preservation nonprofits were often established prior to the formation of any state or national preservation groups, and many, like the Waterford Foundation, pre-date the National Trust for Historic Preservation (1949) and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.¹³¹ From their beginnings, local preservation nonprofits often established multilayered missions that included organizing, educating, fundraising, lobbying, the actual buying and selling of historic properties, and other necessary tasks to promote local history and historic preservation. Through trial and error, early preservation nonprofits utilized a variety of strategies to directly engage in preservation and restoration activities, including long-term property acquisition, revolving funds, and historic house and garden tours—often relying on automobile tourism—to fund projects.¹³²

This distinctly American tradition of relying on the private sector to find solutions to preservation problems, rather than relying on governmental intervention, first emerged during the nineteenth century.¹³³ Some of the earliest and most high-profile preservation organizations were formed in Virginia. In fact, the most famous nonprofit preservation effort, and arguably the birthplace of the modern American preservation movement altogether, lies with Ann Pamela Cunningham and the Mount Vernon Ladies Association (MVLA). This was a private women's historical society chartered in 1856 to foster patriotism and traditionalism through the protection of George Washington's home and grave, after both the Virginia and U.S. governments declined to intervene to protect the property.¹³⁴ Revolutionary in its time, the Association sought to purchase Washington's property to "preserve" it on behalf of the American public.¹³⁵ They raised the money to purchase Mount Vernon through a national fundraising campaign, relying on a network of women who formed local clubs in all states of the Union.¹³⁶ Ultimately, they were successful in their enterprise and raised the necessary \$200,000 needed to

¹²⁶ Constance K. Chamberlin, *Waterford: The Challenge* (Waterford, Virginia: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 1980), 2; "Old Waterford," *Virginia Cavalcade*, Spring 1969, 18.

¹²⁷ Chamberlin, 2; "Arts and Craft Exhibit."

¹²⁸ Best and Hillyer, 374.

¹²⁹ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., May 1944, 1.

¹³⁰ J. Myrick Howard "Nonprofits in the American Preservation Movement," in *A Richer Heritage: Preservation in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Michael Stipe, Chapel Hill, NC University of North Carolina Press, 2007, 313.

¹³¹ Howard, 332-333.

¹³² Howard, 314.

¹³³ Howard, 313.

¹³⁴ James M. Lindgren, "'For the Sake of our Future': The Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities and the Regeneration of Traditionalism," *The Virginia Magazine*, Vol. 97, No. 1 (January 1989), 50.

¹³⁵ Lydia Mattice Brandt, "'Keep It the Home of Washington!': The Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union, 1854-1890," in *First in the Homes of His Countrymen: George Washington's Mount Vernon in the American Imagination* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2016), 42.

¹³⁶ Brandt, 45-46.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 25

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

purchase the mansion and surrounding 200 acres, marking one of the first successful preservation nonprofit acquisition campaigns in America.¹³⁷ The MVLA's high-profile effort helped to establish organized, private sector action as a model for historic preservation throughout the country.

Another pioneering Virginia preservation non-profit was the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, established in 1889 (now Preservation Virginia), which was also the first statewide preservation organization formed in the United States.¹³⁸ Modeled on the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, over the first 25 years as an organization the APVA acquired a range of buildings across the state, including buildings in very prominent historical places like Williamsburg, Fredericksburg, Jamestown, and Richmond.¹³⁹ AVPA's early preservation efforts were tied heavily to saving a bygone era. Formed just after the Reconstruction Era in the south, the preservation of historic buildings and historic places was one way to hold on to traditions that many were anxious had been lost during the Civil War.¹⁴⁰ What the APVA proposed through their preservation efforts was not a stoppage of progress altogether but a regeneration of traditions which would redirect Virginia society.¹⁴¹ Historic buildings were the primary tool that APVA used to "recreate the present in the mold of the past."¹⁴² As such, these early preservationists carefully edited, curated, and adapted history to suit their modern needs, as a means to reinforce traditionalism.¹⁴³ APVA carefully selected buildings to preserve that advanced this cause.¹⁴⁴

The APVA was also indirectly involved in the formation of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, which initiated the most influential preservation effort in the nation—one that inspired the formation of small local groups, and heritage landscape museums, across the United States. W.A.R. Goodwin, a prominent participant in APVA, approached John D. Rockefeller, Jr. in 1926 about financing the restoration of the entire town of Williamsburg.¹⁴⁵ The purchasing of property and the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg was first financed through the nonprofit Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.¹⁴⁶ This high-profile restoration—covered often by national press and attracting visitors from across the country (and beyond)—stoked a passion for preservation among many Americans and led to a flurry of outdoor museum created across the country.¹⁴⁷

During the 1920s and 1930s, many nonprofit preservation organizations were created nationally.¹⁴⁸ Two other notable preservation nonprofits were formed after the creation of the Waterford Foundation. The Historic Charleston Foundation, formed in 1947 as a spin-off of the Preservation Society of Charleston (1920), utilized several established techniques to fund local preservation efforts. The organization held an annual house tour, called the Festival of Houses (1948), to generate revenue as well as to carry out an education campaign.¹⁴⁹ Additionally, the Historic Charleston Foundation established the nation's first revolving fund (1957) and between

¹³⁷ Brandt, 5; "Early History of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association," George Washington's Mount Vernon. Accessed December 7, 2019, <https://www.mountvernon.org/library/digitalhistory/digital-encyclopedia/article/early-history-of-the-mount-vernon-ladies-association/>.

¹³⁸ James M. Lindgren, "'Virginia Needs Living Heroes': Historic Preservation in the Progressive Era," *The Public Historian*, Vol 13, No. 1 (Winter 1991), 10.

¹³⁹ Lindgren, "'Virginia Needs Living Heroes,'" 10; Lindgren, "'For the Sake of our Future,'" 50.

¹⁴⁰ Lindgren, "'Virginia Needs Living Heroes,'" 15.

¹⁴¹ Lindgren, "'Virginia Needs Living Heroes,'" 15.

¹⁴² Lindgren, "'Virginia Needs Living Heroes,'" 20.

¹⁴³ Lindgren, "'Virginia Needs Living Heroes,'" 20.

¹⁴⁴ Lindgren, "'Virginia Needs Living Heroes,'" 22.

¹⁴⁵ Lindgren, "'For the Sake of Our Future,'" 56-57.

¹⁴⁶ Howard, 316.

¹⁴⁷ Howard, 316. Subsequent museums included like Henry Ford's Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan (1928), and Old Sturbridge Village (1935-1941), Massachusetts by Albert Wells, owner of the American Optical Company.

¹⁴⁸ Howard, 317.

¹⁴⁹ "Honor What Makes Us," About Historic Charleston Foundation | Preservation Advocacy, Accessed December 6, 2019, <http://www.historiccharleston.org/about/>.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 26

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

1959 and 1976 was able to purchase, rehabilitate, and place restrictive covenants on 60 buildings.¹⁵⁰ Founded in 1949 by an Act of Congress, the National Trust for Historic Preservation was created to provide support and encouragement to grassroots and nonprofit preservation efforts throughout the United States.¹⁵¹ The primary purpose of the fledgling organization, like so many other preservation nonprofits before them, was the acquisition and administration of historic sites as a means of preservation.¹⁵²

The Waterford Foundation's early preservation efforts focused on acquiring properties in the Village. More than a decade before the establishment of Historic Charleston Foundation's revolving fund, the Waterford Foundation was acquiring at-risk deteriorating properties, repairing them, and reselling them (occasionally at a loss).¹⁵³ In 1944, the first property the Foundation purchased was the Old Waterford Mill for \$2,000 with the financial assistance of a board member.¹⁵⁴ An interesting real estate acquisition strategy was developed by the Foundation. For the properties where the Foundation retained ownership, they sought out commercial, educational, industrial, and agricultural buildings not only because they were key elements in understanding Waterford's history but were also buildings that private citizens were unlikely to preserve (especially with their non-domestic functions intact).¹⁵⁵ As a result of the Foundation's early acquisition efforts, Waterford received the moniker of "Little Williamsburg."¹⁵⁶ Today, the Foundation owns 10 buildings in the village, all non-domestic: the Bond Street Barn (Bond and Main Streets, VDHR# 401-0121), the Corner Store (40183 Main Street, VDHR# 401-0113), the Forge (15484 Second Street, VDHR# 401-0059), the Tin Shop (15481 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0016), the Chair Manufactory (15502 Second Street, VDHR# 401-0057), the Waterford Mill (40105 Main Street, VDHR# 401-0001), the Old School (40222 Fairfax Street, VDHR# 401-0090), the Red Barn (behind 15481 Second Street, VDHR# 401-0116), Schooley Mill Barn (Second and Factory Streets, VDHR# 401-0033), Second Street School (15611 Second Street, VDHR# 401-0032), and the John Wesley Community Church (40125 Bond Street, VDHR# 401-0077).¹⁵⁷

At its third board meeting in April of 1944, the Waterford Foundation discussed a handicraft exhibit to "demonstrate the aim of the Foundation" and "to foster and promote the practice and learning of these crafts."¹⁵⁸ The board advertised the first exhibition through targeted mailings and newspaper announcements; a newspaper article in *The Loudoun News* advertised the first Fair (October 1944) and the two-pronged mission of the Foundation: "The purpose of the Foundation is to revive and stimulate community interest in recreating Loudoun's oldest town as it existed in previous times, and to illustrate its various crafts ad activities."¹⁵⁹

The first exhibition was a success—"approximately 100 [persons] entered 300 exhibits of handwork...nearly 600

¹⁵⁰ Winslow Hastie and April Wood, "The Evolving Revolving Fund: Historic Charleston Foundation Revamps Its Pioneering Program," *Forum Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 1, Fall 2014, 11-12.

¹⁵¹ "A Brief History of the National Trust: National Trust for Historic Preservation," A Brief History of the National Trust | National Trust for Historic Preservation, Accessed December 7, 2019, <https://savingplaces.org/trust-history>.

¹⁵² "A Brief History of the National Trust."

¹⁵³ Chamberlin, 3.

¹⁵⁴ Chamberlin, 2.

¹⁵⁵ Lee, 44; Joseph W. Keating, Jr. "Waterford: Presence of the Past," *Waterford Foundation 32nd Annual Homes Tour and Crafts Exhibit*, Waterford, VA: Waterford, Foundation, Inc. 1975, no page number.

¹⁵⁶ Stanley Baitz, "Restoring Waterford of 100 Years," *The Sunday Star Pictorial Magazine*, Washington, D.C. August 22, 1948.

¹⁵⁷ Chamberlin, 3.

¹⁵⁸ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., April 1944,1; Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., May 1944, 1; "Arts and Craft Exhibit."

¹⁵⁹ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., August 1944, 1; Howard, 317.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 27

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

guests...attended.”¹⁶⁰ It was decided at the next board meeting following the first Fair to make it an annual event. The board also decided to charge an entrance fee and percentage fee on goods sold to defray the cost of the Fair as well as to fundraise.¹⁶¹ By May of 1945, the Foundation had embarked on another fundraising strategy—one of which was to create an “associate membership” program.¹⁶² This was a targeted invitation by the board to seek out appropriate members. By 1946, the Foundation was charging a sponsor fee for the Fair.¹⁶³

Another promotional tactic employed by the early Foundation focused on advertising to the motoring American public. The foundation sent circulars of the history of Waterford to the Virginia Travel Bureau and the American Automobile Association (AAA) located in Washington, D.C. In 1946, the board of directors was told that “one of their feature writers [from A.A.A.] plans to visit Waterford and write up an article for the American Motorist, on ‘Waterford Town.’”¹⁶⁴ Clearly, the early Foundation saw the value of attracting automobile tourism to the town—in fact, by the third annual Fair (1946), visitors had come from 26 states, the District of Columbia, France, Japan, Greece, and even South Africa.¹⁶⁵

It was not until the passing of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 that many of the goals and missions of these early preservation nonprofits began to change. The Waterford Foundation, Inc. is representative of this early preservation nonprofit era. The Waterford Foundation relied on a few primary means of preservation in its early years, including the acquisition of property, an annual craft exhibit and fundraising event (the Waterford Fair), Fair sponsorship programs, general membership drives, and the distribution of promotional literature, to support its preservation mission.

The Era of Designations: The Creation of the Waterford National Historic Landmark

Waterford was among the first wave of historic designations that occurred after the initiation of federal preservation programs during the late 1960s. The trajectory of historic preservation practice in the United States was altered most profoundly by the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the most comprehensive piece of federal legislation to address America’s historic resources. Though previous measures, such as the Antiquities Act of 1906 and the Historic Sites Act of 1935, introduced degrees of protection and provided limited governmental oversight, the National Historic Preservation Act ushered in a new era in historic preservation in the United States and laid the framework for what exists today. In the decades following World War II, increasing concern developed regarding the destruction of the nation’s historic and cultural resources as the nation grappled with a rapidly growing population, expansion of automobile ownership and associated suburban development, and large-scale demolition and redevelopment in cities under the auspices of Urban Renewal.

Under mounting pressure over heritage losses as the nation approached its bicentennial, President Lyndon B. Johnson convened a special committee in 1965 to assess the situation and recommend policies. In January 1966, the committee released *With Heritage So Rich*, a report that laid the groundwork for what would become the

¹⁶⁰ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., November 1944, 1.

¹⁶¹ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., November 1944, 1; Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., July 1945, 1; Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., September 1945, 1.

¹⁶² Allen B. McDaniel, President, Letter to the Board of Directors, Waterford Foundation, Inc., March 1945, 2; Waterford Foundation Meeting Minutes, July 1945, 1.

¹⁶³ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., July 1946, 2; Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., January 1947, 1.

¹⁶⁴ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, I February 1946, 1. At the time of this nomination, that article has yet to be confirmed written or located.

¹⁶⁵ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., October 1946, 1.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 28

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

National Historic Preservation Act. Most significantly, this legislation instituted specific policies and procedures regarding how historic resources are recognized and managed.¹⁶⁶ It created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; mandated State Historic Preservation Offices, including the completion of state inventories of historic resources; imposed requirements for federal agencies regarding impact to historic resources; and established the National Register of Historic Places, administered by the National Park Service, incorporating into it the National Historic Landmarks Program, which originated with the Historic Sites Act of 1935.¹⁶⁷ With the introduction of these designation programs—which built upon the earlier Historic Sites Act and its subsequent Historic Sites Survey—historic buildings, districts, and sites of federal, state, and local significance were officially recognized on a national scale.¹⁶⁸

Initial efforts to nominate the village of Waterford as a historic district originated at the state level with the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission (VHLC), predecessor of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (also the State Historic Preservation Office). The Virginia General Assembly created the Virginia Landmarks Register in 1965, a year before the National Historic Preservation Act established the National Register of Historic Places. During the late 1960s, staff at VHLC actively promoted the nomination of historic sites to both the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. Staff asked preservationist and Waterford resident W. Brown Morton, III to nominate the village of Waterford due to his familiarity with its historic resources. Morton had initially become familiar with Waterford in 1959 when he completed a survey of the village for a summer job with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. A student at the University of Virginia's School of Architecture at the time, Morton completed Historic American Buildings Survey Inventory forms for every structure in the village of Waterford. As a young professional employed by the Historic American Buildings Survey, he returned to Waterford to live in 1967. By 1968, Morton and his wife Margaret purchased the Mahlon Schooley House (VDHR# 401-0027) at 15555 Second Street. They restored the house's primary façade by removing the deteriorated c. 1920s front porch, reconstructing the brick jack arches above the second-floor windows, and repointing the masonry with a mortar mixture and mortar joints based on the original brickwork. Morton's depth of experience with Waterford—both as a preservationist and resident—made him an ideal candidate for writing the nomination.¹⁶⁹

In what would prove to be a highly significant and innovative tactic, Morton proposed the boundaries of Waterford's historic district to include not only the village core but also much of the village's agricultural context and historic viewsheds. Morton saw Waterford's value in both the integrity of the village's historic buildings and the surrounding agricultural land and open meadows—conceptualizing the district as both “the place and its setting as a whole, rather than two pieces of something.”¹⁷⁰ In the 1960s, historic district nominations almost always followed the established property boundaries of the buildings included in the district. Morton found this approach limiting because it would not recognize Waterford's broader historic setting and felt strongly that the significance of Waterford is realized through “not only the buildings but the unspoiled natural landscape that surrounds it on all sides.”¹⁷¹ Therefore, to define the boundaries of the district, he stood with his back to every

¹⁶⁶ “National Historic Preservation Act,” National Parks Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Accessed December 10, 2019, <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/historicpreservation/national-historic-preservation-act.htm>.

¹⁶⁷ “National Historic Preservation Act of 1966,” National Council of State Historic Preservation Officers, Accessed December 11, 2019, <http://ncshpo.org/resources/national-historic-preservation-act-of-1966/>.

¹⁶⁸ Lee, 47.

¹⁶⁹ W. Brown Morton, III, interview by Mary C. Fesak, Leesburg, Virginia, November 22, 2019; “Historic Registers,” Virginia Department of Historic Resources, last modified July 22, 2019, accessed November 27, 2019, <https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/historic-register/>.

¹⁷⁰ W. Brown Morton, III, interview by Catherine Morrissey, March 3, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

¹⁷¹ W. Brown Morton, III, interview by Catherine Morrissey, March 3, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 29

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

structure in the village and drew the historic district boundaries based on the viewshed in order to protect “the reasonable open space view.”¹⁷² As a result, the boundaries followed the natural topography of the land surrounding Waterford, frequently including only portions of nearby farms instead of their entirety. Although Morton’s methodology was unorthodox, he successfully persuaded the staff at VHLC to accept his boundary recommendations due to the important relationship between agricultural land and industrial processing in rural mill villages like Waterford. The Waterford Historic District was listed in the Virginia Landmarks Register on May 13, 1969, and the National Register of Historic Places on June 3, 1969.¹⁷³

Local preservationists, like Morton, as well as staff at the National Park Service, sought National Historic Landmark status for Waterford after it was listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Morton believed that Waterford met the National Historic Landmark criteria because there were few surviving eighteenth century Quaker villages that had such intact buildings and landscapes. Despite community support for landmarking Waterford, he felt that there would be a conflict of interest for himself as a resident if he were to be directly involved in the landmarking process, so he asked National Park Service historian Charles W. Snell to independently conduct a study. Snell also concluded that Waterford met the National Historic Landmark criteria and wrote the justification using the historic district boundaries established by Morton. In October 1969, the National Park System Advisory Board thus included Waterford in their recommendations to landmark eighty sites as part of a larger thematic study of Colonial American architecture. Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel officially made Waterford a National Historic Landmark on April 15, 1970.¹⁷⁴

The inclusion of Waterford’s agricultural lands and open space within the historic district was among the earliest such designations—if not the first ever—in the United States. In the following years, as Loudoun County faced increasing development pressures, it became apparent that the preservation of the village—and its character and context—was necessarily dependent on the retention of its broader landscape, specifically its historic agricultural lands and associated viewsheds. Elizabeth Brabec, Professor of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning and lead author of the significant Waterford report *Linking the Past to the Future*, published in 1992, stresses that the inclusion of not only a landscape setting but “very large expansive boundaries” was “revolutionary,” “incredibly forward-thinking,” and “unheard of at the time,” and that such inclusive boundaries preserved the visual clues necessary to understand the village in its historical context.¹⁷⁵ Morton’s innovative approach in assessing the boundaries of the historic district provided an important basis for historic preservation easements in Waterford and in establishing Waterford’s National Historic Landmark District as a forerunner in cultural landscape preservation.

Preservation Easements: “The Preservation of the Village Cannot be Left to Chance”

Soon after the village of Waterford received official designations by the VHLC, the National Register of Historic Places, and the National Historic Landmarks Program, the Waterford Foundation began utilizing a relatively new and powerful legal instrument to help preserve the village—historic preservation conservation easements. Within a few years of the legal establishment of easements in Virginia in 1966, the Waterford Foundation initiated this new approach to preservation in the village—no longer satisfied to entrust Waterford’s historic district preservation to the unpredictable whims of revolving property owners and the slow, expensive strategy of

¹⁷² W. Brown Morton, III, interview by Catherine Morrissey, March 3, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

¹⁷³ Morton; “401-0123 Waterford Historic District,” Virginia Department of Historic Resources, last modified April 16, 2019, accessed November 27, 2019, <https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/historic-registers/401-0123/>.

¹⁷⁴ Morton; Chairman of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments to the Secretary of the Interior, October 8, 1969, National Archives and Records Administration.

¹⁷⁵ Elizabeth Brabec, interview by Catherine Morrissey, February 12, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 30

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

purchasing individual properties.¹⁷⁶ A Waterford Foundation board member, Philip R. Ehrenkranz, wrote in October 1972 that “the foundation knows only too well that from this point forward, the preservation of this village cannot be left to chance” and that “only through the dedicated efforts of its people will Waterford retain its beauty and historical integrity.”¹⁷⁷ Beginning in 1971, the Waterford Foundation embarked on an ambitious program that encouraged private property preservation through the purchase and donation of easements.¹⁷⁸

Easements were a relatively new preservation tool when they were first implemented in the Waterford Historic District. California had established the first easement enabling statutes in 1959, and the state of New York quickly followed in 1960.¹⁷⁹ In 1966, the same year as the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act, Virginia passed the Open-Space Land Act, which created the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission and Virginia Outdoors Foundation, paving the way for the state easements program which was established in 1967.¹⁸⁰ The creation of that program was the idea of the principal author of the Open-Space Land Act and environmental law attorney George C. Freeman, who realized there were far too many important historic resources for the state government to own or for private nonprofits to manage.¹⁸¹ He thus encouraged private preservation and stewardship of historic resources, a strategy that would also keep historic properties in private ownership as well on the tax rolls.¹⁸² This legislation allowed owners to voluntarily donate to the state specific rights to their properties—including the right to demolish cultural resources, make alterations to buildings without the state’s approval, and to refrain from commercial development or subdivision of the property’s historic setting.¹⁸³ These donations of property rights took the form of deed restrictions that forever remain with the property, providing permanent legal preservation of a property.¹⁸⁴ In order to encourage the donation of easements by private property owners, financial benefits were built into the process, allowing private property owners to claim a tax deduction for the difference in the property value before the donation and after.¹⁸⁵

Waterford’s use of preservation easements was on the leading edge of the movement. While the easement legislation was enacted in 1966, the first easement received by VHLC was in 1969 on the Old Mansion, a circa-1741 brick dwelling on 128 acres of land in Caroline County, Virginia. Two years later, Waterford initiated its first easement.¹⁸⁶ It was not until 1980, almost a decade after Waterford launched its preservation easement program, that the National Trust for Historic Preservation began to publish technical guidance on the topic.¹⁸⁷ As the National Trust pointed out, even by 1980, “only a few organizations had a clear understanding of the concepts and procedures involved in accepting gifts of preservation easements,” clearly placing VHLC and the Waterford Foundation on the forefront of such donations of property rights.¹⁸⁸ Today, Virginia’s historic preservation easement program is one of the largest in the United States, as the Virginia Department of Historic Resources

¹⁷⁶ Philip R. Ehrenkranz, “Open Space Easements in Waterford: Avoiding the Shipwreck,” in *Waterford Foundation’s 29th Annual Homes Tour and Craft Exhibit*, Waterford Foundation, Inc: Waterford, VA, 1972, 20.

¹⁷⁷ Ehrenkranz, 20.

¹⁷⁸ Ehrenkranz, 19.

¹⁷⁹ Federico Cheever and Nancy A. McLaughlin, “An Introduction to Conservation Easements in the United States: A Simple Concept and a Complicated Mosaic of Law,” *Journal of Law, Property, and Society*, Vol. 1, 2015, 116.

¹⁸⁰ Calder Loth, “Forty Years of Preservation: Virginia’s Easement Program,” in *Notes on Virginia 2005*, Richmond, VA: Virginia Department of Historic Resources, 2006, 49; Ehrenkranz, 19; “Hunton & Williams Remembers George C. Freeman, Jr.,” accessed April 16, 2021, <https://www.huntonak.com/images/content/3/1/v4/31576/George-Clemon-Freeman-Jr.pdf>.

¹⁸¹ “Hunton & Williams Remembers George C. Freeman, Jr.”

¹⁸² Loth, 49; Ehrenkranz, 19.

¹⁸³ Loth, 49.

¹⁸⁴ Loth, 49.

¹⁸⁵ Loth, 49-50; Lee 50.

¹⁸⁶ Loth, 50.

¹⁸⁷ Elizabeth Watson and Stefan Nagel, “*Establishing and Operating an Easement Program to Protect Historic Resources*,” National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2000, 1.

¹⁸⁸ Watson and Nagel, 1.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 31

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

currently administers approximately 688 easements statewide and is viewed as a model program nationwide.¹⁸⁹

While difficult to research and compare to other historic districts, the employment of preservation easements in Waterford is likely one of the most extensive and successful in the country—due to the sheer number of easements and the extent of their protective coverage. Certainly, the Waterford National Historic Landmark District is the best and densest concentration of easements in any historic district in the Commonwealth of Virginia.¹⁹⁰ Since the inception of the preservation easement campaign in Waterford in 1972, private property owners as well as the Waterford Foundation have donated easements on approximately 95 properties.¹⁹¹

From the beginning, the Waterford Foundation utilized an innovative, hybrid approach to procure easements. One strategy employed was to leverage their own outright purchase of open space to persuade adjoining property owners to place preservation easements on their own properties. The Waterford Foundation, in turn, would then place these critical viewsheds—so integral to the village’s historic character—under easement.¹⁹² The first attempt to employ this strategy occurred in 1971, when the Foundation made plans to purchase the open space north of Water Street (referred to as the Bayly-Carr Pasture or the Water Street Meadow).¹⁹³ In August and September of 1971, the Foundation hosted discussions with owners of properties bordering Water Street to explore the interest level of the property owners for granting open-space easements to the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission.¹⁹⁴ The Foundation’s efforts were successful, as several private homeowners joined the Foundation in placing easements on their respective properties.¹⁹⁵ In June of 1972, the first easements in Waterford were conveyed to VHLC.¹⁹⁶

Throughout the remainder of the decade, the residents of Waterford and the Foundation continued to place properties under easement.¹⁹⁷ As development pressure intensified in the areas surrounding the village of Waterford, the Foundation focused attention on preservation easements on agricultural properties or meadows—for which they established a new open-space fund in 1972, the same year that easements were first conveyed in Waterford.¹⁹⁸ The “Beach” open space behind the Dormers (40101 Janney Street / VDHR # 401-0213) was placed under easement in 1973, this time with the Virginia Outdoors Foundation.¹⁹⁹ Calder Loth, architectural historian

¹⁸⁹ “Easement Program Overview,” Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Accessed December 9, 2019, <https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/easements/easement-program-overview/>; personal correspondence between Brad McDonald, Easement Steward Coordinator, Virginia Department of Historic Resources and Catherine Morrissey, December 9, 2019.

¹⁹⁰ Loth, 50; Calder Loth, interview by Catherine Morrissey, January 11, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.; personal correspondence between Brad McDonald, Easement Steward Coordinator, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, and Catherine Morrissey, December 9, 2019.

¹⁹¹ Waterford Foundation, Inc., “Waterford Area Easements,” Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc. Archives, 2019, unpublished document. This is the most comprehensive list of all easements in Waterford known to date, whether façade or open space easements, held by multiple organizations including Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Virginia Outdoors Foundation, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

¹⁹² Ann Anderson, “Waterford’s Open Space Program,” *Waterford Foundation 33rd Annual Homes Tour and Craft Exhibit*, Waterford Foundation, Inc: Waterford, VA, 1976, no page number.

¹⁹³ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 1971, 1-2.

¹⁹⁴ Ehrenkranz, 19.

¹⁹⁵ The property owners were Parker Westbrook (15533 Butchers Row/VDHR #401-085), Judy and Patrick Acheson (15545 Butchers Row/VDHR # 401-0083), Ruth and George Bentley (40216 Main Street/VDHR #401-0082), and Anna and Dan Holland (40194 Main Street/VDHR #401-0079).

¹⁹⁶ Ehrenkranz, 20.

¹⁹⁷ Anderson, no page number.

¹⁹⁸ Anderson, no page number; Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., September 1972, 1-2.

¹⁹⁹ Waterford Foundation, Inc., “Waterford Area Easements.”

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 32

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

and former VDHR Easement Coordinator, notes how from “the very beginning, [the] Waterford Foundation and the citizens took the approach that not all the easements should go to one entity,” that “the more you spread it around, the more protection or interest you get.”²⁰⁰ In 1974, three more private property owners followed suit—including the Chamberlin family, who placed easements on both Greystone and Clifton, properties located close to the village but outside of the National Historic Landmark District boundaries.²⁰¹ Another 18 easements were conveyed in 1975, alone, including all of the properties owned by the Waterford Foundation at the time, as well as the property holdings of Wellman and Anne Carter Chamberlin.²⁰² In 1976, another 16 preservation easements were placed, with four more in 1977.²⁰³

The 1970s was the high-water mark for preservation easement activity in the historic district, though at least an additional 14 easements have been negotiated since 1977. The result of this program was transformational for the aesthetic control of the Waterford National Historic Landmark District. This aggressive pursuit of private property preservation easements in the village was one of the most successful preservation strategies employed—ensuring that a large percentage (see figure 4) of the Waterford National Historic Landmark District would enjoy at least some level of oversight and control. This cause would be further advanced with the establishment of a local historic district, formed around Waterford’s village core in 1977, which included local architectural design review.

Local Oversight: Loudoun County’s Historic District Review Committee

At the same time easements were first being employed in Waterford, Loudoun County introduced a new instrument for the protection of historic resources when, in 1972, its Board of Supervisors amended the county Zoning Ordinance to allow for local historic districts—adding an important new layer of legal protections for participating towns and properties.²⁰⁴ Waterford was among the first districts in the county to adopt this new oversight option in 1972.²⁰⁵

With the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and creation of the National Register program, many local towns, and communities quickly nominated and delineated historic districts. While the NHPA was passed at the federal level and provided recognition, the legislation did not fundamentally change the fact that control of what happened to private property was largely in the hands of property owners and local zoning authorities. The local sovereign authority given to municipalities by state governments to regulate land use was where historic preservation happened and continues to happen today.¹ That authority is given through enabling

²⁰⁰ Calder Loth, interview by Catherine Morrissey, January 11, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

²⁰¹ Waterford Foundation, Inc., “Waterford Area Easements.”

²⁰² Waterford Foundation, Inc., “Waterford Area Easements.”

²⁰³ Waterford Foundation, Inc., “Waterford Area Easements.”

²⁰⁴ Also see Lina Corfresi and Rosetta Radtke, “Local Government Programs: Preservation Where it Counts,” and Diane Lea, “America’s Preservation Ethos,” in *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-First Century*, Robert E. Stipe, ed., Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

²⁰⁵ The modified ordinance, adopted in 1972, authorized the designation, protection, and review of historic and cultural resources through the creation of Historic Overlay zones. Specific regulatory measures took effect in 1977, after further amendment to the Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance. This historic design review program aimed specifically to protect the overall aesthetics of districts by vetting the most visible changes to historic buildings. An Historic District Review Committee, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, was granted the authority to review requests for exterior alterations and new construction within established Historic and Cultural Conservation Districts. Still in place today, the Historic District Review Committee is tasked with issuing Certificates of Appropriateness for additions or renovations to extant buildings, and the review of demolition permits and requests for rezoning, special exceptions and variances, and site plans and subdivisions. “Chapter Four – Historic Districts,” in Loudoun County Heritage Preservation Plan, Accessed December 10, 2019, <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1135/Heritage-Preservation-Plan-COMPLETE>. Chamberlin, 8; “Chapter One—Historic Districts and the Preservation Process,” in Loudoun County Heritage Preservation Plan, 13.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 33

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

legislation that permits cities and counties to enact land use controls like zoning regulations. These local ordinances can control new construction, regulate additions to historic buildings, stop or delay the relocation of buildings, prevent, or delay the demolition of buildings, and so on. In the landmark 1978 decision *Penn Central Transportation Co. v. New York City*, the Supreme Court ruled that private developmental restrictions could be placed on a property for historic preservation purposes. This underscored the legitimacy of local zoning practices already in place in many cities, towns, and counties.²⁰⁶

Due to the unprecedented level of oversight that local review imposed upon private property owners, the Waterford zoning overlay was met with opposition—especially by owners of agricultural properties. Partly because of the controversial nature of the historic overlay zoning, the local Waterford Historic and Cultural Conservation District was established with narrower boundaries than the National Register and National Historic Landmark districts—despite the Waterford Foundation Board of Directors’ recommendation that the boundaries match.²⁰⁷ As a result of the more narrowly defined boundaries, only the oldest buildings in the village proper, including the majority of Bond Street and the east side of High Street—but none of the surrounding farmlands—were included in the locally regulated district.²⁰⁸ Nevertheless, the ordinance soon took tangible effect in the village core, when, in 1978, the Historic District Review Committee approved plans for the Felton House, located at 15653 Factory Street (VDHR # 401-0036), the first new construction to occur since the Waterford Historic and Cultural Conservation District was established.²⁰⁹

Of note are several additional properties, located outside the village core and the local district boundaries, that have come under the review umbrella of the Conservation District as the result of private easements that stipulate this review. Still, entering the 1980s, a large majority of the agricultural and open space context of Waterford village was still highly vulnerable to incompatible development—which prompted the Waterford Foundation and its partners to pursue new studies and programs to protect these critical viewsheds.

The 1980s and 1990s: Protecting Open Space & Agricultural Context

With its historic designations, a locally-regulated historic district, and the rapid successes of its easement program—as well as its expansive National Historic Landmark boundaries recognizing the importance of the farmland—Waterford was well-positioned to conserve and interpret the historic village and its surroundings through the adoption of and experimentation with emerging trends in rural preservation and what would more broadly come to be known as cultural landscape preservation.²¹⁰ The challenge of advancing the preservation of a cohesive village landscape was significant, since Waterford faced growing and persistent development pressures to convert area farms into housing tracts. During the 1980s, Waterford’s most complex and innovative preservation campaign commenced after effective preservation tools were in place to protect the village core. Waterford preservationists-initiated programs to mitigate the effects of new development, by purchasing development rights and steering new construction to areas that were the least visually intrusive to the village’s historic viewsheds.

²⁰⁶ In 1980, Congress amended the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to encourage increased partnerships between the federal government, state preservation offices, and local communities. The newly created Certified Local Government (CLG) program offered pass-through, federal preservation funds to communities that established and regulated historic properties and met certain standards and stipulations.

²⁰⁷ Waterford Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., March 1972, 4.

²⁰⁸ Chamberlin, 8; Lee, 49-50. The boundaries of the Waterford Historic and Cultural Conservation District were later expanded to include Bond Street, the east side of High Street, and a number of larger parcels outside of the village core (via mapping for Loudoun County Department of Planning & Zoning).

²⁰⁹ Hellman, 10; the Robert Felton House was the first construction in the district following the amendment to the Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance and appointment of the Historic District Review Committee, based on survey data and build dates from VDHR.

²¹⁰ “The NPS: A Brief History,” The NPS: A Brief History | The Cultural Landscape Foundation, Accessed December 11, 2019, <https://tclf.org/places/view-city-and-regional-guides/national-park-service-guides/philadelphia/nps-brief-history>.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 34

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Washington D.C. and Suburbanization Pressure in the 1980s

After 1980, Loudoun County experienced a surge in population and subsequent suburban development, threatening some of the county's historical and natural resources.²¹¹ During the last two decades of the twentieth century, Northern Virginia underwent a major wave of corporate and technological development that resulted in major suburban growth in Loudoun, Prince William, and Fairfax counties.²¹² For Loudoun County, this growth encompassed several large-scale projects aimed at expanding existing infrastructure, including the county court complex and Dulles International Airport in 1962. With the construction of Dulles, speculators began purchasing land throughout Northern Virginia for planned suburban developments.²¹³ With the increased suburban population, highways were either expanded or replaced. The most ambitious of these highway revitalization projects included the expansion of VA Route 7 and the construction of the Dulles Toll Road in 1984.²¹⁴ Consequently, much of the infrastructure that had characterized Loudoun County before the twentieth century, including crossroad communities and rural storefronts, began to disappear.²¹⁵ Continued development pressure near Waterford, along with the construction of several private properties within the boundaries of the Waterford National Historic Landmark District caused residents to reach out and complain to Senator John Warner. In 1987, Senator Warner wrote to the National Park Service asking whether the agency could help by establishing guidelines for controlling the impact of present and future development on the Waterford NHL district.

In the face of such rapid changes, Waterford preservationists-initiated studies and sought new approaches to conserving historic viewsheds and the preservation of open spaces. In 1980, the Waterford Foundation published *Waterford, the Challenge*, with support from a preservation grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation. This report was the first to take a critical look at Waterford's preservation successes and challenges over the preceding 40 years, but it also served as a call to action for additional efforts to protect the village and its historic landscape. Its author, Constance Chamberlin, who served as secretary of the Waterford Foundation, observed that "the tremendous development pressures on the farmland around Waterford are threatening to destroy the rural setting which is basic to Waterford's character," which she identified as increasingly rare as neighboring towns were "engulfed by the twentieth century." She warned of the urgency of the situation, noting that "if Waterford is to be saved, it will have to be done now," and "with larger amounts of money than have been available up to now."²¹⁶ Chamberlin also observed that "the most urgent priority is the preservation of the remaining unprotected open land immediately surrounding the village," including "undeveloped lots within the village which contribute greatly to its beauty and serene quality."²¹⁷ While some of these land parcels were "within the 100 year flood plain and not suitable for development," or likely candidates for easements, she worried about "a number of landowners who, for one reason or another, will not choose to participate in the [easement] program."²¹⁸

²¹¹ This section was co-researched and co-written by Maxwell Sickler, intern for the National Parks Service, National Capital Region, National Historic Landmarks Program.

²¹² George Mason University Center for Real Estate Entrepreneurship, "Learning from History to Shape our Built Future," *Center for Real Estate Entrepreneurship Events Bulletin*, September 24, 2018.

²¹³ Anne Keisman, "Loudoun Reaches No. 1 Spot as Development Spreads," *Loudoun Times Community Newspaper*, April 14, 2004.

²¹⁴ Peter Samuel, "The Dulles Toll Road Extension: Reviving America's Private Turnpikes," *Policy*, Summer 1990, 27-28. The Dulles Toll Road was expanded to six lanes, and five additional interchanges were built in 1990 in order to alleviate potential traffic jams.

²¹⁵ Eugene Scheel, "With 'The Park,' County's Growth Battles were just Beginning: The Beginnings of Sterling Park, Virginia in 1961," June 16, 2002, <https://www.loudounhistory.org/history/sterling-park-beginnings-1961/>, retrieved 12/04/2019. In total, the construction of Sterling Park replaced 1,762 acres of farmland around Leesburg Pike. Sterling Farm was one of the largest properties in the area of Sterling Park and was a prominent feature of the County's agricultural landscape since the early-19th century.

²¹⁶ Chamberlin, 20.

²¹⁷ Chamberlin, 17.

²¹⁸ Chamberlin, 17.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 35

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Emergence of “Cultural Landscape” Preservation

As the Waterford Foundation continued to grapple with the challenge of preserving its agricultural context, important national movements were emerging that turned the focus on the preservation of “rural historic districts” and “cultural landscapes.” In 1978, the Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation was formed, which included in its purview the study of historic rural landscapes.²¹⁹ The following year, the National Trust for Historic Preservation launched its Rural Heritage Program, commencing with survey studies, conferences, publications, and the development of two demonstration rural areas (Cazenovia, New York and Oley, Pennsylvania), which served as models for other rural towns merging historic preservation efforts with rural development.²²⁰ The Trust defined rural conservation as “the protection of the countryside including the preservation of buildings and villages of cultural significance, the protection of their surroundings, and the enhancement of the local economy and social institutions.”²²¹ This Rural Conservation program would eventually result in the publication of *Saving America’s Countryside: A Guide to Rural Conservation* (1988), an influential book that featured Waterford as a case study in six different sections.²²²

During the 1980s, the National Park Service published several documents that provided a framework for the study and preservation of natural, rural, and historic landscapes. Though the term “cultural landscapes” had been coined by Carl Sauer in 1927, it was not adopted by the National Park Service until 1981.²²³ In 1984, the NPS published *Cultural Landscapes: Rural Historic Districts in the National Park System*, which included a typology of cultural landscapes, including historic designed landscapes, historic sites, ethnographic landscapes, and vernacular landscapes.²²⁴ This typology was critical in advancing the study of cultural landscapes. Initially, all “historic landscapes” were lumped together, with the priority of study given to those historic landscapes associated with an important period, designer, and usually a discrete period of significance.²²⁵ *Rural Historic Districts* also advanced several key landscape components and features critical to identifying and designating cultural landscapes, including patterns, land-use, response to natural features, circulation networks, vegetation, cluster arrangements, structures, small-scale elements, and historic views or vistas.²²⁶ In 1989, the NPS published a National Register Bulletin titled *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*, which defined these landscapes and their characteristics, suggested practical methods for their research and survey, and provided guidance in applying National Register criteria and determining significance, integrity, and boundaries. In 1992, the NPS published *Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Landscapes*, which set national standards for the protection and stabilization of landscapes through preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. These treatment approaches relied on methods that *Rural Historic Districts* advanced, and now considered both natural and cultural features of landscapes, including topography, natural systems, circulation, vegetation, water features, as well as furnishings and objects, views, and spatial organization. In 1998, the NPS outlined methodologies for the analysis and management of cultural landscapes in *A Guide to Cultural Landscape*

²¹⁹ Lee, 58.

²²⁰ “Historic Preservation Goes Rural,” *The Christian Science Monitor*, May 14, 1991, Accessed December 11, 2019, <https://www.csmonitor.com/1991/0514/14121.html>.

²²¹ William J. Murtagh, *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1997), 136.

²²² Samuel N. Stokes, A. Elizabeth Watson, and Shelley S. Mastran, *Saving America’s Countryside: A Guide to Rural Conservation* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).

²²³ The term “cultural landscape” was first defined by the National Park as a cultural resource type In *Cultural Resource Management Guideline*, NPS 28, Release No. 2.

²²⁴ Robert Z. Melnick, *Cultural Landscapes: Rural Historic Districts in the National Park System*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1984, 1.

²²⁵ Melnick, 7.

²²⁶ Melnick, 18.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 36

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

*Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques.*²²⁷ These reports, which formalized the study, evaluation, and preservation of cultural landscapes, represented a new paradigm in the field of historic preservation and reflected two decades of gradual development of this specialized field.

Waterford Area Management Plan (1987)

Waterford's continued preservation efforts to protect its National Historic Landmark District were at the forefront of the cultural landscape preservation movement. In a series of studies and published reports from the latter half of the 1980s, the Waterford Foundation and partnering organizations explored Waterford's National Historic Landmark District and sought ways to preserve its character-defining features—especially the open space and viewsheds. In 1987, during the creation of a planning document for all of Loudoun County, a separate study—titled the Waterford Area Management Plan—was published by the Loudoun County Department of Planning, with input from Waterford residents. The stated purpose of the study was “to recommend policies and programs that will help the County manage growth and change in the Waterford area” and “to conserve the historic and architectural character of the Waterford National Historic Landmark District.”²²⁸ Milton Herd, who at the time was Chief of Comprehensive Planning for Loudoun County, highlights how many communities were competing for these plans because the county was under such tremendous development pressure and seeking guidance around how to resolve growth issues. He emphasized that the “political pressure and savvy” of the Waterford Foundation helped prioritize an area plan for Waterford.²²⁹ The boundaries of the “Waterford Area” established in the Management Plan were identical to the National Register and National Historic Landmark District boundaries. The report emphasized that Waterford's significance as a National Historic Landmark was largely justified due to the recognition of 1,420 acres of rural context, and the report strongly emphasized that Waterford's historic significance and scenic quality were “wholly dependent upon the visual connection between the village and the surrounding agricultural area.”²³⁰ It warned that “the basis for the retention of this historic designation and the potential for an expanded tourism program are both subject to the maintenance of the existing scenic character.”²³¹ To achieve these ends, the Waterford Area Management Plan stressed the need for public and private cooperation—while the County could implement some recommendations on issues like rezoning, new applications for land use, sewage connections, parking, and road improvements, the county would not take the lead on preserving open space.²³²

Underscoring the need for intervention, in 1986, a developer unveiled a plan to build dozens of homes on Waterford's 77-acre Huntley Farm property, stretched out along almost the entirety of the east side of High Street—within a key village viewshed. The Waterford Foundation, in consultation with the NPS's National Historic Landmarks Program, determined that the construction of these homes would negatively impact the integrity of the district and would likely lead to the loss of its National Historic Landmark designation.²³³ Expressing great concern, the National Park Service declared, “Suburban growth is threatening the historic agricultural land surrounding the village,” and if the Huntley farm property were developed, it would “destroy

²²⁷ Robert R. Page, Cathy A. Gilbert, and Susan A. Dolan, “A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contexts, Process, and Techniques,” U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service: Washington, D.C., 1998.

²²⁸ Loudoun County Department of Planning, “Waterford Area Management Plan,” Leesburg, VA, adopted October 19, 1987, preface.

²²⁹ Milton Herd, interview by Catherine Morrissey, January 8, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

²³⁰ “Waterford Area Management Plan,” 8.

²³¹ “Waterford Area Management Plan,” 8.

²³² “Waterford Area Management Plan,” 8.

²³³ “Historic Preservation Administration Act of 1989 and the National Historic Preservation Policy Act of 1989: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks, and Forests of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources” (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990), 394-395; “Landmark Community Fighting Change,” *Daily Press* (Newport News, VA), June 30, 1988; Linda Cox, “Historic Waterford Vs. a Flood of Eager Developers,” *Washington Post*, June 24, 1990; Arnold M. Burke, “Watering Down Waterford,” *Preservation News*, September 1, 1986.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 37

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

the visual relationship between the historic farmland and the village.”²³⁴ Due to the severity of this threat, in 1988, the Waterford National Historic Landmark District was added to the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s inaugural list of America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places.²³⁵ The Foundation, in cooperation with the developers, were ultimately able to successfully revise the construction plans to include only fourteen homes, strategically placed outside of Waterford’s historic viewshed. Significantly, this resolution included the purchase of \$200,000 in property easements from the developer, funded in part by the Commonwealth of Virginia. However, the Foundation felt that this was not a sustainable path forward—boldly stating in response to the development, that “without a commitment from Loudoun County, the Waterford National Historic Landmark will not survive.”²³⁶ The Huntley Farm development project, and the real threat of the loss of NHL designation, served as a catalyst for the Waterford Foundation to continue developing new preservation strategies to retain and manage the district’s open space.²³⁷

“Pioneering a Protection Approach”: The Waterford Compact

In 1989, the Waterford Foundation commissioned a report, funded in part by a grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, titled *Waterford National Historic Landmark: Its Significance and Protection*. Prepared by architectural historian and historic preservation consultant Antoinette J. Lee, the report sought to increase public awareness of the Landmark’s significance, called for key partnerships with influential organizations, and, perhaps most importantly, explored guidelines for appropriate new construction within the Landmark’s boundaries, based on an analysis of its historic characteristics. Stating that “the future of the Waterford National Historic Landmark depends on the actions of the Loudoun County government, the National Park Service representing the U.S. Department of the Interior, and private interests, including the landowners and the Waterford Foundation,” the report urged that “all parties must join in a partnership committed to the maintenance of this nationally significant historic district” if it was to be preserved.²³⁸

The remainder of the report focused on how to “further the implementation of the Waterford Area Management Plan” by outlining the history of the village, evaluating its physical and historic characteristics, and ultimately, providing “the background necessary for the drawing up of guidelines and preservation/development scenarios that will allow for appropriate new construction in such a manner as to maintain the Landmark’s character.”²³⁹ While there was clearly still some hope that Loudoun County’s local historic district boundaries might be expanded to match those of the national historic districts²⁴⁰—thus providing design review and local regulatory control over rural development—it was also clear that other preservation strategies would be necessary. Perhaps most notably, the report contained language that emphasized Waterford’s emergence as a widely known, high-profile case study in the new rural preservation movement. It noted that, “Planners, preservationists, and local officials look to the Waterford experience for an example of how to address the preservation of rural character and historic open space in the midst of suburban sprawl.” It further added that the “effort to protect the Waterford National Historic Landmark has won many supporters nationwide because it is symptomatic of development challenges that are occurring near every major American city.” Indeed, Waterford at this stage was a key laboratory of preservation experimentation, as preservationists were beginning to expand their efforts to “address

²³⁴ Burke, “Watering Down Waterford.”

²³⁵ “America’s 11 Most Historic Endangered Historic Places—Past Listings,” National Trust for Historic Preservation, accessed May 21, 2021, <https://savingplaces.org/11most-past-listings>; “Historic Preservation Administration Act of 1989 and the National Historic Preservation Policy Act of 1989.”

²³⁶ Waterford Foundation, *44th Annual Home Tours and Crafts Exhibit*, Waterford, Virginia: The Waterford Foundation, Inc. October 1987, 6.

²³⁷ Brabec, “Linking the Past,” 51-52.

²³⁸ Lee, 1, 3.

²³⁹ Lee, 3.

²⁴⁰ Lee, 52.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 38

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

the protection of large rural swathes of land often measuring thousands of acres.”²⁴¹

With many eyes on Waterford’s rural preservation efforts, and with the Huntley Farm controversy fresh in mind, the Waterford Foundation launched a new preservation initiative—called the Waterford Compact—in 1988 and fully launched in 1992. Land use expert Robert Lemire praised the innovative nature of the program at the time, observing that “the Waterford Foundation is pioneering a protection approach that should be of enormous interest to other special areas” in the United States.²⁴² In essence, the Waterford Compact aimed to neutralize the largest point of contention between preservationists and landowners in the district: the significant financial value in developing tracts of undeveloped land, compared to leaving the same land “preserved” as open space. Under the Waterford Compact, the Waterford Foundation promised to compensate private landowners for cooperating with their preservation goals. Key to the agreement was the establishment of the Waterford Foundation’s right of first refusal—meaning that the Foundation could buy-out some rights of private landowners in exchange for their agreement to adhere to specific, preservation-friendly development guidelines. The Waterford Compact is, at its core, a method for compensating any lost value caused by voluntarily limiting development on a property.²⁴³ This approach began to dramatically shift the relationship between preservationists and the district’s rural landowners. Lemire observed in 1991 that the “Waterford Foundation is beginning to be perceived as a resource to landowners instead of a threat.”²⁴⁴

Linking the Past to the Future: A Landscape Conservation Strategy for Waterford, Virginia—and Beyond

One of the last major preservation reports commissioned on behalf of both the Waterford Foundation and the National Park Service was a publication titled *Linking the Past to the Future: A Landscape Conservation Strategy for Waterford Virginia* (1992). This 86-page report combined the efforts of previous years and developed specific recommended development scenarios for the remaining unprotected parcels in the outlying areas of the district. The report and design plans were viewed as a potential model to address “the same problem and circumstances” that were “occurring across the country as significant historic landscapes, covering vast acreage and held largely in private hands,” were “undergoing changes in land use” from agricultural to residential.²⁴⁵ *Linking the Past* was on the forefront of historic rural landscape studies—arguing the need for their appreciation as culturally complex, diverse, large scale entities that are evolving and ever changing.²⁴⁶ It sought to “find ways in which new development can successfully be integrated into historic landscapes . . . meeting [both] preservation goals and the economic viability of new development.”²⁴⁷ Many similar historic districts, especially in large metropolitan regions, were similarly threatened at the time by rapid development. When the report was written, about 20 percent of all National Historic Landmarks in rural areas were considered endangered from suburban growth.²⁴⁸ The significance of *Linking the Past* was that it experimented with the new preservation methods laid out in the NPS’s (then draft) *Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Landscapes*, essentially using Waterford as a case study in planning and managing rural historic landscapes.²⁴⁹ Elizabeth Brabec, Professor of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning and the lead author of *Linking the Past*, highlights how the preservation strategies attempted in Waterford represented two “firsts” in cultural landscape preservation: “One is [the] right

²⁴¹ Lee, 57.

²⁴² Robert A. Lemire, “The Waterford Compact,” *Waterford Foundation Annual Report*, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 1990-1991, 9. Lemire was at the time noted as a land use expert specializing in conflict resolution and mediation of land use disputes, as well as a professor of historic conservation at Harvard University.

²⁴³ Brabec, “Linking the Past,” 59.

²⁴⁴ Lemire, 9.

²⁴⁵ Elizabeth Brabec, “Tomorrow’s Parks and Open Spaces Preservation Strategy for Waterford Village,” *CRM*, Volume 16, No. 4. Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 1993, 20.

²⁴⁶ Brabec, “Tomorrow’s Parks,” 20.

²⁴⁷ Brabec, “Tomorrow’s Parks,” 20.

²⁴⁸ Brabec, “Linking the Past,” iv.

²⁴⁹ Brabec, “Tomorrow’s Parks,” 20; 22.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 39

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

of first refusal [The Waterford Compact] for development rights in the landscape of a national historic landmark, and the other one is the application of a limited development strategy, which had not been done in any cultural landscapes at this point.” Thus, Waterford again played a key role in testing landscape preservation strategies for rural historic districts in the United States.

Conclusion

The campaign to restore, designate, and protect the character of the historic village core of Waterford, along with its agricultural setting, is a nationally significant story of local historic preservation efforts—and reflects how private citizens and the Waterford Foundation continuously strove to apply emerging preservation strategies to creatively preserve this heritage landscape. Waterford’s remarkably intact architectural and cultural landscape survives with such high integrity due to this multipronged historic preservation campaign, spanning nearly eight decades. This preservation campaign employed an innovative, collaborative, and multifaceted approach that utilized a wide variety of strategies including privately funded restoration efforts; non-profit advocacy; land acquisition; federal, state, and local historic designations; an extensive easement program; and, during its most recent phase, a complex local and county planning effort to protect the critical open spaces providing Waterford’s agricultural context. The sustained preservation efforts of the Waterford Foundation, and a continuing culture of stewardship among its many private property owners, has protected the character of this highly evocative historic landscape. It’s high level of integrity, largely attributable to the 20th century preservation campaigns, is a large part of its national significance.

An outcome of the preservation campaign in Waterford has been the gradual gentrification of the village. Some of the demographic changes in Waterford are reflective of population shifts that happened within Loudoun County and in the nation more broadly during the mid- and late-twentieth century. The overall population of the county grew, initially in large part due to an influx of resident commuters who worked in Washington, D.C., and other large urban areas. Expanded and improved roadways combined with the increased affordability of the automobile by the 1930s made this influx of commuters possible.²⁵⁰ Inversely, as the economy shifted increasingly away from agriculture, the younger and laboring members of rural villages and towns, like Waterford, increasingly moved to urban centers for employment opportunities. Still, the initial preservation efforts in Waterford, executed by the Chamberlins in the 1930s, resulted in the displacement of some village residents while also attracting outsiders typically with higher incomes. Some of those displaced were long-time African American families. Rising property values and real estate costs also drove out long-time residents. The organized community campaign to preserve the village, from the 1940s onward, was largely driven by Waterford’s mainly White newcomers.

In oral history interviews conducted in 2021 in conjunction with this National Historic Landmark update, several former residents of the village described how the preservation of Waterford had racial implications and contributed to change in the village. John Chamberlin, Brown Morton, and Margaret Morton all reported that Waterford was much more diverse in the mid-twentieth century and that its social character has changed tremendously over the past 50 years. Chamberlin poignantly observed that despite the successful preservation of the village architecture and landscape, “the town that I grew up in sociologically no longer exists.”²⁵¹ All three informants recalled that many Black residents lived in Waterford into the late-twentieth century. While the earliest preservation efforts in the village provided job opportunities for Black residents—first as carpenters and laborers in house restorations and later as attendants at the Waterford Fair—the preservation culture in Waterford led to a

²⁵⁰ Kathryn Gettings Smith, Edna Johnston, and Megan Glynn, “Loudoun County African-American Historic Architectural Resources Survey,” History Matters LLC, Washington, D.C., September 2004.

²⁵¹ John Chamberlin, interview by Catherine Morrissey, January 6, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 40

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

gentrification dynamic that slowly pushed out most non-Whites.²⁵²

However, the demographic shift in Waterford was not only a racial one. Brown Morton noted that as “a result of Waterford’s popularity,” it has “become so expensive that we’ve lost the character of the village.” He adds that, “When we moved there, there were Black people, White people, farmers, commuters like ourselves, old people, [and] young people,” but now “it’s lost that sense of community of different races, different backgrounds, different economic levels, different religious views.”²⁵³ John Chamberlin similarly suggested that, as houses became more expensive, they became unaffordable for “people who are nurses, and schoolteachers, and policemen, and firemen, and, you know, the people that hold society on their shoulders.”²⁵⁴ Margaret Morton further observed that, as a result of these trends, Waterford during the last several decades has had fewer families and children and a far wealthier residential demographic. The value of real estate in the village has increased profoundly over the course of the last few decades. The Mortons offered an example: they bought their home in the village in 1968 for \$33,000 and sold it in 2008 for \$902,000, more than four times the value when adjusted for inflation.²⁵⁵

Epilogue: Development Pressures and the Continuing Campaign to Preserve Waterford

Threats and preservation initiatives continue to this day in Waterford. By the early 1990s, the construction and alteration of roadways adjacent to the Waterford Historic District became a major concern for the town’s conservationists. In 1990, the proposed suburban developments within the Waterford Historic District along Virginia Scenic Byway Route 665 were stalled due to concerns regarding their potential impacts on the village’s surrounding agricultural area. Correspondence between the National Park Service and the Loudoun County Planning Commission indicate that the two parties were actively attempting to coordinate concerns regarding future development and the preservation of the historic village. Furthermore, this correspondence demonstrates that Loudoun County in the 1990s was attempting to employ rural road capacity and cluster zoning as part of its efforts to minimize development impacts on historic properties, including Waterford.²⁵⁶

The latter half of the 1990s was a period of unparalleled growth for Loudoun County and Northern Virginia as a whole. By 1998, there were nearly 1,000 technology companies—including then high-profile America Online and MCI WorldCom—operating in the Northern Virginia area, providing Fairfax and Loudoun counties with another economic boom. Massive suburban expansion projects, like Belmont and Ashburn, were undertaken to serve the housing needs of thousands of new tech workers and their families. Hundreds of companies flooded the county with offers to build schools, shopping malls, and recreational areas for the vastly expanded suburban sectors of the region. To effectively manage the growth, Loudoun County administrators partnered with advocates of smart-growth development in the late 1990s. These professionals advocated for the slowing of residential growth to avoid increased property taxes that potentially anger current residents.²⁵⁷ Part of this strategy involved placing constraints on developers to lessen the impact of suburban expansion on the county’s rural environments. It was also during this period when Loudoun County officials began to adopt “density-packing” as a technique to restrict suburban growth to specific zones of previous development.

²⁵² Margaret Morton, interview by Catherine Morrissey, March 3, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

²⁵³ W. Brown Morton, III, interview by Catherine Morrissey, March 3, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

²⁵⁴ John Chamberlin, interview by Catherine Morrissey, January 6, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

²⁵⁵ Margaret Morton, interview by Catherine Morrissey, March 3, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, CPI Inflation Calculator, https://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm.

²⁵⁶ Letter, Jerry L. Rogers to C. Lynn Adams, October 12, 1990, 1 and 3.

²⁵⁷ Keisman, 1.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 41

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

A Final Piece of the Puzzle: The Acquisition & Preservation of the Phillips Farm

While the preservation of the Waterford Historic District underwent many preservation challenges in the 1980s and 1990s, continuing demand for residential development continued to threaten this cultural landscape. The development pressure felt by Waterford residents did not cease and instead accelerated in the twenty-first century, by which point Loudoun County's population had increased to nearly 200,000 residents, about twice the population of the county in the Pre-World War II era. Today, the population of Loudoun County has nearly doubled again and continues to grow. This astounding level of growth has come with a series of challenges to those who want to protect its historical and natural resources.

In 2003, the Brown family sold 144 acres of the historic Phillips Farm (VDHR# 401-0138 and VDHR# 401-0232) for \$2.2 million to a developer called Historic Fields LLC. Located immediately to the west of the Catoctin Creek, the Phillips Farm was vital to the settlement of Waterford in 1733 and to the viewshed of the National Historic Landmark District. Historic Fields LLC planned to construct fourteen luxury houses along a ridgeline that would have been clearly visible from the village. Some felt that the development would have resulted in Waterford's delisting as a National Historic Landmark.²⁵⁸

The Waterford Foundation approached Historic Fields LLC about purchasing the property, but the developer's price of \$3.9 million was firm. Although the Foundation had never raised such a large sum, it was determined to preserve the Phillips Farm and launched the *Save the Landmark* campaign at their 60th anniversary gala in March 2003. It raised money through preservation bonds and local, national, and international donations. The Foundation also successfully applied for an \$800,000 grant from the USDA Farm & Ranch Lands Protection Program and over \$1 million in funds from the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) with the help of Senator John Warner and Congressman Frank Wolf. In July, over 200 Waterford residents and friends gathered to hold a Quaker-style "silent witnessing," which generated national publicity. The Foundation received a \$500,000 pledge from Robert and Clarice Smith, a \$200,000 grant with an additional \$50,000 for educational programs from the Trustees of the Paul Mellon Estate, and \$50,000 from Dominion Resources Foundation.²⁵⁹

The Waterford Foundation worked with major land preservation organizations to save the Phillips Farm, partnering with the Trust for Public Land to negotiate the purchase of the property. The Trust for Public Land successfully reached an agreement with the developer in August 2003, and the Foundation successfully purchased the Phillips Farm on December 18, 2003. The Waterford Foundation then began to work with the Virginia Outdoors Foundation (VOF) to establish a conservation easement on the property and reached an agreement in 2005 when VOF purchased the easement for \$1.4 million. This enabled the Waterford Foundation to repay most of its debt and ensured that the land would be permanently used for agriculture. The USDA grant also stipulated that the land remain agricultural in use, while the TEA-21 funding stipulated that the Foundation build a small parking lot and walking trails along the historic mill race located on the Phillips Farm.²⁶⁰ The acquisition of the Phillips Farm represents the continued preservation efforts of the citizens of Waterford and the Waterford Foundation, protecting critical open space and viewsheds.

Comparative Analysis

The Waterford National Historic Landmark District is rare among designated heritage landscapes as an exceptionally well-preserved eighteenth- and nineteenth-century rural village with expansive boundaries that

²⁵⁸ "Milestones: The Phillips Farm," Annual Report, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc. Archives; "Save the Landmark Campaign," Annual Report, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc. Archives, 17-22.

²⁵⁹ "Milestones;" "Save the Landmark Campaign;" "Annual Report," Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc. Archives, 2003, 10-11.

²⁶⁰ "Save the Landmark Campaign;" "Annual Report," Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc. Archives, 2005, 10-11.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 42

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

capture its historic setting. Waterford is also exceptional for the innovative and multipronged preservation campaign undertaken to preserve the village landscape. The revolutionary approach to boundary delineation of the district, which included not only the village core but also its historic agricultural lands and open space, preserved the visual clues necessary to understand the village in its historical context.²⁶¹ The preservation of this village landscape, through the use of emerging and experimental approaches in preservation and implementation of an array of diverse tools, demonstrates an important and early example of a sustained preservation effort spearheaded by private citizens and a community non-profit organization. Unlike museum restorations such as Colonial Williamsburg, the village is a living landscape where most of the property remains in private, individual ownership.

Research to date has uncovered no other NHL-designated heritage landscapes that have employed such a diverse array of preservation methods—orchestrated by a local, non-profit agency and by many private homeowners—to achieve such a remarkable and thorough preservation of a comprehensive rural, village landscape. Indeed, part of what makes the Waterford preservation model unique—and nationally significant—is the 1970 National Historic Landmark nomination boundaries that include not only the 136-acre village cluster but also over 1,200 acres of rural context, comprised mostly of surrounding farmsteads—making it likely the first district of its kind in the nation. The intense and sustained effort to conserve this cohesive village landscape, supported by many preservation partners, resulted in a remarkably well-preserved nineteenth-century village landscape with an exceptional level of integrity—both in its architecture and its overall village form. The following districts have achieved comparable results through other preservation approaches.

Williamsburg Historic District, Williamsburg, Virginia

Williamsburg Historic District, designated a National Historic Landmark in 1960, was listed prior to modern National Historic Landmark criteria. The statement of significance and period of significance are tied to when the city of Williamsburg was the colonial capital of Virginia (1699-1779). The nomination recognizes the philanthropic efforts of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and W.A.R. Goodwin as one of the “most ambitious restoration projects in the country.”²⁶² Undoubtedly, if the nomination were amended today, its significance would be tied to Colonial Williamsburg’s critical role in shaping modern preservation practice in America. Like the village of Waterford, Williamsburg restored a large heritage landscape in-situ; however, it is a restored and curated landscape through many additions and deletions to achieve a desired (and possibly, partially imagined) result. During this restoration process, a staggering amount of historic fabric was lost—approximately 600 buildings were removed from the landscape, 100 historic buildings were restored, and about 350 buildings were reconstructed.²⁶³ Early restoration efforts during the 1930s in the historic core of the Waterford National Historic Landmark District were often compared to that of Williamsburg. In one newspaper, Waterford was dubbed with moniker of “Little Williamsburg.”²⁶⁴

The Williamsburg and Waterford heritage landscapes differ in two notable ways. First, within the boundaries of the Waterford Historic District, the buildings were never selectively curated, as in Williamsburg, to convey a certain era. In Williamsburg, buildings that post-dated 1779 were removed during the restoration process. Likewise, historic buildings that had been lost in Waterford were not reconstructed on the landscape. As such, the extant buildings and landscape features in the Waterford Historic District represent a natural evolution of a village over two centuries. Second, Waterford, unlike Williamsburg, is not a museum landscape. Instead, it is primarily

²⁶¹ Elizabeth Brabec, interview by Catherine Morrissey, February 12, 2021, transcript, Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

²⁶² Stephen Lissandrello, “Williamsburg Historic District,” National Historic Landmark Inventory-Nomination Form, Landmark Review Project, Washington D.C., 1975, Section 7, page 1.

²⁶³ Lissandrello, Section 7, page 1.

²⁶⁴ Stanley Baitz, “Restoring Waterford of 100 Years,” *The Sunday Star Pictorial Magazine*, Washington, D.C. August 22, 1948.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 43

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

owned and preserved through private property stewards. Waterford Foundation owns only 11 of the 233 properties in the village, most of which were considered necessary interventions to preserve non-residential properties and open space. While Williamsburg and Waterford share a similar early-twentieth century restoration spirit, the Waterford National Historic Landmark District relied on a plethora of preservation tools and partners, while the Williamsburg Historic District was mostly the result of a private philanthropic preservation effort.

Old Deerfield Historic District, Deerfield, Massachusetts

Old Deerfield Historic District is another one of the first designated National Historic Landmark districts, also listed in 1960. Like the Williamsburg Historic District, Old Deerfield Historic District is a legacy designation and was listed prior to modern National Historic Landmark criteria and processes. Recognizing settlement patterns in northern Massachusetts in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, this early nomination also highlights the role Historic Deerfield, Inc. played in restoring the village.²⁶⁵ It is noted in the nomination that Deerfield village is “one of the most successful community restorations in the United States” through a diverse partnership network including the Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association, the Town of Deerfield, the First Church, private property stewards, philanthropic donors Henry and Helen Flynt, and the preservation non-profit Heritage Foundation (now Historic Deerfield, Inc., formed in 1952).²⁶⁶ Like with the Waterford Historic District, Old Deerfield Historic District preserves an in-situ heritage landscape, much unchanged since its own zenith.²⁶⁷ This rural New England village was originally settled in the late-seventeenth century and now predominantly represents the mid-eighteenth century, at its height as a center of the wheat industry and cattle market in the Connecticut River Valley. Like Waterford, it is largely intact, with limited and minimally invasive later infill. Its streets are unaltered in plan, and the original village lots remain intact.²⁶⁸ Similarly, in order to preserve the integrity of the entire site, the NHL boundaries include both the village and the historic farmland bounding the district at its north and south reaches. This legacy district exemplifies a restored and preserved landscape like that of Waterford, though illustrative of an earlier building period and in New England.

Frequent comparisons have been drawn between Waterford and Old Deerfield’s legacy district for its high level of integrity, its early community preservation efforts, and its in-situ preservation of a heritage landscape. However, there are a few key differences between the two National Historic Landmark districts. First, the Old Deerfield Historic District is a hybrid landscape—part private residential landscape and part museum, whereas the Waterford Historic District is primarily privately owned, largely by individuals. Both National Historic Landmark districts recognize the importance of viewsheds and critical open space in relation to the historic settlements, but the Waterford Historic District was the first NHL to delineate historic district boundaries in this way. While Old Deerfield Historic District was designated ten years before the Waterford Historic District, it did not have official delineated boundaries until 1978, when the National Historic Landmark committee added them to the earlier nomination.²⁶⁹ The restoration of the museum portion of the village was completed under the philanthropic auspices of the Flynts, who started the project in 1952, nearly two decades after the Chamberlins’ restoration efforts in Waterford. Furthermore, the preservation of the Old Deerfield Historic District was not as multipronged as the campaign that Waterford sustained over many decades.

Old Salem Historic District, Winston-Salem, North Carolina

The Old Salem Historic District, designated a National Historic Landmark in 1966 and amended in 2016, was most recently listed under NHL criteria 1, 4, and 6 for being a theocratically governed utopian town, for the

²⁶⁵ Charles E. Shed, “Deerfield Village,” National Historic Landmark Inventory-Nomination Form, 1960, Section 8, page 1.

²⁶⁶ Shed, Section 8, page 3.

²⁶⁷ Shed, Section 8, page 3.

²⁶⁸ Shed, Section 8, page 3.

²⁶⁹ E-mail correspondence between Kathryn Smith (NPS) and Patricia Henry (NPS), December 11, 2019.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 44

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

architecture within it, for the archaeological significance of lost landscape features, and, most notably, for the twentieth century preservation efforts of Old Salem, Inc.²⁷⁰ The most relevant and comparable significance argument to that of the Waterford Historic District, under Criterion 1, focuses on the role of Old Salem, Inc. as a nationally significant vanguard institution in the field of public history.²⁷¹ Like the preservation campaigns led by the Waterford Foundation, Old Salem, Inc. utilized two preservation strategies in order to preserve a religious heritage landscape in situ. In 1948, the city of Winston-Salem pioneered the use of zoning overlays to be used as a tool to protect historic districts, and it established a master plan for its preservation efforts.²⁷² Old Salem, Inc., also founded in 1948, created a private/public partnership using deed covenants and revolving funds to undertake restoration of the entire town, similar to the revolving fund strategy employed by the Waterford Foundation five years earlier.

The in-situ preservation of the heritage landscape at Old Salem is like that of Waterford, as both historic places relied on a public/private partnership to preserve their respective heritage landscape. Both the Old Salem Historic District and the Waterford Historic District used multiple preservation tools at different points in time to achieve their preservation goals. The two historic districts differ in that Waterford continued with new and innovative efforts to preserve the village, actively experimenting with new strategies well into the 1990s. The innovative approach used in determining Waterford Historic District's boundaries ensured that much more of the heritage landscape was recognized and protected. Comparatively very little open space is preserved within Old Salem. Lastly, the landscape of Old Salem today represents a mix of restored museum landscape and private property owners. Again, one thing that makes the preservation of Waterford distinctive is that the heritage landscape is almost entirely preserved by non-corporate private property stewards.

In addition to the examples presented above, several other well-preserved village landscapes are designated as National Historic Landmark Districts. Each shares some characteristics in common with the Waterford Historic District but also shows ways that Waterford was a forerunner for its early and sustained community preservation efforts and inclusion of expansive boundaries that capture its historic and natural setting.

Jacksonville Historic District, Jacksonville, Oregon

Oregon's Jacksonville Historic District is recognized as one of the best preserved nineteenth century mining towns in the Pacific Northwest, featuring an architectural array of little-altered commercial and residential buildings from its rapid development in the 1850s through the onset of stagnation in the 1880s, as a result of its being bypassed by the main railroad line and depletion of gold ore deposits.²⁷³ Like Waterford, it was initially passively preserved and retains its village scale and spatial relationships among historic resources.²⁷⁴ In the early 1960s, Jacksonville residents rallied to prevent a new highway from being routed through the village, which sparked preservation efforts to designate the district "in order to preserve the remarkable collection of properties in its setting of wooded hills."²⁷⁵ The core of the village was listed as a National Historic Landmark District in 1966, with an expansion to its boundaries in 1977 to capture supporting residential neighborhoods.²⁷⁶ While

²⁷⁰ Michael O. Hartley, Martha B. Hartley, and John C. Larson, "Old Salem Historic District (updated documentation and boundary change)," National Historic Landmark Nomination, Old Salem Museums & Gardens, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, 2016, 205-206.

²⁷¹ Hartley, 259.

²⁷² Hartley, 260.

²⁷³ Cecil McKithan, "Jacksonville Historic District," National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form (Washington, D.C.: Historic Sites Survey Division, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977), Section 8; "Illustrating Four Treatments in Oregon," National Park Service, accessed May 26, 2021, https://www.nps.gov/tps/education/workingonthepast/case_studies/jacksonville1.htm.

²⁷⁴ McKithan, "Jacksonville Historic District."

²⁷⁵ "Illustrating Four Treatments in Oregon."

²⁷⁶ "Illustrating Four Treatments in Oregon."

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 45

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Jacksonville and Waterford are similar as exceptionally—first passively and then actively—preserved village landscapes, retaining their historic cores and broader settings, they differ in their typologies and course of development. Jacksonville, as a mining boomtown, witnessed a rapid ascension as a commercial center in southwest Oregon, while Waterford’s landscape reflects several periods of progressive development in the agrarian Upland South. Today, Jacksonville, like Waterford, is a living village as opposed to a museum landscape, whose residents were also behind the effort to preserve the village character, though 20 to 30 years after Waterford.

Georgetown-Silver Plume Historic District, Georgetown and Silver Plume, Colorado

Like in Jacksonville, gold was discovered in the 1850s in what would come to be known as Georgetown, Colorado, followed by large quantities of silver, setting off a mining boom and subsequent rapid development. The town of Georgetown was established first, with Silver Plume developing as a satellite mining camp and the Georgetown Loop Railroad later connecting the two across the alpine Clear Creek Valley. Together, the towns boast a dense and varied collection of late-nineteenth century commercial, residential, and public architecture. The Georgetown-Silver Plume Historic District was also designated in 1966 as a National Historic Landmark, recognizing its importance as a significant late-nineteenth mining community in the Rocky Mountain West.²⁷⁷ A preservation “boom” followed in the 1970s, when Georgetown passed a comprehensive historic preservation ordinance that was precedent-setting in Colorado—similar to the rush of preservation easements negotiated in Waterford following its National Historic Landmark designation.²⁷⁸ When boundaries were established for the Georgetown-Silver Plume Historic District in the late 1970s, a decade after its original designation and in a move reflecting increased concern for preservation, they encompassed not only the town cores and connecting railroad grade but included “the bulk of the mining excavations” around Silver Plume, as well as specific lines “set to provide a sufficient historic and natural setting lateral to the course of the valley.”²⁷⁹ While Georgetown-Silver Plume is, like Jacksonville, altogether typologically and developmentally different than Waterford, it is one of the earliest districts to include expansive boundaries to capture its broader cultural landscape—though following on the heels of Waterford’s innovative boundary demarcations. However, Georgetown-Silver Plume Historic District is no longer a living village but reflects a museum landscape and is managed by the Georgetown Trust for Conservation & Preservation.²⁸⁰

Shakertown at Pleasant Hill Historic District, Pleasant Hill, Kentucky

Designated as a National Historic Landmark District in 1971, just after Waterford, Shakertown, located in north-central Kentucky, was initially established in the early-nineteenth century by the United Society of Believers of Christ’s Second Coming. Known as Shakers, they formed communal, utopian societies and were known for their architecture and handicrafts. The village is significant today as the largest restored Shaker community, with nearly three dozen original buildings and encompasses almost 2,800 acres including historic agricultural lands. At its height in the middle of the nineteenth century, Shakertown was one of the largest Shaker communities, though by 1910 had ceased to be an active society and soon after transitioned into private ownership. In the early 1960s, a group of citizens with interest in preserving the historic village formed the nonprofit organization Shaker Village of Pleasant Hill to purchase and restore the buildings. Unlike Waterford, Shakertown is not a living village but is

²⁷⁷ Joseph S. Mendinghall, “Georgetown-Silver Plume Historic District,” National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form (Washington, D.C.: Historic Sites Survey, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1975), Section 8; “Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District,” Georgetown Trust for Conservation & Preservation, Inc., accessed May 26, 2021, https://georgetowntrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Final-NHLD-Overview-8x11_5.pdf.

²⁷⁸ Mendinghall, “Georgetown-Silver Plume Historic District;” “Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District.”

²⁷⁹ Mendinghall, “Georgetown-Silver Plume Historic District.”

²⁸⁰ “Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District.”

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 46

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

instead a curated museum landscape.²⁸¹ In fact, the first president of the newly established Shaker Village organization was James Lowry Cogar, Colonial Williamsburg's first curator, who "insisted upon the purchase of 2,250 acres of original Shaker land to act as a buffer against commercial encroachment."²⁸² In this way, the district is similar to Waterford in that the village retains its historic setting, though it is a curatorial restoration versus preserved as an active village community and continues to be owned and managed by Shaker Village of Pleasant Hill.

The above comparative analysis supports the identification of the Waterford Historic District as the only National Historic Landmark District that recognizes a multipronged preservation strategy of a comprehensive village landscape that is mostly privately owned. This, coupled with the district's unparalleled integrity of a nineteenth-century agricultural service village in the Upland South, clearly makes the Waterford Historic District significant at the national level.

²⁸¹ W. Brown Morton, III, "Shakertown at Pleasant Hill Historic District," National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form (Washington, D.C.: Historic Surveys, Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1971), Section 8; "History and Restoration of Shaker Village at Pleasant Hill," Shaker Village at Pleasant Hill, accessed May 26, 2021, <https://shakervillageky.org/history-and-restoration/>.

²⁸² "History and Restoration of Shaker Village at Pleasant Hill."

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 47

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

6. PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND STATEMENT OF INTEGRITY

Ownership of Property

Private: X
Public-Local: X
Public-State:
Public-Federal:

Category of Property

Building(s):
District: X
Site:
Structure:
Object:

Number of Resources within Boundary of Property:

Contributing

Buildings: 205
Sites: 31
Structures: 9
Objects: 0
Total: 245

Noncontributing

Buildings: 159
Sites: 3
Structures: 13
Objects: 0
Total: 175

PROVIDE PRESENT AND PAST PHYSICAL DESCRIPTIONS OF PROPERTY

(Please see specific guidance for type of resource[s] being nominated)

HISTORIC DESCRIPTION

Town Development

Pioneering Waterford's Built Environment, 1733-1800

The bulk of the Waterford Historic District lies within two land grants dating to the first half of the eighteenth century, including 400 acres acquired by Amos Janney around 1733, and 303 acres acquired by Janney's brother-in-law, Francis Hague, in 1743.²⁸³ The first settlement cluster in what is now Waterford reportedly centered on the current mill area, near the intersections of present-day First Street, Bond Street, and Main Street. According to one account, four log buildings were constructed in this vicinity, including a mill, a miller's house, a blacksmith shop, and a cabin.²⁸⁴ Shortly after this initial settlement, around 1741, Amos Janney established a Quaker meetinghouse, called the Fairfax Meeting, in the northeast corner of his land. Initially constructed in log, the meetinghouse was rebuilt in stone in 1761 (and later expanded in 1770). The expanded stone meeting house stands

²⁸³ Though Amos Janney is generally credited with founding the village by establishing a homestead, a mill, and a Quaker meetinghouse, details surrounding the earliest settlement activity in Waterford is murky. This is exacerbated by the fact that no official record has ever been located for Amos Janney's acquisition of his 400-acre parcel. For example, the dividing line between the Janney and Hague parcels, as mapped by local historian Eugene Scheel, actually places the earliest settlement cluster—including the current mill site, Bond Street, and most of what became Main Street—on Hague's land, rather than on Janney's. (Scheel, 7.) A "handshake" deal between relatives certainly is one possible explanation for Janney initiating settlement off his own property Divine, 19., but since Janney's brother-in-law did not own the adjacent 303 acres until 1743, any building activity on the neighboring tract before that point would have been on the land of Catesby Cocke or John Mead, who sold it to Hague. It is unclear where exactly Amos Janney built his mill, though local histories speculate that his mill site was upstream from the current mill site and possibly still not on Janney's own land. One local history identifies Janney's homestead site as near the c.1800 Talbott Farm, southeast of the current Waterford village cluster, at a fair distance from his possible mill site, introducing further questions about the earliest developments and their exact locations. Divine, 19.

²⁸⁴ Lee, 18.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 48

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

today at **15510 Loyalty Road (VDHR# 401-0088)**. An early road, running northwest-southeast, connected the mill site/settlement cluster and the Fairfax meeting house, providing the first settlement axis for the village.²⁸⁵ Still, during its earliest decades, the settlement that would become Waterford was mostly a collection of dispersed farmsteads, with the mill and Quaker meetinghouse serving as economic and community focal points.

After 1750, Amos Janney's son, Mahlon, played a significant role in the development of the village. After apparently inheriting his father's properties, he built a dam across the Catoctin Creek, dug a mile-long millrace to the present mill area, and purchased a property from his uncle Francis in 1762 "with improvements thereon," possibly referring to an existing two-story mill, built of stone and frame, at the site of the present mill building.²⁸⁶ This mill served as a continued focal point of the budding settlement, which was referred to as "Janney's Mill" until the 1780s.²⁸⁷

By the early 1780s, when the village was renamed Waterford, it featured about a dozen houses, many outbuildings, a store, a blacksmith shop, a tannery, and the Quaker meetinghouse, in addition to several surrounding farms. The population was approximately 80. However, Waterford's first significant expansion occurred after 1780, when a cousin of Amos Janney, Joseph Janney, bought a 12-acre tract of land along Main Street from Francis Hague's heirs, and subdivided the tract into building lots running along both sides of Main Street, including 15 on the south side that extended from the mill to the present village center at Second Street.²⁸⁸ While a few houses on Main Street predated this subdivision, the surviving houses there today suggest that the subdivision prompted the construction of several houses during the 1780s and 1790s. By 1800, the population of the hamlet had nearly doubled, and in November of that year, the U.S. Post Office Department officially established a post office for Waterford, located in Daniel Stone's house on Bond Street (40108 Bond Street, VDHR# 401-0073).²⁸⁹

Post-1800 Expansion

Until the turn of the nineteenth century, Waterford was still a linear and sparsely-populated settlement, with the mill and tannery at the western end and the Quaker meetinghouse and school on the eastern end, connected by a meandering road that is now Main Street, Water Street, and Loyalty Road. After 1800, Waterford village expanded significantly—and within just a few decades, it had taken the general footprint, street grid, and form that it retains today. Mahlon Janney established two other mills in Waterford, south of the village along Ball's Run, including a fulling mill in the late 1790s and a saw and gristmill around 1803.²⁹⁰ In early 1801, Janney also extended Main Street up the steep incline of "Market Hill," to the top of the ridge, subdividing about 4 acres of his land into a total of 17 lots on either side of Main Street, including a site for his own new house (built in 1805 at the top of the hill, at the intersection of High Street). Within a few years, several houses (and a store) were constructed on the Market Hill extension of Main Street.

It is unclear when the major north-south streets of Second and High were first legally platted, but when Janney passed away in 1812, his executors subdivided his remaining land along Second Street and High Street into 64 more parcels.²⁹¹ The parcels, each about a quarter acre, provided larger building lots than earlier parcels along

²⁸⁵ Lee, 18.

²⁸⁶ Divine, 20. Mahlon was only 16 years old when his father passed away in 1747.

²⁸⁷ Divine, 20. While some accounts suggest Janney built this mill before acquiring the land, it also might be possible that Janney built or replaced the mill after acquiring the property.

²⁸⁹ Scheel, 10.

²⁹¹ Hellman, 2; Scheel 12. Studio Ammons, 14. The gristmill, later known as the Schooley Mill, was apparently used to process corn and limestone, freeing up Janney's primary mill for merchant flour production

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 49

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Main Street. Since Second and High Streets led approximately to the sites of Janney's industrial enterprises along Ball's Run, they almost certainly existed as de facto roadways before 1812, and may have already been legally laid out by 1801—the year that the Virginia General Assembly officially established the town on “lots and streets . . . already laid off . . . at the place known by the name of Waterford.”²⁹² This new, carefully-gridded addition to Waterford village expanded its footprint significantly, and was called “New Town” or “Janney's New Addition.” Several cross streets were platted along the rise between Second and High Streets, the two major north-south thoroughfares, including Mahlon Street (in honor of Mahlon Janney), Patrick Street, Janney Street, and at the southern end Factory Street—near the industrial enterprises at Ball's Run.²⁹³

The decade after 1810 was a time of growth for community institutions, as well. In December 1810, the Virginia General Assembly chartered the Waterford Library Company, which seems to have never had a dedicated building, but was perhaps housed in the Friends' Meetinghouse or its school. Around 1813, on the town green (known as the “Town Triangle” at Main and Water Streets, the trustees of Waterford acquired property “to build a Market House” and a “Jail” for “the benefit of the said town of Waterford.”²⁹⁴ The current jail on that site features an 1877 inscription on the exterior stone wall, so it is perhaps a replacement of the original. A market house was constructed, but it was in poor repair by the 1840s and has long since been removed.²⁹⁵ Still, the establishment of these public institutions here clearly marked the Town Triangle as the center of the expanding village, its population approaching 400 at the time. In 1815, a bank—called the Loudoun Company—was established at Isaac Steer's brick house on Main Street (40149 Main Street), reportedly the first in the county. This institution may have been involved in financing the continued boom in house construction in Waterford during the 1810s and 1820s.²⁹⁶

Change might have been more gradual and dispersed in the rolling hills around the village, but the industrious farmers in the area certainly contributed to the village's economic vitality and growth. Over the first century of settlement, the rural expanses surrounding the gridded streets of Waterford were slowly subdivided into smaller farms, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the area adjacent to the village was comprised of family farms averaging 150 to 200 acres.²⁹⁷ Though every farmstead was different, those surrounding Waterford village were gradually improved and evolved as the needs and fortunes of the farmers changed over time. Typically, a house was constructed first, and then ancillary buildings such as barns, granaries, and other outbuildings were added over time. It was common for farming families to rebuild or add to their houses as they accrued wealth, often building in more expensive materials such as brick or stone, rather than log or wood frames. This type of architectural evolution is still visible today in the surviving farm landscapes in the Waterford Historic District.²⁹⁸

The financial prospects of farmers in Waterford at the turn of the nineteenth century seem to have been generally promising. One writer in the nineteenth century claimed that farmland around Waterford was “equal to any in the state of Virginia” and “excellent wheat and corn land.”²⁹⁹ Local farmers maintained and enhanced this rich farmland through “The Loudoun Method of Farming,” which may have originated with settlers from southeast Pennsylvania and introduced a three-step fertilizing treatment of lime, manure, and clover to increase the fertility of the soil. This system was well-publicized by John Binns (writing from Clover Hill Farm north of Waterford)

²⁹² Scheel, 11. Janney was not among the listed trustees of the new town, however, which included James Moore, James Griffith, John Williams, and Abner Williams.”

²⁹³ Scheel, 13.

²⁹⁴ Scheel, 14.

²⁹⁵ Waterford corporation minutes, 1836-1845.

²⁹⁶ Scheel, 14-17.

²⁹⁷ Scheel, 14-17.

²⁹⁸ Lee, 24.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 50

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

in *A Treatise on Practical Farming*, published in 1803 and apparently even acknowledged by Thomas Jefferson.³⁰⁰

Despite elaborately gridded streets in Waterford, which included a system of alleys shown on maps from the mid-1800s, new construction from 1810-1830 tended to remain mostly along the primary streets: along Main Street in the older axis of town, and along Second and High Streets in the “New Town,” with only moderate building activity on secondary streets. Most houses on the west side of Second Street, overlooking the floodplain meadow of Catoctin Creek, were constructed during the early 1820s.³⁰¹ This floodplain was likely the geographic factor that prevented significant development west of Second Street. Mid-nineteenth century maps show side streets and alleys platted to run west of Second Street, and even an alley running parallel to and west of Second Street, but it seems that these small secondary thoroughways were little developed.³⁰² Today, only Patrick and Janney Streets extend slightly west of Second. The resulting contrast between the line of developed houses and the open expanse of floodplain meadow is one of the key “hard edges”—between the village and countryside—that lends Waterford village its distinct visual character. A similar visual “edge,” with open, pastoral views directly adjacent to early-nineteenth century houses, can be found in several other places in the village, including the south side of Main Street, the north side of Main Street on the “Big Hill,” and south of Factory Street. Though there was little residential development along High Street, the broad expanse of farm pasture to its east today still provides another visual contrast between village street and rural country meadow.

By the 1830s, Waterford had emerged as an impressive village. As reported by Yardley Taylor in Joseph Martin’s 1835 *Gazetteer of Virginia*, the village boasted about 70 dwellings, six mercantile stores, four taverns, two churches, two “free schools,” two water-powered mills, three physicians, two house-joiners, two cabinet-makers, two hatters, and one each of a boot and shoe manufacturer, a painter, a chair-maker, and a tailor.³⁰³ By this time, the area around Factory Street and nearby Ball’s Run had evolved into a distinct manufacturing area, spatially removed from most of the residential and commercial enterprises in the core of the village. In this industrial neighborhood, along the north side of Factory Street, there was a machine parts warehouse, a wheelwright and paint shop, a cold iron shop, and a blacksmith shop, with another blacksmith shop located just south of Factory Street on what is now Clark’s Gap/State Road 665.³⁰⁴ In March 1836, Waterford incorporated, with nine “freeholders” established as its elected officials. The incorporation act invested the freeholders with the power to erect a town hall, a workhouse (poor house), a fire company, and (again) a market house and jail on the town triangle.³⁰⁵ It is not clear if a dedicated town hall, workhouse, or fire house were ever constructed, but by 1840, the town’s population was recorded around 500—the peak for the town of Waterford.³⁰⁶

William Williams II may have been exaggerating in 1860 when he declared that Waterford had, by the mid-1820s, “presented the appearance of a finished town” and then “suddenly ceased to improve.”³⁰⁷ Yet, his recollection probably reflects a significantly slowed rate of growth after around 1830. During the period between 1830 and the Civil War, occasional new construction continued to focus on Second Street, as well as its intersecting side streets to the east, including Church, Patrick, and Mahlon. High Street was never densely developed beyond its northern stretch, which featured several churches and houses by the mid-nineteenth century. By the onset of the Civil War, the growth of Waterford had slowed considerably.

³⁰¹ Lee, 24-27.

³⁰² “Waterford, 1875,” From *Surveys* by James S. Oden, Library of Virginia.

³⁰³ Scheel, 17-18.

³⁰⁴ Lee, 27

³⁰⁵ Scheel, 17.

³⁰⁶ Scheel, 18.

³⁰⁷ Quoted in Scheel, 17.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 51

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

A combination of factors likely caused Waterford's slowing growth after the first quarter of the 1800s. First, the village was bypassed by major new transportation developments that instead boosted nearby settlements. In 1830, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad reached Point of Rocks, Maryland, on the Potomac River about seven miles northeast of Waterford. Just two years later, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal also reached Point of Rocks. Additionally, by 1832, west of Waterford, the Leesburg and Snickers' Gap Turnpike—known as old Route 7 today—connected Leesburg to the Shenandoah Valley, leaving Waterford off a major east-west corridor. The completion of a highway (today's Route 15) between Point of Rocks and Leesburg in 1853 further isolated Waterford. At the same time, inexpensive fertile lands were opening for settlement in western states and territories as the United States slowly spread across the continent. Some accounts suggest that many in Waterford's Quaker community, disheartened over Virginia's retention of slavery, moved to northeast Ohio and other territories in search of free societies and new opportunities.³⁰⁸

Though the physical growth of Waterford village may have slowed as the Civil War approached, it would be a mistake to assume that it was economically depressed. Agriculture continued to drive the economy of the area, and farmers surrounding the village continued to produce large harvests for market. Samuel Means, the prosperous owner of the large merchant mill at Waterford during the Civil War, reportedly owned 28 horses for hauling flour to Point of Rocks.³⁰⁹ During the 1850s, Schooley's Mill continued to process corn meal, hominy, and lumber, and other manufacturers continued to operate in the Factory Street area.³¹⁰

Most of the houses built in Waterford during its peak decades between 1800 and 1860 are three-bay, two-story structures of frame or brick construction, many displaying elements of the Federal style of architecture.³¹¹ Brick was clearly a popular building material during the first few decades of the nineteenth century, when many of the larger houses along the town's major thoroughfares were constructed in brick, often with Flemish bond on the façade. The village also boasts many log structures, many dating to the late-eighteenth or early-nineteenth century. The resulting mix of log, frame, stone, and brick houses—many of a similar scale and spacing—creates both an architectural rhythm and variety that adds to the rich visual texture of the village.

Post-Civil War Waterford: The Victorian Era, 1865-1900

After the Civil War, limited new construction continued to slowly fill the existing grid of Waterford.³¹² One account suggests that during the twenty years between 1865 and 1885, only five new structures were built in the village.³¹³ One of those new structures, built in 1867 at the corner of Second and Janney Streets, was the new one-room schoolhouse for Black children, one of nine such schools in Loudoun County sponsored by the Freedmen's Bureau.³¹⁴

In the farms around Waterford, several barns and other agricultural outbuildings had been burned during Civil War torch raids. After the war, most of these structures were rebuilt, including those on the Talbott, Hague-Hough, and Clifton farms. Many of these barns were reconstructed on their original fieldstone foundations, with post-Civil War timber framing.³¹⁵

³⁰⁸ Scheel, 17-18.

³⁰⁹ Divine, 21.

³¹⁰ Lee, 29.

³¹¹ Lee, 29.

³¹² Lee, 27.

³¹³ Lee, 31.

³¹⁴ Scheel, 20; *Friends Intelligencer* (Philadelphia, PA), November 23, 1867.

³¹⁵ Lee, 31.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 52

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

In 1875, Waterford, like many towns in the area, reincorporated due to the legal vagaries after the Civil War, and as a way to raise taxes and update ordinances.³¹⁶ Waterford's new ordinances shed light on the aesthetic goals of the town's leadership during the Victorian era. All houses were required to have hitching posts, since horses could not be tethered to trees, gates, or fences. Further, despite Waterford's intimate relationship with farming and animal husbandry, any penned-in hogs that were offensive to neighbors could be removed by council vote. Ordinances stipulated that the main streets were to be 20 feet wide with five-foot wide sidewalks, graded, and of wood or some type of paving. Each owner had to remove debris, waste matter, and weeds from his property, and the construction of any building other than a dwelling had to be approved by the town council.³¹⁷ In 1883, the impressive new Presbyterian Church was constructed in the Gothic Revival style on High Street.

Between 1885 and 1905, many new dwellings and other structures were built in Waterford village. Demand for summer or country homes among wealthy newcomers may have helped fuel this activity.³¹⁸ Almost twenty houses were built during these decades, especially filling in empty lots on both sides of Second Street, as well as newly subdivided lots on High Street, near the intersections with Main and Patrick Streets. Factory Street also transitioned to a residential area during this time, as the old manufactures and workshops there closed in the face of a rapidly industrializing and urbanizing nation. Many of these new houses were larger in scale, built in Victorian styles, and enjoyed larger lots of open space. Several older houses in town were "Victorianized" during this period through the addition of porches and architectural ornament.³¹⁹

In February 1888, *The Loudoun Telephone*, a newspaper based in nearby Hamilton, Virginia, published a short column summarizing life in Waterford. Though brief, and perhaps biased, the picture it painted was one of a quiet but stable community. It noted that:

Waterford is quiet—Socially there is nothing brilliant; the men attend the Farmers Club, the ladies go to their Household, both take a hand in an occasional quilting and the young folks hang over the front gate in the moonlight. Financially, there is nothing startling. The several stores seem to be doing a fairly good business and the Mills seem to be quite busy, but ready cash is not abundant. Religiously, the Town is experiencing no sensation at this time. Morally, there is occasion for the remark that Waterford is too near "The Point [of Rocks]" for its own good. In other towns of the county, I hear the charge that there is a good deal of drinking in Waterford—and I am afraid the town is not in position to bring suit for slander on this score.³²⁰

That the stores were "doing a fairly good business" and the mills appeared "quite busy" suggests that the agricultural community surrounding the village of Waterford, which had always been a source of community's vitality, was going strong.

Stagnation and Economic Depression, 1900-1930

After the turn of the twentieth century, the village of Waterford entered a period of general stagnation. One chronicler of Loudoun County still counted "383 inhabitants" of Waterford in 1908 (including 14 "merchants and

³¹⁶ Scheel, 20.

³¹⁷ Scheel, 21.

³¹⁸ As late as 1908, James Head noted that, "In common with the other towns and villages of the famous Loudoun Valley, Waterford is noted for its numerous and inexhaustible wells of the purest and best water, bracing air, and low mortality rate," which might explain part of the attraction of Waterford as a healthy country retreat. James William Head, *History and Comprehensive Description of Loudoun County*, Park View Press, 1908, 75.

³¹⁹ Lee, 31-33.

³²⁰ Quoted in Scheel, 22.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 53

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

mechanics”), but the Victorian building boom had run its course.³²¹ While the 1920s witnessed the addition of a few new houses scattered within the village,³²² the Great Depression would soon reinforce the village’s stagnation—affecting the farmers outside the town as well as the owners of the village’s houses and stores. After almost 200 years, Waterford seemed to have run its course as a rural mill town. In a seemingly symbolic turn of events, in April 1929 the remaining Quakers in Waterford “laid down” the Fairfax Meeting due to a lack of an active congregation. The minutes of that last meeting lamented, “It is with feeling of sadness we close this mtg., established here in 1748—186 years ago. The last and solemn mtg. is now concluded.”³²³ In 1936, as the struggles of the Great Depression took its toll on the village infrastructure, the incorporation of Waterford was forfeited, as well. The streets were reportedly in very bad repair, and the town government—which had not met formally in years—had no money for improvements. The Loudoun County board of supervisors suggested a solution to Waterford’s leaders: if they dropped their local incorporation, the county highway department would make much needed repairs to Second Street and lower Main Street. The Virginia General Assembly approved the change in 1937, and Waterford’s main streets were paved for the first time.³²⁴

Waterford’s Preservation Era, 1931-1992

The year 1937 also marked a more hopeful turning point for Waterford’s future—the genesis of the preservation movement that would lead to Waterford’s restoration over many decades. In that year, the first restorations of the village’s dilapidated historic houses were initiated by brothers Edward and Leroy Chamberlin. Photographs by the Historic American Buildings Survey in 1937 documented many neglected houses in need of intervention. Within six years, the Waterford Foundation was formed to promote the history and preservation of the village. Over the next half century, the Waterford Foundation would incorporate a range of strategies—including purchasing and restoring properties, encouraging preservation easements, and working to designate Waterford as a protected historic district—that would result in a remarkably well-preserved village enjoying a nearly unrivaled level of protection for a town of privately-owned properties. This era and its formative influence are treated extensively in Section 5.

Architectural Evolution in the Waterford Historic District

Phase I: Architecture in Waterford’s Dispersed Hamlet (1730-1780)

Architectural evidence of the early dispersed settlement period remains around the intersection at Main Street and Bond Street. During this earliest colonial settlement period of Waterford, buildings were constructed using materials that were readily available, such as fieldstone and log, built in vernacular forms.³²⁵ The earliest types were “hall plan” houses, or single room dwellings, typically with a garret space above for sleeping, and “hall and parlor plan” houses, with two rooms side by side (or double-cell plan dwellings, with two rooms front to back). I-houses—dwellings standing two-stories in height with a side-gable roof, one room deep and usually two rooms wide—would become the most commonplace dwelling type on the landscape.³²⁶ These forms, both expanded versions of earlier plans and those built as such, are found throughout the village, and are built of log, fieldstone, frame, and brick. They typically feature a symmetrical three- or five-bay façade and interior or exterior gable end chimneys.

Waterford’s first European immigrants, as Pennsylvania German Quakers, brought with them traditional northern

³²¹ Head, 75.

³²² Lee, 33-35.

³²³ Scheel, 22.

³²⁴ Scheel, 22-23.

³²⁵ Virginia Savage McAlester, *A Field Guide to American Houses* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2013), 119; Lee, 18.

³²⁶ Fred B. Kniffen, “Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion,” in *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, eds. Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1986), 7-10.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 54

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

and central European building techniques. Three main materials—log, stone, and timber frame—were used in the construction of the early settlement. The earliest construction method likely utilized square-hewn logs placed horizontally in a square, room-size, single-pen plan, with interlocking v-notched corners for stability.³²⁷ One significant adaptation in German log construction, as transported to Virginia, was the transition from a centrally-positioned chimney to one located at a gable end, a revision in plan to compensate for a warmer, southern climate.³²⁸ Overhead space was utilized for sleeping. Some log dwellings were later clad in weatherboard for additional protection from the elements and also as an aesthetic update to the exterior.³²⁹ Log construction persisted in some parts despite the availability of milled lumber, with later examples built with the intent to be clad in weatherboard or wood shingles.³³⁰ Frame additions and porches are also common.³³¹ Extant log dwellings are found throughout the district, though the majority are located on lower Main Street, which, along with Bond Street, was the earliest developed portion of the village.

After log dwellings were constructed, prosperity and stability in the settlement encouraged either the replacement, expansion, or new construction of permanent buildings utilizing the abundance of fieldstone in the region.³³² The geological formation underlying the village produced excellent building materials. Composed of granites, gneisses, and Catoctin rocks—the production of Catoctin lava flows.³³³ Fieldstone was a common material in the foundations and in the walls of the earliest “patent houses” on the dispersed farm settlements outside of Waterford.³³⁴ “Patent houses” gained their name because they were erected to demonstrate that a farmer intended to permanently settle on the land.³³⁵ Few of these patent houses still exist around Waterford in a recognizable form. The Hague-Hough House, located at 40120 Bond Street (VDHR# 401-0115), retains its original 1745 one-room, stone patent house on its east end.³³⁶ This is likely the oldest surviving house in Waterford.

The 1760s marked a distinct shift to more durable construction methods in the village, especially as seen through the construction of the second mill building, as well as the Fairfax Meeting House. Around 1761, Mahlon Janney relocated his father’s mill to the current location.³³⁷ He replaced the earlier log mill building with a one-story, frame structure atop a fieldstone foundation, replete with expensive French buhr stones.³³⁸ Janney also cut in the hand-dug, circa 1761 mill race, and erected the stone milldam (VDHR # 401-0232), both of which are still extant today. Another notable upgrade to the settlement that occurred around the same year as the construction of the mill, was the replacement of the circa 1741 log meeting house with the eastern half of the present stone building ((VDHR # 401-0088) the building expanded to its current form in 1781). A school and cemetery were also added to the Meeting House site by 1755.³³⁹

³²⁷ McAlester, 126, 128.

³²⁸ Kniffen, 13.

³²⁹ McAlester, 130.

³³⁰ McAlester, 130.

³³¹ McAlester, 130.

³³² Lee, 18.

³³³ Benjamin A. Morgan, “An Outline of the Geology of the Area Surrounding Waterford, Virginia” *Waterford Foundation 31st Annual Homes Tour and Crafts Exhibit*, Waterford, Foundation, Inc: Waterford, VA, October 1974, 13; Lee, 18.

³³⁴ Lee 18; 23-24.

³³⁵ Lee, 23-24.

³³⁶ Lee, 23-24.

³³⁷ Studio Ammons, 13.

³³⁸ “401-0001 Waterford Mill,” Waterford Historic District Survey, accessed December 3, 2018, <https://vcris.dhr.virginia.gov/vcris>; Susan Hellman, “Walk with Us... Waterford, Virginia,” 3rd ed. (Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 2015), 14; “The Old Mill of Waterford,” Waterford Foundation, accessed 9/19/2019, <https://www.waterfordhistory.org/history/waterford-old-mill/>; Studio Ammons, 13.

³³⁹ Studio Ammons, 10.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 55

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Early village dwellings from the initial settlement period, also dating from the 1760s are located on Bond Street near Mahlon Janney's relocated mill. The dwellings likely display architectural patterns reflected in the earlier log dwellings in town that do not survive, especially in form and size. 40108 Bond Street (VDHR #401-0073) is an embanked combination log and frame dwelling built in a vernacular style. It is three-bays, single-pile, with a center entry. Notably, it served as a combination store and dwelling—likely a typical pattern in the settlement era.³⁴⁰ The Samuel Means House at 40128 Bond Street (VDHR# 401-0074), built circa 1762 is also an embanked, two-story, three-bay, single-pile center entry vernacular dwelling. Reportedly built by Mahlon Janney, one of the principal differences between these two Bond Street houses is Janney constructed his house of stone.

The buildings and landscape features of the dispersed settlement era are reflective of early colonial building patterns across the colony—the buildings were constructed using readily available materials, in this case primarily log and fieldstone. The forms the buildings took were vernacular in nature, typically one-room hall plan, or two-room hall-parlor variations. It is not until the next settlement phase in Waterford that the surviving buildings took on more sophisticated forms and styles that utilized more sophisticated materials and design motifs.

Phase II: Architecture During Waterford's Linear Growth (1780-1800)

In 1780 Joseph Janney subdivided Main Street, expanding the hamlet of Waterford along the existing linear axis connecting the mill to the meetinghouse. During this expansion (1780-1800), new construction of buildings relied on common construction types and building styles, notably carrying forward the vernacular building patterns found on Bond Street, as well as the later embrace of high-quality building materials (brick) and more fashionable architectural styles (the Federal style).

The buildings in Joseph Janney's 1780 subdivision along Main Street predominantly continue the vernacular architectural traditions established on Bond Street; they are primarily hall- or hall-parlor plans, single-pile, one- to two-stories in height, and built of log and/or stone construction. Since fieldstone was readily available in this region of Virginia, fieldstone was utilized almost exclusively in Waterford for the construction of building foundations—whether for log, frame, or brick buildings. Many of the extant buildings built in this settlement period (1780-1812) feature an unusual siting technique, one that is dictated by the topography.³⁴¹ On the north side of Main Street, the frame dwellings are attached and embanked into the hillside—a full fieldstone cellar is located at street level, while the main (usually frame or log) dwelling rises two-stories above the cellar. Oftentimes the street level cellars were used as commercial spaces, with living spaces above. Some configurations of these embanked buildings did not have interior access between the ground cellar floor and the house above. On the south side of Main Street, the dwellings also rely on large fieldstone foundations, embanking them not into the hillside, but instead on the crest of it. This creates a two-story house on the façade facing Main Street and a three-story elevation on the rear.³⁴² Examples of this response to topography on the north side of Main Street include 40152 Main Street (VDHR # 401-0068), 40154 Main Street (VDHR # 401-0067), 40162 Main Street (VDHR # 401-0064) and 40170 Main Street (VDHR # 401-0063). Examples of embanked houses on the south side of Main Street include 40155 (VDHR # 401-0009) and 40157 Main Street (VDHR # 401-0010).

Another use of the abundant fieldstone in the region was to utilize the stone in chimney construction. Mostly, the log dwellings in the village feature chimneys constructed of fieldstone, sometimes with a material change to brick in the top half of the stack for more building precision in the narrower upper reaches of the flue.³⁴³ These stone

³⁴⁰ "401-0073 Daniel Stone House," Waterford Historic District Survey, accessed December 4, 2018, <https://vcris.dhr.virginia.gov/vcris>.

³⁴¹ Lee, 23.

³⁴² Lee, 23.

³⁴³ K. Edward Lay, *The Architecture of Jefferson Country: Charlottesville and Abermarle County, Virginia* (Charlottesville, VA: The

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 56

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

and brick chimneys were far safer than wood or wattle and daub versions.

Another vernacular building trend that continued in the linear village was the use of log construction. Some of the earliest and best examples of log dwellings found in the National Historic Landmark District are in the Joseph Janney subdivision. The Janney-Phillips House, located at 40132 Bond Street (VDHR # 401-0075), is the oldest known surviving log dwelling constructed originally in the village. Built c. 1781, the small log core of the dwelling is concealed by weatherboard and has been expanded with several additions, including a lateral three-bay, two-story, brick section. Owner Joseph Janney sold the house in 1784, not long after its initial construction, and built another log dwelling at 40154 Main Street. The Joseph Janney House (VDHR # 401-0067) is a two-story, three-bay log dwelling raised over a full-height, fieldstone foundation, though it was reportedly originally built as a one-story house and later raised with additional logs. This house is also covered in weatherboard and features a lateral two-story, two-bay addition, likely of frame construction, and a two-tiered frame porch. The c. 1800 Griffith-Gover House, located nearby at 40139 Main Street (VDHR # 401-0005), is similarly concealed with weatherboard and is comparable in size and form to the Joseph Janney House, standing two stories, with a three-bay main block, and was later expanded via a lateral two-story, two-bay, frame addition. A unique example in Waterford of a single-pen log dwelling expanded into a double-pen plan is the c. 1800 Weaver's Cottage, located at 40188 Water Street (VDHR # 401-0114) that displays a clear seam at the center façade, evidence of at least two construction phases. Each block of the Weaver's Cottage is one-and-a-half-story, and two-bay building that stands over a full-height fieldstone foundation.

Phase III and IV: Architecture in the Agricultural Service Village (1800-1936)

Many of the new brick dwellings along the Market Hill extension of Main Street were built as three-bay, two-story, single-pile dwellings with Federal style features. Most exhibit Flemish bond brickwork, and careful detailing.³⁴⁴ Federal architecture is the most common style found within Waterford, which reflects the height of development and growth of the village around the turn of the nineteenth century (about 45 dwellings are this style throughout the entire village). Drawing on contemporary European precedents exemplified by British architects Robert and James Adam, Federal-style architecture proliferated in the Early Republic period of the United States and was most popular from about 1780 until 1820 (and in some areas into the second quarter of the nineteenth century).³⁴⁵ This mode of design is typified by symmetry, elaborate door surrounds including elliptical or semi-circular fanlights over front entrances and molded and denticulated cornices. Windows are most commonly six-over-six, double-hung sash, often with brick jack arches or stone lintels, and roofs are either side-gable or hipped in form.³⁴⁶ Federal dwellings most commonly feature five bays at the façade with a central entry, though three and seven bay facades do occur.³⁴⁷ In Waterford; nearly all Federal-style buildings are constructed of brick and a majority of those displaying Flemish bond facades.³⁴⁸

Most Federal-style architecture in the linear portion of the village is found along the south end of Main Street and continuing up the "Big Hill," and along Second Street (in the 1812 "New Town" subdivision). A prime example of Federal architecture found in Waterford is the c. 1804 Edward Dorsey House, located at 40203 Main Street (VDHR # 401-0109), which features an ornate, molded wood central entry with a surround incorporating a webbed, elliptical fanlight, recessed jamb paneling, and framing fluted Doric pilasters. It has a symmetrical five-

University Press of Virginia, 2000), 5; telephone conversation between Michael J. Emmons, Jr. and Willie Graham, November 14, 2019.

³⁴⁴ Lee, 29.

³⁴⁵ McAlester, 217, 222.

³⁴⁶ McAlester, 217.

³⁴⁷ McAlester, 217.

³⁴⁸ Chris Novelli, Melina Bezirdjian, Calder Loth, and Lena Sweeten McDonald, *Classic Commonwealth: Virginia Architecture from the Colonial Era to 1940* (Richmond, VA: Virginia Department of Historic Resources, undated), 44.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 57

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

bay façade laid in Flemish bond, with a decorated wooden box cornice, brick jack arches, and interior end wall chimneys. Another example, known as Mill End, is located at 40090 First Street (VDHR # 401-0072). This two-and-a-half-story brick dwelling, sited across from the Waterford Mill, is laid in Flemish bond at the façade and features a symmetrical five-bay main block, with a lower two-bay service wing. The main block features a central entry with molded wood trim and a seven-light fanlight under a semi-circular brick arch, with brick jack arches over the windows, and interior end wall chimneys.

Another notable trend during this period of expansion and growth was the modification of the older houses located in the village, especially along Bond Street. As wealth increased in the village, homeowners opted to add substantial brick additions to their earlier dwellings—often doubling the size of the house. As early residents upgraded their buildings it is likely that some of the earlier settlement dwellings were lost. Historian Antoinette Lee has said of this early growth period, that after settlers procured land, they typically would construct buildings as need. “First [they built] a house, then a barn, and eventually other buildings, additions to their home or even a new house altogether.”³⁴⁹ An example of this modification is the Janney Phillips House, located at 40132 Bond Street (VDHR # 401-0075). It was modified through an addition that reflects the Federal style during the height of Waterford’s growth and development. The Janney-Phillips House featuring a lateral two-story, two-bay, Federal-style addition with a Flemish bond façade, was constructed initially by 1803 as a single story and raised by 1816 to two stories.³⁵⁰

With the 1812 subdivision of “New Town,” many of the new buildings being constructed were built in the Federal style, which was popular nationally until 1820. A notable difference between the new Federal dwellings built on Second Street, and earlier ones, is they are predominately confined to the west side of Second Street, on large lots that terminate just east of the mill race. The dwellings along Second Street are often three-bay examples of Federal architecture, such as the c. 1817 Mahlon Schooley House, located at 15555 Second Street (VDHR # 401-0027), which features a symmetrical Flemish bond façade with a central entry and is embellished with a sawtooth cornice. Another three-bay example is found at the c. 1815 William Williams House, located at 15606 Second Street (VDHR # 401-0049), which features a symmetrical Flemish bond façade with a side-hall entry and a 1920s Colonial Revival wraparound porch, likely built by Waterford builder J. Elbert Devine. Another Federal example, unique within Waterford, is the c. 1820 Jacob Mendenhall House, located at 15620 Second Street (VDHR # 401-0046), which features a symmetrical Flemish bond façade with four bays, including two central entries. This dwelling is unique in that it appears to directly reflect a vernacular Pennsylvania German building trend, with two central front doors.³⁵¹

Another notable trend in the 1810s and 1820s is the infill along Main Street and Butchers Row with Federal-style dwellings. New growth in town was not solely confined to New Town, as Waterford residents continued to build in early portions of the town plat. Some smaller, two-bay, cottage-type dwellings exhibiting modest Federal-style architecture also exist within the district. Examples include the c. 1808 Mahlon Myers House, located at 15533 Butchers Row (VDHR # 401-0085) and the c. 1820 Lloyd Curtis House, located at 40216 Main Street (VDHR # 401-0082). Bearing strong resemblance to one another and both once owned by Mahlon Myers, each is a one-and-a-half-story dwelling featuring a narrow, symmetrical Flemish bond façade with an interior end wall chimney. Another instance is Wisteria Cottage, located at 40129 Main Street (VDHR # 401-0003), which is similar in size and form and exhibits a decorative mouth-tooth cornice. It also features a façade laid in Flemish bond, though it shows evidence of extensive patching, with some courses laid in a running bond.

³⁴⁹ Lee, 24.

³⁵⁰ Hellman, 8.

³⁵¹ Hellman, 30.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 58

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Following the initial platting of "New Town"—and a flurry of construction on the west side of Second Street—the rest of the grid slowly filled in over the course of the next century. No discernible infill pattern emerged, but the new dwellings constructed reflected the popular styles of the time when they were built. Examples of Romantic architecture (Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, and Italianate), Victorian architecture (Second Empire, Queen Anne, and Folk Victorian), and Eclectic architecture (Colonial Revival) represent the subsequent building styles found throughout the gridded town.

Greek Revival

Several buildings reflecting a Greek Revival style are found within Waterford, including domestic, commercial, and religious examples. Sunnyside, built c. 1850 and located at 15570 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0051), is a one-and-a-half-story, five-bay, frame dwelling. It features a central, flat-roofed portico with heavy entablature, supported by six squared, vernacular Doric columns, two of which are engaged; a central entry surrounded by a multi-light transom and sidelights; and a wide molded wooden cornice. The portico, however, is a c. 1990 reproduction of the dwelling's earlier missing one.³⁵² A similar portico is found on the c. 1856 William James House, located at 40187 Main Street (VDHR# 401-0117), though this example is also purportedly a reproduction, built in the mid-twentieth century.³⁵³

The Chair Manufactory, built c. 1860 and located at 15502 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0057), is constructed in a two-story, three-bay, front-gable form, with an early-twentieth century wing addition. The front-gable main block features a prominent oculus style window near the peak of the roof. Used as a chair factory during the late-nineteenth century, the building retains its six-over-six-light windows with molded wood trim and prominent crowns.³⁵⁴

Waterford Baptist Church is perhaps the purest example of Greek Revival architecture found within the district. Located at 15545 High Street (VDHR# 401-0102), the one-story, brick church was built in 1853 in a front-gable form and most prominently features a distyle in antis portico with two Doric columns at the center flanked by two Doric pilasters, creating the look of a tetrastyle portico. Its heavy entablature features Greek temple-inspired triglyphs and metopes. The recessed entryway includes three wooden doors, each vertical two-panel, a type common to Greek Revival architecture, with molded wood trim and plinth blocks.³⁵⁵ The façade features a molded cornice with partial returns and a wide frieze.

Gothic Revival

The most pronounced examples of the Gothic Revival style found in the district are both religious buildings—the c. 1880 Catoctin Presbyterian Church, located at 15565 High Street (VDHR# 401-0099), and the c. 1891 John Wesley Community Church, located at 40125 Bond Street (VDHR# 401-0077). Catoctin Presbyterian Church is a one-story, front-gable, brick building and features several characteristically Gothic arches at the façade in addition to arched windows with stained glass along each elevation. John Wesley Community Church is also a one-story, front-gable building, though of frame construction, and features a tall bell tower with a pyramidal roof at the facade. Like Catoctin, it features Gothic lancet windows at the façade and along its other elevations.

Italianate

Though growth in Waterford slowed by the later part of the nineteenth century, there are several commercial examples of Italianate-influenced buildings clustered at the center of the village. The Old Insurance Building,

³⁵² Hellman, 28.

³⁵³ Hellman, 22.

³⁵⁴ Hellman, 26.

³⁵⁵ McAlester, 248.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 59

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

located at 15479 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0015), was constructed in 1872 as the Loudoun Mutual Fire Insurance Company. This one-story, three-bay, brick building features a Flemish-bond façade with a recessed central entry containing Italianate-style, two-panel, wooden double doors. To either side of the entry is a tall and narrow 16-over-16-light window, as opposed to more characteristic Italianate one-over-one- or two-over-two-light windows. A decorative cornice featuring projecting sawtooth and rowlock brick courses is employed in lieu of more typical Italianate bracketing. Despite its location in a rural mill village, this building is suggestive of a more characteristically urban form of Italianate architecture.

Adjacent to the Old Insurance Building is the Tin Shop, located at 15481 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0016). Built c. 1875 and renovated c. 1894 after a flash flood, this two-story, five-bay, frame building is more illustrative of the Italianate style, featuring overhanging eaves, a wide cornice adorned with paired brackets and dentils, and decorative, framed window moldings. The nearby Waterford Market, located at 15487 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0018), was constructed in 1883 in a boxy, two-story, frame form, with basic applied Italianate features, including overhanging eaves, a bracketed cornice, and a customer entryway with wooden double doors, two-light over raised one-panel.

Built as a store c. 1880, the Waterford Post Office, located to the other side of the Tin Shop at 40175 Main Street (VDHR# 401-0014), is a two-story, four-bay, brick building and is the purest representation of the Italianate style in the village. It features deeply-overhanging eaves, a wide cornice ornamented with brackets and dentils, and two-over-two-light windows with bracketed, pedimented crowns over the first-floor bays and arched, framed trim around the second-floor windows. It also features a characteristically Italianate customer entryway, with wooden double doors, vertical one-light over raised one-panel, recessed with panel jamb molding.

Second Empire

Just one Second Empire style building exists in the district. However, it is one of the most prominent buildings in town, the Corner Store, situated at the core of the village. Built c. 1900 at 40183 Main Street (VDHR# 401-0103), the two-story, frame Corner Store features a false-mansard roof with bracketed eaves and a molded cornice. It also contains two-over-two-light windows, typical of the style, and an intact storefront with large commercial windows and double doors.

Queen Anne

Perhaps the best representation of Queen Anne-style architecture in the district is the c. 1896 Elton James House, located at 15591 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0030). This two-story, stuccoed, frame dwelling features irregular rooflines with two projecting tower features at the façade, one with a pyramidal roof and other with a pedimented front-gable containing a characteristic Queen Anne-style multi-light window. The slate roof utilizes two types of fancy-butt shingles. This domestic example of the Queen Anne style is more illustrative of the Free Classic subtype, which tends to be more stripped down and commonly uses classical columns porch columns, as does the Elton James House.

Two other examples—the c. 1897 Edith Walker House, located at 15550 High Street (VDHR# 401-0092), and the c. 1900 Captain's House, located at 40186 Patrick Street (VDHR# 401-0105)—are similar in form to one another but executed with different detailing. Each features an irregular, cross-gable roof, with tall, corbelled brick chimneys, pedimented dormers, and a prominent wraparound porch. The two-and-a-half-story, frame Edith Walker House is accented with fancy-butt shingles in the gable ends and on dormers and a second-story sleeping porch, while classical columns support its wraparound porch. The two-and-a-half-story, frame Captain's House exhibits turned porch posts with decorative scrolled corner brackets, though it is otherwise stripped of ornament.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 60

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Folk Victorian

Most illustrative of the Folk Victorian style is the c. 1887 Flavius Beans House, located at 15575 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0029). This two-story, symmetrical frame dwelling features a central Gothic cross-gable containing two arched Italianate-style windows, with an ornament at the peak. It is accented with a variety of fancy-butt shingles in the gable ends and features Queen Anne-style multi-light windows in the main block. The dwelling features an ornate projecting bay on its southwest elevation, with the same multi-light windows with prominent Greek Revival-inspired crowns, and a decorative cornice with dentils and brackets. The one-story porch is supported by classical columns, with brackets at the cornice, and an Italianate entryway with a raised-panel door.

Another example is the c. 1890 James House, located at 15496 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0058). This two-story, symmetrical frame dwelling features a characteristically Gothic center cross-gable at the façade ornamented with a decorative finial at the peak, with Italianate-type chamfered porch posts and raised-panel door, plus a Greek Revival-inspired surround. Several similar examples include the neighbor of the Flavius Beans House, the c. 1886 Asbury Johnson House, located at 15567 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0028); Lanesslea, built c. 1902 at 15668 Factory Street (VDHR# 401-0041); and Echo Hill, built c. 1890 outside of the core of the village at 15514 Loyalty Road.

A mixed use, commercial and domestic building exhibiting attributes of the Folk Victorian style is the Isaac Steer Hough, Jr. House, built c. 1886 at 40142 Main Street (VDHR# 401-0070) (and is said to incorporate an earlier dwelling.). The first level serves a commercial function, with large storefront windows, while the upper floors are residential. The two-tiered porch, supported by chamfered posts, wraps around at the second level, and features a flatsawn balustrade, typical of factory-produced Queen Anne-type architectural components.

Huntley, located at 15578 High Street (VDHR# 401-0093) and built c. 1836, is a prime example of an earlier vernacular dwelling that was Victorianized. Situated on land adjacent to the c. 1896 Queen Anne-style Edith Walker House, and once part of the same family property, this dwelling was likely updated around the same period that Robert Walker built the neighboring house for his sister Edith. Huntley exhibits fancy-butt shingles in the gable ends and a one-story wraparound porch with a central cross-gable, supported by basic turned posts on piers and decorative corner brackets.

Colonial Revival

Most of the domestic Colonial Revival buildings in the Waterford district are built in an American Foursquare form, which was also popular during the first decades of the twentieth century and is distinguished by a boxy shape with steeply pitched, nearly pyramidal, hipped roof, typically with dormers and overhanging eaves. Its basic form allowed for the application of various architectural styles. Three similar examples are found—the c. 1917 Lemuel Smith House, located at 15520 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0055); the c. 1918 William Russell House, located at 40231 Fairfax Street (VDHR# 401-0091); and the c. 1924 Leslie Myers House, located at 15674 Factory Street (VDHR# 401-0040). Each dwelling stands two-and-a-half-stories in height and features a hipped roof with overhanging boxed eaves, pedimented or hipped dormers, and wraparound Colonial Revival porches with classical columns.

Two commercial examples of the Colonial Revival are found in the second and third iterations of the Loudoun Mutual Insurance Company, located respectively at 40170 Patrick Street (VDHR# 401-0054) and 15609 High Street (VDHR# 401-0098). The c. 1901 two-story, three-bay, symmetrical brick building is an early example of the style and features a hipped roof with overhanging boxed eaves with a denticulated and molded cornice; six-over-one-light windows with reveals and three-course segmental arches; and a central, hipped roof portico supported by vernacular Doric columns and pilasters, also with a denticulated and molded cornice. The second insurance building, constructed c. 1949, is a later and larger example of the Colonial Revival with strong

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 61

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Georgian-Revival features including a central block and two lower flanking wings. This one-and-a-half-story, nine-bay, symmetrical brick building features a denticulated and molded cornice, twelve-over-twelve-light windows, and a classically-inspired tetrastyle portico with a denticulated cornice.

Another prime example of the Colonial Revival Style is the c. 1910 Waterford Old School, located at 40222 Fairfax Street (VDHR# 401-0090), which exhibits a two-story, three-bay main block with a symmetrical façade and features a central pedimented portico, classically-inspired with heavy entablature including triglyphs, metopes, and mutules.

Architecture in a Preservation-Minded Town, 1930-on

While the historic core of Waterford is predominantly a nineteenth-century village, there are scattered examples of later infill in the core, as well as concentrations of newer development on the periphery of the historic district. Yet perhaps the strongest imprint of the “preservation” era in Waterford was the conservation of the existing building stock. After 1930, the “design” of the village of Waterford increasingly became an exercise in collective curatorship—with a growing, communal ethic towards preserving existing buildings, restoring them to their antebellum appearances, and resisting alterations or additions that would signal later historical periods or anything resembling modern design. Though more of a challenge to “see” than the other periods of village development, the preservation phase of Waterford’s history was no less influential in crafting its appearance today. Without the preservation intervention, which lasted for decades, the village of Waterford would look dramatically different today. Infill construction that occurred after the historic preservation started to steer the look of the village generally retained the siting, scale, and traditional materials of the architecture. After the advent of the local historic preservation ordinance in 1977, the additions to the district were carefully designed to avoid detracting from the historic character.

Except for a handful of outbuildings, namely several c. 1930 garages and sheds, no primary buildings were constructed during the Great Depression. In the following few decades, a few new dwellings were constructed within the district. Those examples, both in the core of the village and at the periphery, are Minimal Traditional and Ranch style dwellings. Minimal Traditional homes are typically simple and compact, one-story, and often have side gable roofs—sometimes referred to as a Cape Cod in form. Commonly built in a relatively short window of time between the Great Depression and the years following World War II, they were inexpensive to build and were typically favored for low-interest and long-term Federal Housing Authority mortgages.³⁵⁶ Two examples in Waterford are the c. 1948 Rollison House, located 15520 Loyalty Road (VDHR# 401-0089), and the c. 1955 Presbyterian Church Manse, located at 15577 High Street (VDHR# 401-0100).³⁵⁷ Both dwellings are compact and feature side-gable roofs with front-gable dormers, reflecting the Cape Cod subtype, though the Presbyterian Church Manse appears to have been altered with a lateral addition to its façade.

Another building trend that occurred concurrently to the newly constructed Minimal Traditional and Ranch style dwellings was the construction of a handful of sensitively designed infill buildings meant to replicate earlier vernacular styles in the village. Inspired by late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century log dwellings, several twentieth-century examples exist within the district. One instance is the c. 1965 Sugar Shack, located at 40159 Main Street (VDHR# 401-0011). Built to replace a row of five dwellings that were destroyed in a fire, it is constructed of logs reused from another building. In later years, it was covered with weatherboard. Another example is the c. 1970 George E. Bentley House, located at 40200 Church Street (VDHR# 401-0106), which is

³⁵⁶ McAlester, 586-589. We have not researched whether Waterford’s examples of this housing type are directly associated with the Federal Housing Authority mortgage program.

³⁵⁷ Hellman, 12.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 62

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

constructed with railroad ties from the former Washington and Old Dominion Railroad.³⁵⁸ Double-pile and standing two-and-a-half-stories in height, it is decidedly larger than a traditional log dwelling. While both houses are examples of later infill within the district, the dwellings were constructed in a manner to be visually nonintrusive and to coalesce with the historic landscape of Waterford. Like the previous examples, Trouble Enough Indeed, located at 15552 Second Street (VDHR# 401-0052), is a late-twentieth century creation; however, the house is comprised of three individual mid-to-late-nineteenth century houses—two log and one frame—moved from outside of Waterford and combined into one dwelling in 1972.³⁵⁹ The front block of the combined and reimagined dwelling stands at two-stories over a full-height foundation, its taller stature a result of its later initial build date.

New Traditional style dwellings began to grow in popularity towards the end of the twentieth century, partly in response to mid-century modern styles, with greater attention given to emulating traditional building styles. New Traditional architecture is a contemporary spin on traditional precedents, emulating aspects of earlier popular styles but straying from purity of design and form, with broad departures in scale, fenestration, and detail.³⁶⁰ Many New Traditional dwellings are found throughout the periphery of the district, the majority of which have been constructed in the last 25 years, and take on a more generalized Colonial Revival approach, though several more closely imitate earlier styles.

The village of Waterford, and its adjoining farms, faced increasing development pressure from the 1970s to the 2010s. In response, the Waterford Foundation and Loudoun County passed preservation protections in the form of a zoning ordinance (1977) and started an easement program to protect the village (1972). These two key preservation strategies impacted the type, location, scale, and style of the development throughout the decades that followed. What resulted was primarily dwellings that reflected a New Traditional “Federal” style employing many of the design elements found on the historic dwellings in the core of the village.

Also replicating the dominant Federal style found within Waterford were many new dwellings, constructed on the periphery, that reflect New Traditional Federal style. Examples of these newer dwellings, evocative of the Federal period, are mainly found in recently-developed subdivisions and include 40515 Browns Lane (VDHR# 401-0153), 40570 Browns Lane (VDHR# 401-0152), 15966 Clarkes Gap Road (VDHR# 401-0175), and 15426 Loyalty Road (VDHR# 401-0163). Two examples of New Traditional Federal-style infill construction are also found in the village core. The c. 2011 Madison House, located at 40153 Janney Street (VDHR# 401-0047), and the adjacent dwelling at 40171 Janney Street (VDHR# 401-0219), built c. 1991, reflect a Neo-Federal approach, featuring symmetrical five-bay facades with central entries, each with a side-gable roof and decorative mouth-tooth cornice. Both examples are two-story, double-pile frame buildings clad in brick veneer and featuring brick jack arches.

This last phase in the development of the Waterford Historic District can best be understood through regulated, carefully managed growth and infill. It is not by chance that the district survives in such pristine condition and with such high integrity. An integral part of Waterford’s character comes from the harmonious size, scale, and massing of the dwellings constructed within the village landscape—and a commitment to retaining that feeling, while allowing new development within the historic district. Due to the thoughtful, curated placement of new development—including the regulation of the total number of new buildings, as well as their location, orientation, size, massing, and style—resulted in minimal impact on the overall integrity of Waterford’s National Historic

³⁵⁸ “401-0106 George E. Bentley House,” Waterford Historic District Survey, accessed July 16, 2019, <http://vcris.dhr.virginia.gov/vcris/>.

³⁵⁹ Susan Hellman, *Walk with Us... Waterford, Virginia* (Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 2015), 28.

³⁶⁰ McAlester, 717-727.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 63

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Landmark district.

Current Description & Integrity of Waterford National Historic Landmark District

The Waterford Historic District, situated along the Catoctin Creek in north-central Loudoun County, Virginia, was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1970, after first being recognized on the National Register of Historic Places in 1969. Totalling over 1,420 acres, the district includes a compact village of mostly eighteenth- and nineteenth-century dwellings, as well as large expanses of surrounding farmland, open space, and agricultural complexes that lend Waterford a rare, cohesive feeling of a nineteenth century village landscape that enjoys extensive viewsheds without significant modern intrusions.

Despite many decades of development pressure, the intense, multipronged preservation effort in Waterford has helped to conserve the village as an integrated cultural landscape. Unlike many other towns where modern development continues to expand the settlement footprint and alter the overall character of its built environment, the Waterford Historic District largely retains its form and footprint as a nineteenth century village, with essentially the same network of streets and roads, its open spaces and viewsheds, and relationships to waterways and natural features. While the National Historic Landmark District is comprised of over 1,400 acres, the historic cluster of dense residential settlement in the 136-acre village core represents only about 10 percent of the total land area. Most modern construction within the district boundaries has occurred outside of the central village, and a series of preservation efforts have limited its scope and visual impact to effectively preserve key viewsheds. This approach, designating both village and the surrounding agricultural landscape that was integral to its development, was one of the first of its kind in the nation and among the most successful. The Waterford Historic District's continued visual integrity reflects an innovative and sustained effort to preserve a complete, cohesive historic village landscape of a Virginia piedmont farming community.

The natural systems, features, and topography that influenced the development patterns and evolution of the village and its surrounds are still easily read on the landscape. Catoctin Creek and its floodplain serves as an informal western boundary of the central village. Vestiges remain of the historic millrace, stretching from the Waterford Mill (VDHR # 401-0001) at the north of the village to the southwest towards Ball's Run, with a stand of trees still lining its original path. These features, along with hillier terrain to the east, influenced the placement of buildings and roadways, with initial eighteenth century development concentrating on higher ground to the north and east along Bond and Main Streets, and gridded expansion beginning in the early-nineteenth century to the south along Second and High Streets. These streets continue to be the primary village axis roads, creating a rough "T" or "Y" footprint. Historic routes such as Milltown Road and Clover Hill Road (to the north), Loyalty Road (joining with Browns Lane and Old Waterford Road, to the east), Clarkes Gap Road (to the south), and Old Wheatland Road (to the west)—in place before the mid-nineteenth century—continue to provide access to and from the village and its adjoining farmlands. Surrounding the densely settled central village are tree-lined, preserved open spaces, which stand in contrast to it and maintain the hard-visual lines that have historically characterized the relationship between village and country.

Since the 1930s, there has been minimal infill to Waterford's core. The built environment remains predominantly illustrative of a late-eighteenth through early-twentieth century agricultural and mill village, with different building forms and popular architectural styles representing all post-contact periods of development. Buildings in the oldest section of the village, particularly along Main Street, are minimally set back from the road, with partial sidewalks of brick and stone, and generally featuring narrow, if any, side yards. In later-developed parts of the village, such as along High and Second Streets, building setbacks are typically greater, with dwellings constructed on larger lots with partial sidewalks of brick and poured concrete along their road frontages.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 64

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Historically, residential village lots would have commonly served as mixed use dwelling and working spaces and contained an assemblage of domestic and occupational outbuildings, in addition to the primary building. Today, many properties retain a nineteenth- or early-twentieth century example, usually located in the rear yard. Examples include icehouses, smokehouses, springhouses, and, most often, multipurpose sheds and structures that have been adapted for different uses over time. A variety of barns, ranging from Pennsylvania German fieldstone bank barns to early-twentieth century frame dairy barns, survive in the Waterford Historic District. The majority are located at the periphery of the village core on larger parcels of land, though a few examples are found on larger lots within the central village, such as the c. 1790 stone bank barn at the Hague-Hough House, located at 40120 Bond Street (VDHR # 401-0115).

Though there have been few visual intrusions within Waterford's central core, accommodations have been made for modern living. Streets and some rural roads are paved with asphalt and marked with standardized black and white signs. Electric lines run overhead throughout the village, with some utility poles holding modern metal streetlamps. The visual impact of the cables and poles is tempered by the many mature trees that line the village streets. Most village properties have accommodated automobiles with designated gravel parallel parking areas between the street and building façade. Some larger lots feature gravel, paved, or poured concrete driveways with occasional garages. While there has been little visual intrusion in the central core of Waterford since the 1930s, the construction that has occurred since 1977 has been tightly controlled by the Loudoun County Historic District Review Committee, which ensures that any new development or exterior alterations follows strict architectural guidelines within the Waterford Historic and Cultural Conservation District. This local historic district initially protected the central village only—and not its entirety—though it has been expanded over the years to cover increasing much of the acreage under conservation easements.

In addition to its building stock, preserved landscape features significantly contribute to the historic character of the district. Low, fieldstone retaining walls are commonly found throughout the central village, particularly along the street side of embanked buildings and in the terraced side yards of hillier parcels, but also as street side borders among more level lots. Wooden fences are routinely used to demarcate property lines, with post-and-rail and picket types utilized mostly at both front and side yards. In later-developed portions of the village, such as along Second Street, late-nineteenth century wrought iron fences are also typical. Post-and-wire fences, in popular use during the early-twentieth century, mark some rear yards. Village lots are also frequently delineated by a stand or scattering of mature trees, while outlying farm fields are bordered by wooded areas or hedgerows connecting one to another. These natural borders were utilized to mark properties and control livestock, and they generally continue to follow historically established boundaries. They also play a pivotal role in protecting visual sightlines from encroaching development within the district. The retention of these historic landscape patterns is an essential component of the district's historical context and integrity.

The outlying areas of Waterford's National Historic Landmark district features many historic roads, many of which remain narrow, unpaved, and with a "sunken" appearance that convey their age and evoke travel prior to the advent of the automobile.

The most significant change that has occurred within the Waterford Historic District is the large number of homes that have been constructed in newer subdivisions at the periphery of the village. While new construction and exterior building alterations in the village core must comply with architectural guidelines enforced by the Loudoun County Historic District Review Committee, the recent development at the periphery of the district—such as in subdivisions along Browns Lane, Charles Henry Place, Hamilton Station Road, and Lookout Lane—falls outside of the local historic district boundaries and has not been subject to review. Though most dwellings constructed have been built in New Traditional styles influenced by Federal architecture, they are not compatible in form, scale, or fenestration to historic examples and are sited in a manner inconsistent with established patterns

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 65

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

in the village core. They are incompatible in terms of setbacks, lot sizes, and access—as the creation of these subdivisions have necessitated new roads within the district. While the historic viewsheds from the center of the village have been successfully preserved through the multifaceted efforts of the Waterford Foundation, its partners, and through the stewardship of individual landowners; areas of the district periphery have changed.

The high integrity of the village’s overall form and design (and thus the influence of Waterford’s historic preservation movement) is also tangible (somewhat paradoxically) in the open spaces where new construction was avoided—the “close calls” that would have dramatically altered portions of the Landmark district and negatively impact its integrity. This was achieved through the prevention of proposed demolitions and changes to the village throughout the course of the twentieth and twenty-first century. Examples of the preservation victories in the historic district also include the “near misses” the proposed changes that did not occur because of the vigilance of the citizens of the village. A few examples of these “misses” include in 1939 when Secretary of War Harry Woodring purchased the Edward Dorsey House (40203 Main Street) with the intention of dismantling the house and moving it to Alexandria. The residents and the Chamberlin brothers protested this loss—even drawing attention from a nationally syndicated columnist, Drew Pearson, who wrote about the story. Woodring ultimately sold the property in 1940.³⁶¹ Other preventative intervention included the purchase of the Huntley Farm, ultimately preventing the construction of 74 dwellings in the historic core. Also, the acquisition of the Phillips Farm prevented the erection of another 14 dwellings sited on a critical ridgeline, which would have been visible from all points in the village. As such, the exceptional integrity found throughout the village of Waterford can be understood through its exceptionally preserved buildings, its conserved rural character, and the lack of damaging infill.

³⁶¹ “A Blind Man and an Heiress,” 54.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

RESOURCE INVENTORY

The information in the inventory was gathered from a reconnaissance level survey undertaken in December of 2018. Additionally, information contained in the inventory is supplemented by an earlier survey done in 1980/1981 and currently on file with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and a walking tour guide created by the Waterford Foundation, the third edition of which was published in 2015. Both the earlier survey and the walking tour focus on the resources within the village core, around 130 in total, while this inventory contains descriptions for 233 resources within the village and around its periphery, all within the boundaries of the National Landmark Historic district.

This inventory starts with the historic core of the village, and then describes the resources found on the roads outside the core, in a clockwise fashion, starting to the northeast of the village with Loyalty Road. The inventory starts with the Waterford Mill, and then describes the rest of Main Street. It continues with the two main cross streets, Second Street and High Street, ordered numerically by address. Next the smaller, cross streets in the village core are described. Organized alphabetically and further numerically by address the order is as follows: Bond Street, Butchers Row, Church Street, Factory Street, Fairfax Street, Janney Street, Patrick Street and lastly in the core, Water Street. Next, starting with Loyalty Road to the northeast of the village core, the peripheral streets are organized in a clockwise fashion, and further organized numerically by address. The peripheral inventory is as follows; Loyalty Road, Browns Lane, Old Waterford Road, Bridlepath Lane, Clarkes Gap Road, Hamilton Station Road, Lookout Lane, Charles Henry Place, Weadon Farm Lane, Old Wheatland Road, Milltown Road, Clover Hill Road, and lastly Leila Lane.

For contributing status: C = contributing, NC = noncontributing

MAIN STREET

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
401-0001	401-0123-0001	40105	Waterford Mill	c. 1818	Building	C	E4
401-0002	401-0123-0002	40125	Marshall Claggett House	c. 1760	Building	C	E4
		40125	Shed	c. 1950	Building	NC	E4
401-0003	401-0123-0003	40129	Wisteria Cottage	c. 1800	Building	C	E4
401-0004	401-0123-0004	40135	Hollingsworth-Lee House	c. 1800	Building	C	E4
		40135	Shed	c. 1930	Building	C	E4
		40135	Outhouse	c. 1930	Building	C	E4
401-0071	401-0123-0071	40138	Francis Pierpoint House	c. 1810	Building	C	E4
		40138	Shed	c. 1980	Building	NC	E4
401-0005	401-0123-0005	40139	Griffith-Gover House	c. 1800	Building	C	E4

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 67

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		40139	Dance Pavilion	Early 20 th C	Building	C	E4
		40139	Masonry Megaphone Building with Conical Top	Early 20 th C	Structure	C	E4
		40139	Guest House	Mid-20 th C	Building	NC	E4
401-0070	401-0123-0070	40142	Isaac Steer Hough, Jr. House	c. 1886	Building	C	E4
		40142	Icehouse	c. 1886	Building	C	E4
		40142	Woodshed	c. 1940	Building	NC	E4
		40142	Chicken House	1990	Structure	NC	E4
401-0006	401-0123-0006	40145	Camelot School	c. 1820	Building	C	E4
401-0069	401-0123-0069	40148	J. Terrance McCracken House	c. 1870	Building	C	E4
		40148	Shed	c. late 20 th century	Building	NC	E4
401-0007	401-0123-0007	40149	The Bank House	c. 1800	Building	C	E4
		40149	Smokehouse	c. early 19 th century	Building	C	E4
		40149	Springhouse	c. early 19 th century	Building	C	E4
401-0068	401-0123-0068	40152	Kitty Leggett House	c. 1791	Building	C	E4
401-0008	401-0123-0008	40153	William Irish Shop	c. 1797	Building	C	E4
401-0067	401-0123-0067	40154	Joseph Janney House	c. 1784	Building	C	E4
		40154	Shed	c. late 19 th century	Building	C	E4
401-0066	401-0123-0066	(40154)	Collins Cottage Ruin (historically on a separate parcel; now part of 40154 Main St)	c. 1800	Building	C	E4
401-0009	401-0123-0009	40155	Sappington House	c. 1800	Building	C	E4
401-0010	401-0123-0010	40157	Goodwin House	c. 1800	Building	C	E4
		40157	Outbuilding	c. late 20 th century	Building	NC	E4
401-0065	401-0123-0065	40158	Janney-Coates House	c. 1805	Building	C	E4
401-0011	401-0123-0011	40159	Sugar Shack	c. 1965	Building	NC	E4

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 68

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
401-0064	401-0123-0064	40162	Talbott's Tavern	c. 1810	Building	C	E4
401-0012	401-0123-0012	40167	Sally Nettle House	c. 1811	Building	C	E4
401-0063	401-0123-0063	40170	Talbott House	c. 1810	Building	C	E4
		40170	Icehouse	c. mid 19 th C	Building	C	E4
401-0013	401-0123-0013	40171	Leven Smallwood House	c. 1810	Building	C	E4
401-0060	401-0123-0060	40174	Apothecary Shop	c. 1816-1825	Building	C	F4
401-0014	401-0123-0014	40175	Waterford Post Office	c. 1880	Building	C	F4
401-0062	401-0123-0062	40176	Arch House	c. 1815	Building	C	F4
401-0061	401-0123-0061	40180	Rollison House	1816-1830	Building	C	F4
401-0113	401-0123-0113	40183	Corner Store	c. 1900	Building	C	F5
401-0117	401-0123-0117	40187	William James House	c. 1856	Building	C	F5
401-0112	401-0123-0112	40191	McGeath Log House	c. 1820	Building	C	F5
401-0078	401-0123-0078	40192	Old Jail and Town Green	c. 1877	Building	C	F5
401-0111	401-0123-0111	40193	Asa Moore House	c. 1800	Building	C	F5
401-0079	401-0123-0079	40194	James Moore House	C. 1805	Building	C	F5
		40194	Outbuilding	C. 1855	Building	C	F5
401-0110	401-0123-0110	40197	Charles Moreland House	c. 1802	Building	C	F5
		40197	Springhouse	c. 1802	Structure	C	F5
401-0080	401-0123-0080	40200	James Moore House	c. 1855	Building	C	F5
		40200	Shed and Garage	c. 1930	Building	C	F5
401-0109	401-0123-0109	40203	Edward Dorsey House	c. 1804	Building	C	F5
401-0108	401-0123-0108	40205	Hough Brothers House	c. 1812	Building	C	F5
		40205	Garage	c. 1950	Building	NC	F5
		40205	Pergola	c. 1990	Structure	NC	F5
401-0081	401-0123-0081	40210	Charles and George Schooley House	c. 1855	Building	C	F5

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 69

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
		40210	Garage	c. 1930	Building	C	F5
401-0107	401-0123-0107	40215	William Paxson House	c. 1803	Building	C	F5
		40215	Shed	c. 2000	Building	NC	F5
		40215	Shed	c. 2000	Building	NC	F5
401-0082	401-0123-0082	40216	Lloyd Curtis House	c. 1820	Building	C	F5
		40216	Shed	c. 1820	Building	C	F5
401-0103	401-0123-0103	40221	Old Methodist Church	c. 1877	Building	C	F5
401-0076	401-0123-0076	Corner of Main and Bond St.	The Scales (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 303361415000)	c. 1900	Building	C	E4

SECOND STREET

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
401-0015	401-0123-0015	15479	Old Insurance Building	c. 1872	Building	C	E5
401-0016	401-0123-0016	15481	Tin Shop	c. 1875	Building	C	E5
401-0116	401-0123-0116	Behind 15483	Red Barn (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 303266125000)	c. 1912	Building	C	E5
401-0017	401-0123-0017	15483	Livery Stable (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 303266721000)	c. 1810	Building	C	E5
		15483	Shed	c. 1920	Building	C	E5
401-0059	401-0123-0059	15484	The Forge	c. 1880	Building	C	F5
401-0018	401-0123-0018	15487	Waterford Market	1883	Building	C	E5
401-0019	401-0123-0019	15493	William Nettle House	c. 1818	Building	C	E5

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 70

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		15493	Outbuilding	c. 19 th century	Building	C	E5
401-0058	401-0123-0058	15496	James House	c. 1890	Building	C	F5
		15496	Outhouse	c. 1890	Building	C	F5
401-0057	401-0123-0057	15502	Chair Manufactory	c. 1860	Building	C	F5
		15502	Shed	c. 2000	Building	NC	F5
401-0020	401-0123-0020	15505	William Hite Hough House	c. 1817-1820	Building	C	E5
401-0021	401-0123-0021	15511	Walker-Phillips House	c. 1820	Building	C	E5
		15511	Barn	c. mid-19 th century	Building	C	E5
401-0139	401-0123-0139	15511	0.1 acre parcel between two other parcels, 401-0021 and 401-0143. Site of former dwelling.		Site	C	E5
	401-0123-143	none	Holway Open Space, 2.13-acre parcel (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 303161894000) EASEMENT (VDHR)		Site	C	E5
		none	Barn	c. late 19 th century	Building	C	E5
		none	Mill Race			C	E5
401-0056	401-0123-0056	15512	Robert O. Compher House	c. 1816	Building	C	F5
401-0120	401-0123-0120	15512	Bob Compher's Barn	c. 1890	Building	C	F5
401-0055	401-0123-0055	15520	Lemuel Smith House	c. 1917	Building	C	E5/F5
		15520	Garage	c. 1917	Building	C	E5/F5
401-0022	401-0123-0022	15523	Clockmaker's House and Shop	c. 1820	Building	C	E5

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 71

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		15523	Shed	c. 1990	Building	NC	E5
401-0023	401-0123-0023	15527	Samuel Hough House	c. 1818	Building	C	E5
401-0024	401-0123-0024	15533	Catoctin Creek	c. 1820	Building	C	E5
		15533	Shed	c. 1950	Building	NC	E5
401-0025	401-0123-0025	15539	Merchant House	c. 1906	Building	C	E5
		15539	Shed	c. 1930	Building	C	E5
401-0026	401-0123-0026	15547	Ephraim Schooley House	c. 1825	Building	C	E5
		15547	Garage	c. 1950	Building	NC	E5
		15547	Shed	c. 1950	Building	NC	E5
401-0052	401-0123-0052	15552	Trouble Enough Indeed	c. 1972	Building	NC	E5
		15552	Shed	c. 1972	Building	NC	E5
		15552	Garage	c. 1972	Building	NC	E5
401-0027	401-0123-0027	15555	Mahlon Schooley House	c. 1817	Building	C	E5
		15555	Slaughterhouse	c. 1930	Building	C	E5
401-0028	401-0123-0028	15567	Asbury Johnson House	c. 1886	Building	C	E5
		15567	Shed	c. 1950	Building	NC	E5
401-0051	401-0123-0051	15570	Sunnyside/Steer House	c. 1850	Building	C	E5

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 72

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		15570	Shed	c. 1900	Building	C	E5
		15570	Barn or Carriage House	c. 1900	Building	C	E5
401-0029	401-0123-0029	15575	Falvius Beans House	c. 1887	Building	C	E5
		15575	Garage	c. 1920	Building	C	E5
401-0050	401-0123-0050	15580	Samuel Steer House	c. 1860	Building	C	E5
		15580	Guesthouse	c. 1980	Building	NC	E5
401-0123-0147		15584	Robin House	c. 1988	Building	NC	E5
401-0030	401-0123-0030	15591	Elton James House	c. 1896	Building	C	E5
		15591	Garage	c. 1930	Building	C	E5
		15591	Outbuilding	c. 1920	Building	C	E5
401-0031	401-0123-0031	15603	Odd Fellows Hall	c. 1983	Building	C	E5
401-0049	401-0123-0049	15606	William Williams House	c. 1815	Building	C	E5
		15606	Shed	c. 1940	Building	NC	E5
		15606	Chicken Coop	c. 2010	Structure	NC	E5
401-0032	401-0123-0032	15611	Second Street School	c. 1867	Building	C	E5
		15611	Outhouse	c. 1867	Building	C	E5
401-0048	401-0123-0048	15612	Williams Storehouse	c. 1800	Building	C	E6

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		15612	Garage	c. 1920	Building	C	E6
401-0034	401-0123-0034	15619	Shawen House	c. 1850	Building	C	E6
401-0046	401-0123-0046	15620	Jacob Mendenhall House	c. 1820	Building	C	G5
		15620	Shed	c. 1930	Building	C	G5
401-0045	401-0123-0045	15626	Old Methodist Parsonage	c. 1941	Building	NC	E6
		15626	Garage	c. 1941	Building	NC	E6
401-0044	401-0123-0044	15634	Michael House	c. 1989	Building	NC	E6
		15634	Garage	c. 1989	Building	NC	E6
		15634	Chicken Coop	c. 2010	Structure	NC	E6
401-0035	401-0123-0035	15635	Sarah Janney House	c. 1815	Building	C	E6
		15635	Wagon Shed	c. 1900	Building	C	E6
		15635	Corn Crib	c. 1900	Structure	C	E6
401-0043	401-0123-0043	15640	Old Acre	c. 1770	Building	C	E6
401-0033	401-0123-0033	none	Schooley Mill Barn (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 304455972000) 20-acre parcel behind 15635 Second St EASEMENT (VDHR)	c. 1803	Building	C	E6
		none	Shed	c. 1930	Building	C	E6

HIGH STREET

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 74

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
401-0102	401-0123-0102	15545	Waterford Baptist Church	1853	Building	C	F5
401-0092	401-0123-0092	15550	Edith Walker House	c. 1897	Building	C	F5
		15550	Carriage House	c. 1897	Building	C	F5
		15550	Garage	c. 1930	Building	C	F5
401-0099	401-0123-0099	15565	Catoctin Presbyterian Church	c. 1880	Building	C	F5
401-0100	401-0123-0100	15577	Presbyterian Church Manse	1955	Building	NC	F5
		15577	Shed	c. 2010	Building	NC	F5
401-0093	401-0123-0093	15578	Huntley	c. 1836	Building	C	F5
		15578	Barn	c. 1890	Building	C	F5
		15578	Carriage House	c. 1890	Building	C	F5
		15578	Schoolhouse	c. 1910	Building	C	F5
		15578	Wellhouse	c. 1890	Building	C	F5
401-0098	401-0123-0098	15609	Loudoun Mutual Insurance Company	1949	Building	NC	F5
		15609	Barn	c. 1900	Building	C	F5
401-0097	401-0123-0097	15655	Lewis House	c. 1830	Building	C	E6
		15655	Shed	c. 2000	Building	C	E6
401-0094	401-0123-0094	15676	Reuben Schooley House	c. 1870	Building	C	E6

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 75

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
		15676	Shed	c. 1950	Building	NC	E6
		15676	Pergola	c. 1990	structure	NC	E6
401-0095	401-0123-0095	15676	Reuben Schooley Blacksmith Shop	c. pre-1870	Building	C	E6

BOND STREET

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
401-0121	401-0123-0121	none	Bond Street Barn (1.5-acre parcel south of Bond St and east of Main St) Loudoun County Parcel ID# 303363605000	c. 1870	Building	C	E4
		none	Icehouse	c. 1830	Building	C	E4
		none	Tanyard site (Documented on 1980 survey)	c. 1800	Site	C	E4
401-0073	401-0123-0073	40108	Daniel Stone House	c. 1760	Building	C	E4
		40108	Woodshed	c. 1990	Structure	NC	E4
401-0115	401-0123-0115	40120	Hague-Hough House	c. 1745 and c. 1790	Building	C	E4
		40120	Chicken Coop	c. 1920	Structure	C	E4
		40120	Smokehouse	c. 1745	Building	C	E4
		40120	Icehouse	c. 1745	Building	C	E4
		40120	Garage	c. 1920	Building	C	E4
		40120	Outhouse	c. 1920	Building	C	E4
		40120	Bank Barn	c. 1790	Building	C	E4

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 76

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		40120	Agricultural Building	c. 1950	Building	NC	F3
		40120	Privy	c. 1950	Building	NC	F3
401-0077	401-0123-0077	40125	John Wesley Community Church (African American church)	c. 1891	Building	C	E4
401-0074	401-0123-0074	40128	Samuel Means House	c. 1762	Building	C	E4
		40128	Shed	c. 1920	Building	C	E4
401-0075	401-0123-0075	40132	Janney-Phillips House	c. 1781	Building	C	E4
		40132	Barn	c. 1890	Building	C	E4
		40132	Shed	c. 1800	Building	C	E4
401-0084	401-0123-0084	40150	Asa Moore House	c. 1805	Building	C	E4
	401-0123-0184	40164	Frame dwelling	1995	Building	NC	F4
		40164	Garage	c. 1995	Building	NC	F4
	401-0123-0183	40170	Frame dwelling	1994	Building	NC	F4
		40170	Garage	c. 1994	Building	NC	F4

BUTCHERS ROW

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
401-0086	401-0123-0086	15525	James Lewis House	c. 1877	Building	C	F5
		15525	Garage	c. 1930	Building	C	F5

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 77

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		15525	Woodshed	c. 1930	Building	C	F5
401-0085	401-0123-0085	15533	Mahlon Myers House	c. 1808	Building	C	F5
401-0083	401-0123-0083	15545	Mahlon Janney House	c. 1802	Building	C	F5
		15545	Outbuilding	c. 1802	Building	C	F5

CHURCH STREET

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
401-0106	401-0123-0106	40200	Old Waod / George E. Bentley House	c. 1970	Building	NC	F5
		40200	Shed	c. 1970	Building	NC	F5
		40200	Shed	c. 1970	Building	NC	F5

FACTORY STREET

401-0036	401-0123-0036	15653	Felton House	c. 1978	Building	NC	E6
401-0041	401-0123-0041	15668	Laneslea	c. 1902	Building	C	E6
		15668	Garage	c. 1902	Building	C	E6
401-0040	401-0123-0040	15674	Leslie Myers House	c. 1924	Building	C	E6
		15674	Garage	c. 1924	Building	C	E6

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 78

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

401-0037	401-0123-0037	15679	Mill Run	c. 1960	Building	NC	E6
401-0038	401-0123-0038	15707	Boxwood Walk	c. 1820	Building	C	E6

FAIRFAX STREET

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
	401-0123-0146	none	Cemetery, Waterford Union of Churches / Old Waterford Cemetery (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 303178429000)	c. 1830	Site	C	G5
401-0090	401-0123-0090	40222	The Old School	c. 1910	Building	C	F5
401-0091	401-0123-0091	40231	William Russell House	c. 1918	Building	C	F5
		40231	Carriage House	c. 1900	Building	C	F5
	401-0123-0218	40273	Frame dwelling	c. 1890	Building	C	F5
		40273	Outhouse	c. late 19 th / early 20 th C	Building	C	F5
		40273	Barn	c. late 19 th / early 20 th C	Building	C	F5

FIRST STREET

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
401-0072	401-0123-0072	40090	Mill End	c. 1814	Building	C	E4
		40090	Shed	c. 2010	Building	NC	E4

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

JANNEY STREET

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
	401-0123-0213	40101	Dwelling	c. 2015	Building	NC	D6
401-0050	401-0123-0050	40143	Hidden House	c. 1820	Building	C	E6
		40143	Garage	c. 1930	Building	C	E6
401-0047	401-0123-0047	40153	Madison House	c. 2011	Building	NC	E6
	401-0123-0219	40171	Dwelling	c. 1991	Building	NC	E6
		40171	Garage	c. 1991	Building	NC	E6

PATRICK STREET

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
401-0053	401-0123-0053	40169	Israel Griffith Icehouse and Stable (Icehouse)	c. 1830	Structure	C	E5
		40169	Stable	c. 1830	Building	C	E5
401-0054	401-0053-0054	40170	(Former) Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Loudoun County	c. 1901	Building	C	F5
		40170	Garage	c. 1901	Building	C	F5
401-0105	401-0123-0105	40186	The Captain's House	c. 1900	Building	C	F5
		40186	Shed	c. 1900	Building	C	F5

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 80

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
401-0104	401-0123-0104	40186	C. L. Winkoff Barn	c. 1895	Building	C	F5
401-0101	401-0123-0101	40189	Monroe Hough House	c. 1887	Building	C	F5

WATER STREET

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
401-0114	401-0123-0114	40188	Weaver's Cottage	c. 1880	Building	C	F5
		40188	Shed	c. 1980	Building	NC	F5
401-0087	401-0123-0087	40266	Moxley Hall	c. 1860	Building	C	F5
		40266	Shed	c. 1900	Building	C	F5
401-5001		none	Bayly-Carr Pasture / Water Street Meadow (34.5-acre parcel north side of Water St) Loudoun County Parcel ID# 303272253000		Site	C	F5
	401-0123-0214	SE of 40188	0.53-acre vacant lot, Site of 2 African American Dwellings in 19 th century (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 303272019000)	19 th century	Site	C	F5

LOYALTY ROAD

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 81

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
	401-0123-0158	15245	12.03-acre mowed field with creek forming the northeast boundary of the Historic District boundary (portion of property at 15245 Loyalty Rd)	No date	site	C	G3, H3,
	401-0123-0213	South of 15245	3.6-acre parcel at northeast extend of the Historic District boundary	No date	site	C	G3, H3, H4
	401-0123-0220	15381	Frame dwelling with wood clapboard	c. 2002	Building	NC	G3
	401-0123-0166	15383	Frame dwelling, brick and stone veneer	c. 2005	Building	NC	G3
	401-0123-0159	15387	Frame dwelling, wood shingles and brick veneer	c. 2000	Building	NC	G3
	401-0123-0221	15396	Frame dwelling, brick veneer	c. 2002	Building	NC	H4
		15396	Garage	c. 2002	Building	NC	H4
	401-0123-0165	15402	Frame dwelling with vinyl siding	c. 1992	Building	NC	H4
		15402	Shed	c. 1995	Building	NC	H4
	401-0123 0164	15408	Frame dwelling with vinyl siding	c. 1999	Building	NC	H4
	401-0123-0163	15426	Frame dwelling with vinyl siding	c. 1996	Building	NC	H4
	401-0123-0162	15440	Frame dwelling with wood clapboard	c. 2006	Building	NC	H4
	401-0123-0167	15443	Frame dwelling with vinyl siding	c. 2000	Building	NC	G4
		15443	Barn	c. 2000	Building	NC	G4
401-0130	401-0123-0130	15452	Mary Compher House	c. 1900	Building	C	H4
		15452	Shed	c. 1900	Building	C	H4

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 82

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		15452	Shed	c. 1900	Building	C	H4
	401-0123-0160	15484	Frame 1.5-story dwelling	c. 1940	Building	NC	G5
		15484	Apartment	c. 1940	Building	NC	G5
		15484	Shed	c. 2000	Building	NC	G5
	401-0123-0161	15498	1.5-story brick dwelling	c. 1820	Building	C	G5
		15498	Barn	c. 1940	Building	NC	G5
401-0088	401-0123-0088	15510	Fairfax Meetinghouse	c. 1761	Building	C	G5
		15510	School, brick	c. 1805	Building	C	G5
		15510	Shed	c. 1930	Building	C	G5
		15510	Wellhouse	c. 1930	Building	C	G5
	401-0123-0222	15513	Waterford Elementary School	c. 1970	Building	NC	G5
401-0122	401-0123-0122	15514	Echo Hill	c. 1890	Building	C	G5
		15514	Shed	c. 1890	Building	C	G5
		15514	Shed	c. 1890	Building	C	G5
		15514	Shed	c. 2011	Building	C	G5
401-0089	401-0123-0089	15520	Rollison House	c. 1948	Building	NC	G5
		15520	Shed	c. 1948	Building	NC	G5

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 83

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		15520	Shed	c. 1948	Building	NC	G5

BROWNS LANE

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
	401-0123-0150	40405	Village Winery (2-story frame dwelling)	c. 2001	Building	NC	H5
		40405	Barn	c. late 19 th / early 20 th C	Building	C	H5
		40405	Shed	early 20 th century	Building	C	H5
	401-0123-0157	40450	Frame dwelling	c. 1989	Building	NC	H4
		40450	Garage	c. 1989	Building	NC	H4
		40450	Shed	c. 1989	Building	NC	H4
	401-0123-0155	40498	Frame dwelling with brick veneer	1988	Building	NC	H4
		40498	Shed	c. 1990	Building	NC	H4
	401-0123-0156	40506	Frame dwelling with brick veneer	c. 1988	Building	NC	I4
		40506	Shed	c. 1990	Building	NC	I4
	401-0123-0148	40509	Frame dwelling with stucco	c. 2003	Building	NC	H5
	401-0123-0149	West of 40509	Browns Lane Open Space, 6.87-acre grassland (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 303196192000)	None	Site	C	H5

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 84

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
	401-0123-0153	40515	Frame dwelling, stone veneer and wood clapboard	c. 2001	Building	NC	I5
	401-0123-0154	40544	Frame dwelling, stone veneer and vinyl siding	c. 1988	Building	NC	I4
		40544	Shed	c. 1988	Building	NC	I4
	401-0123-0152	40570	Frame dwelling, vinyl siding	c. 1997	Building	NC	I4
	401-0123-0151	40577	Carrs Hill	c. 1953	Building	NC	I4
		40577	Shed	c. 1990	Building	NC	I4

OLD WATERFORD ROAD

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
	401-0123-0182	15620	Frame dwelling with brick veneer	1994	Building	NC	H5
	401-0123-0181	15626	Frame dwelling with composite siding	1998	Building	NC	H5
		15626	Shed	1998	Building	NC	H5
	401-0123-0178	15632	Frame dwelling with composite siding	c. 1999	Building	NC	H5
	401-0123-0180	15642	Frame dwelling with wood clapboard	2002	Building	NC	H6
		15642	Barn	c. 2002	Building	NC	H6
401-0140	401-0123-0140	15693	Thomas Lacy House Site	c. 1800	Site	C	H6
		15693	Concrete Dwelling	c. 1978	Building	NC	H6

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 85

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		15693	Shed	c. 1990	Building	NC	H6
	401-0123-0176	15718	Frame dwelling with stone veneer and clapboard	2006	Building	NC	H6
	401-0123-0177	15730	Frame dwelling with stone veneer and clapboard	2008	Building	NC	I6
		15730	Garage	c. 2008	Building	NC	I6
		15730	Barn	c. 2008	Building	NC	I6
	401-0123-0179	15745	Western third to half of the 13.22-acre parcel, unbuilt with stream running east-west through it (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 304305787000)	none	Site	C	I6

BRIDLEPATH LANE

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
	401-0123-0169	15890	Wooded 8.03-acre portion of a larger parcel on the eastern boundary of the district (house is not in the district) Loudoun County Parcel ID# 304203637000.	none	Site	C	H8
	401-0123-0168	15929	Stuccoed frame dwelling	c. 1996	Building	NC	H8
	401-0123-0170	16067	Open and wooded 5.12-acre parcel between Bridlepath Ln and Old Chamberlin Ln. (2003 house is located outside the district) Loudoun County Parcel ID# 305499515000.	none	Site	C	H8

CLARKES GAP ROAD

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 86

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
401-0039	401-0123-0039	15715	Coale's Blacksmith Shop	c. 1820	Building	C	E6
401-0096	401-0123-0096	15716	Reuben Schooley House	c. 1800	Building	C	E6
		15716	Shed	c. 1950	Building	NC	E6
401-0124	401-0123-0124	15758	Talbot Farm Open Space Tract (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 304373811000)	none	Site	C	F7
	401-0123-0223	15801	2-story, Federal-style brick dwelling	c. mid 19th century	Building	C	E7
		15801	Springhouse	c. mid 19 th century	Building	C	E7
		15801	Shed	c. 1980	Building	NC	E7
	401-0123-0173	15861	Frame dwelling with wood clapboard	c. 1990	Building	NC	E7
	401-0123-0171	15935	0.12-acre parcel between Clarkes Gap Rd. and Hamilton Station Rd. (1996 house is not within the district) Loudoun County Parcel ID# 304167361000	none	Site	C	F7, F8
	401-0123-0217	North of 15980	14.56-acre unbuilt field on the east side of Clarkes Gap Rd.	none	Site	C	G8, F8
	401-0123-0224	North of 15957	12.48-acre portion of a wooded parcel west of Clarkes Gap Road	none	Site	C	F8
	401-0123-0172	15957	3.69-acre portion of a 11.9-acre parcel west of Clarkes Gap Rd.	none	Site	C	F8
	401-0123-0175	15966	Waterford Farms	c. 2018	Building	NC	G8
		15966	Horse Shelter	c. 2018	Building	NC	G8
		15966	Shed	c. 2018	Building	NC	G8
		15966	Chicken Coop	c. 2018	Structure	NC	G8
	401-0123-0174	15980	Clifton	c. 1800	Building	C	G8

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 87

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
		15980	Barn	c. 1920	Building	C	G8
		15980	Stable	c. 1920	Building	C	G8
		15980	Studio	c. 1940	Building	NC	G8
		15980	Springhouse	c. mid 19th century	Building	C	G8
		15980	Garage	c. 1920	Building	C	G8
	401-0123-0225	15985	0.04-acre portion of a 4.82-acre parcel west of Clarkes Gap Rd.	none	Site	C	G8

HAMILTON STATION ROAD

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
	401-0123-0196	15985	Frame dwelling clad in vinyl siding	c. 1986	Building	NC	C7
		15985	Garage	c. 1986	Building	NC	C7
		15985	Machine Shed	c. 2018	Building	NC	C7
	401-0123-0198	16002	Frame I-house dwelling with vinyl siding	c. 1920	Building	C	C8
		16002	Shed	c. 2000	Building	NC	C8
		16002	Shed	c. 2000	Building	NC	C8
	401-0123-0194	16009	Frame dwelling with vinyl siding	c. 1985	Building	NC	C8
		16009	Shed	c. 1990	Building	NC	C8

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 88

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
	401-0123-0195	16023	Frame dwelling with vinyl siding	c. 1985	Building	NC	C8
		16023	Shed	c. 1990	Building	NC	C8
	401-0123-0199	16030	4.12-acre portion of a 14.85-acre parcel southeast of Hamilton Station Rd. Building on the property are outside the district.	none	Site	C	C8
	401-0123-0191	16039	Frame dwelling	c. 1985	Building	NC	C8
	401-0123-0192	16045	Frame dwelling clad in brick veneer	c. 1985	Building	NC	C8
	401-0123-0193	16050	Frame dwelling with brick veneer	c. 1998	Building	NC	C8
	401-0123-0226	16057	0.94-acre grassy and tree-lined portion of a 9.9-acre parcel northwest of Hamilton Station Rd. (1985 house is located outside the district)	none	Site	C	C8
	401-0123-0197	16071	1.56-acre portion of a 3-acre parcel northwest of Hamilton Station Rd. (1973 house is outside the district)	none	Site	C	C8

LOOKOUT LANE

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
	401-0123-0227	39909	Frame dwelling, brick veneer	c. 1987	Building	NC	C7
		39909	Shed	c. 2013	Building	NC	C7
	401-0123-0228	39918	Frame dwelling with composite siding	c. 2006	Building	NC	C7
	401-0123-0186	39931	B. Fox House	c. mid 19 th century	Building	C	C7

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 89

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		39931	Bank Barn	c. mid 19th century	Building	C	C7
		39931	Dairy Barn	c. early 20th century	Building	C	C7
		39931	Guesthouse	c. 2003	Building	NC	C7
		39931	Shed	c. 1950	Building	NC	C7
		39931	Well Cover	c. 1950	Structure	NC	C7
	401-0123-0229	39946	Stuccoed frame dwelling	c. 1986	Building	NC	C6
		39946	Utility Shed	c. 1985	Building	NC	C6
	401-0123-0230	39952	Frame dwelling with vinyl siding	c. 1986	Building	NC	D6/C6
		39952	Shed	c. 1986	Building	NC	D6/C6
		39952	Stable	c. 2008	Building	NC	D6/C6
	401-0123-0185	39962	Frame dwelling with vinyl siding	c. 1950	Building	NC	D7
		39962	Shed	c. 2000	Building	NC	D7
		39962	Shed	c. 2000	Building	NC	D7
		39962	Greenhouse	c. 2000	Building	NC	D7

CHARLES HENRY PLACE

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 90

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Note: The properties along Charles Henry Place were subdivided from a large agricultural tract made up of largely open fields by a developer after 2014. The houses erected circa 2015-2018 stand on 3-acre +/- lots.

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
	401-0123-0216	39634	Frame dwelling with vinyl siding and brick veneer	c. 2015	Building	NC	A5
	401-0123-0201	39652	0.72-acre portion of a 3-acre parcel north of Charles Henry Pl.	none	Site	NC	A5
	401-0123-0187	39682	1.47-acre portion of a 3.017-acre parcel north of Charles Henry Pl.	none	Site	NC	A5
	401-0123-0202	39728	1.44-acre portion of a 3-acre parcel north of Charles Henry Pl.	none	Site	NC	A5
	401-0123-0231	39760	Frame dwelling with composite siding	c. 2015	Building	NC	A5
	401-0123-0203	39772	Frame dwelling with stone veneer	c. 2015	Building	NC	B6
	401-0123-0188	39859	Frame dwelling with composite siding	c. 2016	Building	NC	B6
		39859	Shed	c. 2016	Building	NC	B6

WEADON FARM LANE

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
	401-0123-0189	15446	1.32-acre portion of a 6.78-acre parcel at the western corner of the historic district boundary (2005 house is outside district)	none	Site	C	A4

OLD WHEATLAND ROAD

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 91

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
	401-0123-0200	39704	Brick-and-frame, 2-story dwelling (approx. 4.4 acres of this 7.56-acre parcel are within the district, including the dwelling and outbuildings)	c. 1870	Building	C	A4
		39704	Barn	c. early 20th century	Building	C	A4
		39704	Shed	c. early 20th century	Building	C	A4
		39704	Shed	c. 1980	Building	NC	A4
401-0138	401-0123-0138	39715	Oak Grove / Phillips Farm / Travis Brown Farm	c. 1800	Building	C	B4
		39715	Dwelling	c. 1890	Building	C	B4
		39715	Dwelling	c. 1960	Building	NC	B4
		39715	Barn	c. 1800	Building	C	B4
		39715	Corn Crib	c. 1900	Structure	C	B4
		39715	Stable	c. 2015	Building	NC	B4
		39715	Horse Shed	c. 1900	Building	C	B4
		39715	Garage	c. 1900	Building	C	B4
		39715	Chicken Coop	c. 2015	Structure	NC	B4
		39715	Wellhouse	c. 1920	Building	C	B4
		39715	Horse Shed	c. 2015	Building	NC	B4
		39715	Horse Shed	c. 2015	Building	NC	B4
		39715	Chicken Coop	c. 1940	Structure	NC	B4

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 92

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		39715	Springhouse	c. 1920	Structure	C	B4
		39715	Garage	c. 1920	Building	C	B4
	401-0123-0232	East of 39715	Phillips Farm Open Space (144 acres of open fields, tree-lined field divisions, wooded Catoclin Creek area) Loudoun County Parcel ID# 341103295000	none	Site	C	B4, C4, D4, E4, C5, D5, E5
			Millrace	c. 1760	Site	C	E4, E5, D5
			Dam	c. 1760	Structure	C	E4
	401-0123-0190	39754	Frame dwelling with vinyl siding	c. 2003	Building	NC	C4
		39754	Shed	c. 2003	Building	NC	C4
	401-0123-0206	39891	Frame dwelling with brick veneer	c. 1957	Building	NC	C4
		39891	Stable	c. 1980	Building	NC	C4
		39891	Shed	c. 2007	Building	NC	C4
		39891	Pool Cabana	c. 2000	Structure	NC	C4
401-0205		39892	Terra Nebulo Vineyards Building	c. 2015	Building	NC	C4
	401-0123-0141	39892	Hutchison Farm South Parcel – EASEMENT – VDHR (Fields associated with 39892 Old Wheatland Rd)	None	Site	C	C3, C4 D3, D4
	401-0123-0204	40024	Waterford Water Treatment Plant	c. 1980	Structure	NC	D4
		40024	Utility Building	c. 1980	Building	NC	D4
		40024	Shed	c. 1990	Building	NC	D4
		40024	Shed	c. 1980	Building	NC	D4

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

MILLTOWN ROAD

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
	401-0123-0233	15150	13.94-acre portion of a 22.5-acre parcel east of Milltown Rd. (Loudoun County Parcel ID# 340104441000)	none	Site	C	C2
	401-0123-0207	15529	E. James House Site	c. 1850	Site	C	C3
		15529	Dairy Barn	c. early 20 th century	Building	C	C3
		15529	Silo	c. early 20th century	Structure	C	C3
		15529	Barn	c. late 19th century	Building	C	C3
		15529	Barn	c. 1950	Building	NC	C3
		15529	Milk Parlor	c. early 20th century	Building	C	C3
		15529	Equipment Shed	c. 1960	Building	NC	C3
		15529	Horse Shed	c. 2000	Building	NC	C3

CLOVER HILL ROAD

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/Photo #
	401-0123-0210	15423	14.1-acre portion of a 50.19-acre parcel parcel west of Clover Hill Rd. (buildings are outside the district)	none	Site	C	D2
	401-0123-0211	15586	Hutchison Farm	c. 1940	Building	NC	E3
		15586	Second Dwelling	c. 1980	Building	NC	E3

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 94

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
		15586	Barn	c. 1940	Building	NC	E3
		15586	Shed	c. 1940	Building	NC	E3
		15586	Shed	c. 1990	Building	NC	E3
		15586	Stable	c. 1980	Building	NC	E3
		15586	Garage	c. 1960	Building	NC	E3
		15586	Chicken Coop	c. 2012	Structure	NC	E3
		15586	Large Horse Shed	c. 1990	Building	NC	E3
		15586	Horse Shed	c. 2016	Building	NC	E3

LEILA LANE

VDHR #	VDHR Historic District #	Street Address	Feature Name	Date(s)	Resource Type	Contributing Status	Map Key/ Photo #
	401-0123-0208	40205	3.48-acre portion of the 50.34-acre parcel south of Leila Ln. (buildings are outside the district)	none	Site	C	E2
	401-0123-0209	40395	4.53-acre portion of 25-acre parcel east of Leila Ln.	none	Site	C	G3

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 95

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

7. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES AND OTHER DOCUMENTATION

“About the Garden Club of Virginia.” Garden Club of Virginia Fellowship. Accessed December 6, 2019.

<https://www.gcvfellowship.org/about-gcv/>.

Alanen, Arnold R., and Robert Z Melnick. “Introduction: Why Cultural Landscape Preservation?” In *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

“America’s 11 Most Historic Endangered Historic Places—Past Listings.” National Trust for Historic Preservation. Accessed May 21, 2021. <https://savingplaces.org/11most-past-listings>.

Anderson, Ann. “Waterford’s Open Space Program,” in *Waterford Foundation 33rd Annual Homes Tour and Craft Exhibit*. Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 1976.

“Arts and Craft Exhibit Marks Year’s Activity by Waterford Folk.” *The Loudoun News*, 1944. News clipping held by the Waterford Foundation Archives.

Axelrod, Alan, ed. *The Colonial Revival in America*. Winterthur, Delaware: The Henry Francis du Pont Museum, 1985.

Baitz, Stanley. “Restoring Waterford of 100 Years.” *The Sunday Star Pictorial Magazine*, Washington, D.C., August 22, 1948.

“Become a Certified Local Government (CLG).” National Park Service. Accessed December 15, 2019,

<https://www.nps.gov/clg/become-clg.html>.

Best, Katharine, and Katharine Hillyer. “The Town of the Month: Waterford Virginia.” *Good Housekeeping Magazine*, October 1950.

“Blind Man Weds Beautiful Girl.” *Passaic Daily News*, December 1, 1909.

Brabec, Elizabeth. Interview by Catherine Morrissey, February 12, 2021. Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

_____. *Linking the Past to the Future: A Landscape Conservation Strategy for Waterford, Virginia*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, 1992.

_____. “Tomorrow’s Park and Open Space Preservation Strategy for Waterford Village.” *CRM*, Volume 16, No. 4. Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 1993.

Brandt, Lydia Mattice. ““Keep It the Home of Washington!”: The Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union, 1854–1890.” In *First in the Homes of His Countrymen: George Washington's Mount Vernon in the American Imagination*, 41-80. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2016.

“A Brief History of the National Trust: National Trust for Historic Preservation.” A Brief History of the National Trust | National Trust for Historic Preservation. Accessed December 7, 2019.

<https://savingplaces.org/trust-history>.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 96

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Burke, Arnold M. "Watering Down Waterford." *Preservation News*, September 1, 1986.

Bushman, Richard L. *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities*. New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1993.

Butler, William. "Another City Upon a Hill: Litchfield, Connecticut, and the Colonial Revival." In *The Colonial Revival in America*, edited by Alan Axelrod. Winterthur, Delaware: The Henry Francis du Pont Museum, 1985.

Carter, Thomas. *Building Zion the Material World of Mormon Settlement*. Minneapolis, MN: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2015.

Chamberlin, Constance K. *Waterford: The Challenge*. Waterford, Virginia: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 1980.

Chamberlin, John. Interview by Catherine Morrissey, January 6, 2021. Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

Chambers, Beth. "Loudoun Before the Europeans: Indians of the Virginia Piedmont." In *Waterford Foundation 34th Annual Homes Tour and Crafts Exhibit*. Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 1977.

Cheever, Federico and Nancy A. McLaughlin. "An Introduction to Conservation Easements in the United States: A Simple Concept and a Complicated Mosaic of Law." *Journal of Law, Property, and Society*, Vol. 1, 2015.

"Col. Chamberlin Dead: Veteran of Civil War to Be Buried in Arlington." *The Evening Star*, April 21, 1908.

Corfresi Lina and Rosetta Radtke. "Local Government Programs: Preservation Where it Counts." In *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-First Century*. Robert E. Stipe, ed. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Cox, Linda. "Historic Waterford Vs. a Flood of Eager Developers." *Washington Post*, June 24, 1990.

Deck, Patrick A. and Henry Heaton. *An Economic and Social Survey of Loudoun County*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia, 1926.

Divine, John E. *When Waterford and I Wefre Young*. Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 1997.

"Easement Program Overview." Virginia Department of Historic Resources. Accessed December 9, 2019. <https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/easements/easement-program-overview/>.

"Early History of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association." George Washington's Mount Vernon. Accessed December 7, 2019. <https://www.mountvernon.org/library/digitalhistory/digital-encyclopedia/article/early-history-of-the-mount-vernon-ladies-association/>.

"E.M. Chamberlin Dies in Boston." *The Richmond Times Dispatch*, February 14, 1940.

Egloff, Keith, and Deborah Woodward. *First People: The Early Indians of Virginia*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2006.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 97

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Ehrenkranz, Philip R. "Open Space Easements in Waterford: Avoiding the Shipwreck." In *Waterford Foundation's 29th Annual Homes Tour and Craft Exhibit*. Waterford Foundation, Inc: Waterford, VA, 1972.

Farmer, Charles J. "Persistence of Country Trade: The Failure of Towns to Develop in Southside Virginia during the Eighteenth Century." *Journal of Historical Geography* 14, no. 4 (1988): 331-41.

Federal Writers' Project. *The WPA Guide to Virginia: the Old Dominion*. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 2014, digital ed.

Fesak, Mary C. Interview with W. Brown Morton. Personal interview. Leesburg, Virginia, November 22, 2019.

Fitch, James Marston. *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1990.

"For Pure Residential Character, Waterford Holds Unusual Place." *The Evening Star*, August 10, 1957.

Gebhard, David. "The American Colonial Revival in the 1930s." *Winterthur Portfolio* 22, No. 2/3 1987.

George Mason University Center for Real Estate Entrepreneurship "Learning from History to Shape our Built Future." *Center for Real Estate Entrepreneurship Events Bulletin*, Fairfax, VA: George Mason University, September 24, 2018.

"Georgetown-Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District." Georgetown Trust for Conservation & Preservation, Inc. Accessed May 26, 2021, https://georgetowntrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Final-NHLD-Overview-8x11_5.pdf.

Hardin, Wayne. "Landmark Status? A Mixed Blessing." *The Baltimore Sun*, November 8, 1992.

Hartley, Michael O. Martha B. Hartley, and John C. Larson. "Old Salem Historic District (updated documentation and boundary change)." National Historic Landmark Nomination, Old Salem Museums & Gardens, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, 2016.

Hastie, Winslow, and April Wood. "The Evolving Revolving Fund: Historic Charleston Foundation Revamps Its Pioneering Program." *Forum Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 1, 2014.

Head, James William. *History and Comprehensive Description of Loudoun County*. Park View Press, 1908.

Hellman, Susan. *Walk with Us...Waterford, Virginia*. Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 2015.

Hendricks, Christopher E. *The Backcountry Towns of Colonial Virginia*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006.

Herd, Milton. Interview by Catherine Morrissey, January 8, 2021. Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

"Historic Preservation Administration Act of 1989 and the National Historic Preservation Policy Act of 1989: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks, and Forests of the Committee on

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 98

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Energy and Natural Resources.” Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990.

“Historic Preservation Goes Rural.” *The Christian Science Monitor*. Monitor, May 14, 1991. Accessed December 11, 2019. <https://www.csmonitor.com/1991/0514/14121.html>.

“Historic Registers.” Virginia Department of Historic Resources. Last modified July 22, 2019. Accessed November 27, 2019, <https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/historic-register/>.

“History and Restoration of Shaker Village at Pleasant Hill.” Shaker Village at Pleasant Hill. Accessed May 26, 2021, <https://shakervillageky.org/history-and-restoration/>.

“Honor What Makes Us.” About Historic Charleston Foundation | Preservation Advocacy. Accessed December 6, 2019. <http://www.historiccharleston.org/about/>.

Hofstra, Warren R. *The Planting of New Virginia: Settlement and Landscape in the Shenandoah Valley*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Hofstra, Warren R., and Charles J. Farmer. "In the Absence of Towns: Settlement and Country Trade in Southside Virginia, 1730-1800." *The Journal of American History* 81, no. 4 (1995): 1674.

_____. “Private Dwellings, Public Ways, and the Landscape of Early Rural Capitalism in Virginias Shenandoah Valley.” *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, Vol. 5, Gender, Class, and Shelter (1995).

Hofstra, Warren R, and Karl B Raitz. 2010. *The Great Valley Road of Virginia: Shenandoah Landscapes from Prehistory to the Present*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Hosmer, Charles B., Jr. *Preservation Comes of Age: From Williamsburg to the National Trust, 1926-1949, Volume I*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1981.

“Hunton & Williams Remembers George C. Freeman, Jr.” Accessed April 16, 2021. <https://www.huntonak.com/images/content/3/1/v4/31576/George-Clemon-Freeman-Jr.pdf>.

“Illustrating Four Treatments in Oregon.” National Park Service. Accessed May 26, 2021, https://www.nps.gov/tps/education/workingonthepast/case_studies/jacksonville1.htm.

Keating, Jr., Joseph W. “Waterford: Presence of the Past.” *Waterford Foundation 32nd Annual Homes Tour and Crafts Exhibit*, Waterford, VA: Waterford, Foundation, Inc., 1975.

Keisman, Anne. “Loudoun Reaches No. 1 Spot as Development Spreads.” *Loudoun Times Community Newspaper*, April 14, 2004.

Kniffen, Fred B. “Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion.” In *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, eds. Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1986.

Koons, Kenneth E., and Warren R. Hofstra. *After the Backcountry: Rural Life in the Great Valley of Virginia, 1800-1900*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000.

“Landmark Community Fighting Change.” *Daily Press* (Newport News, VA), June 30, 1988.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 99

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Lay, K. Edward. *The Architecture of Jefferson Country: Charlottesville and Abermarle County, Virginia*. Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia, 2000.

Lea, Diane. "America's Preservation Ethos." In *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-First Century*. Robert E. Stipe, ed. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Lee, Antoinette. *Waterford National Historic Landmark: Its Significance and Protection*. Waterford Foundation, Inc.: Waterford, Virginia, 1989.

Lemire, Robert A. "The Waterford Compact." *Waterford Foundation Annual Report*, Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 1990-1991.

Lemon, James T. *Best Poor Man's Country*. Place of Publication Not Identified: W. W. Norton & Co, 1976.

Library of Congress. Prints & Photographs Division. Historic American Building Survey. Reproduction number, HABS VA,54-WATFO

Loudoun County. *Loudoun County Heritage Preservation Plan*. Adopted by the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, December 15, 2003.

Loudoun County Department of Planning. "Waterford Area Management Plan," Leesburg, VA, adopted October 19, 1987.

Loth, Calder. "Forty Years of Preservation: Virginia's Easement Program." in *Notes on Virginia 2005*. Richmond, VA: Virginia Department of Historic Resources, 2006.

Loth, Calder. Interview by Catherine Morrissey, January 11, 2021. Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

Lindgren, James M. "'Virginia Needs Living Heroes': Historic Preservation in the Progressive Era." *The Public Historian*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1991.

_____. "For the Sake of Our Future': The Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities and the Regeneration of Traditionalism." *The Virginia Magazine*, Vol. 97, No. 1, 1989.

Lissandrello, Stephen. "Williamsburg Historic District." National Historic Landmark Inventory-Nomination Form. Landmark Review Project, Washington D.C., 1975.

Martin, Joseph. *A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer of Virginia, and the District of Columbia*. Charlottesville, VA: Moseley & Tompkins, Printers, 1835.

McAlester, Virginia Savage. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2013.

McKithan, Cecil. "Jacksonville Historic District." National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form. Washington, D.C.: Historic Sites Survey Division, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977.

Melnick, Robert Z. *Cultural Landscapes: Rural Historic Districts in the National Park System*. Washington,

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 100

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1984.

Mendinghall, Joseph S. "Georgetown-Silver Plume Historic District." National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form. Washington, D.C.: Historic Sites Survey, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1975.

Miller, Jill. "Phillips Farm," *Loudoun Wildlife Conservancy*. Accessed September 25, 2019, <https://loudounwildlife.org/2016/11/phillips-farm/>.

Morgan, Benjamin A. "An Outline of the Geology of the Area Surrounding Waterford, Virginia." *Waterford Foundation 31st Annual Homes Tour and Crafts Exhibit*. Waterford, Foundation, Inc: Waterford, VA, October 1974.

Morton, Margaret. Interview by Catherine Morrissey, March 3, 2021. Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

Morton, W. Brown, III. Interview by Catherine Morrissey, March 3, 2021. Waterford National Historic Landmark District Oral History Project, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.

Morton, W. Brown, III. "Shakertown at Pleasant Hill Historic District." National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form. Washington, D.C.: Historic Surveys, Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1971.

Murtagh, William J. *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in American*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1997.

"National Conservation Easement Database: NCED." National Conservation Easement Database | NCED. Accessed December 12, 2019. <https://www.conservationeasement.us/>.

"National Historic Preservation Act." National Parks Service. U.S. Department of the Interior. Accessed December 10, 2019. <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/historicpreservation/national-historic-preservation-act.htm>.

"National Historic Preservation Act of 1966." National Council of State Historic Preservation Officers. Accessed December 11, 2019. <http://ncshpo.org/resources/national-historic-preservation-act-of-1966/>.

"The NPS: A Brief History." The NPS: A Brief History | The Cultural Landscape Foundation. Accessed December 11, 2019. <https://tclf.org/places/view-city-and-regional-guides/national-park-service-guides/philadelphia/nps-brief-history>.

Novelli, Chris, and Melina Bezirdjian, Calder Loth, and Lena Sweeten McDonald. *Classic Commonwealth: Virginia Architecture from the Colonial Era to 1940*. Richard, VA: Virginia Department of Historic Resources, undated.

Oden, James S. "Waterford, 1875," map, Library of Virginia, 1875.

O'Harrow, Jr., Robert. "Rare private deal saves Virginia village's historic character." *Washington Post*, April 27, 1991.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 101

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

“Old Waterford,” *Virginia Cavalcade*, Spring 1969.

Page, Jake. “Will Success Spoil Brigadoon?” *American Land Forum Magazine*, Summer 1985.

Page, Robert R., Cathy A. Gilbert, and Susan A. Dolan. “A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contexts, Process, and Techniques.” U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service: Washington, D.C., 1998.

“The Phillips Farm: A Self-Guided Tour,” Accessed September 25, 2019, <https://loudounwildlife.org/themencode-pdf-viewer/?file=https://loudounwildlife.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/phillips-farm-walking-tour.pdf>.

Raitz, Karl B. "Towns and Villages." In *The New Encyclopedia of Southern Culture: Volume 2: Geography*, edited by Pillsbury Richard and Wilson Charles Reagan. University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Samuel, Peter. “The Dulles Toll Road Extension: Reviving America’s Private Turnpikes.” *Policy*, Summer 1990.

Scheel, Eugene M. *Loudoun Discovered Communities, Corners & Crossroads, Volume Five Waterford, The German Settlement, and Between The Hills*. Leesburg, VA: The Friends of the Thomas Balch Library, Inc., 2002.

_____. “Phillips Farm—Face of Family Farm Changing, but Its Roots Run Deep.” *The History of Waterford Virginia*, Accessed September 25, 2019, <https://www.waterfordhistory.org/history/waterford-phillips-farm/>.

_____. “With ‘The Park,’ County’s Growth Battles were just Beginning: The Beginnings of Sterling Park, Virginia in 1961.” June 16, 2002. Accessed December 4, 2019. <https://www.loudounhistory.org/history/sterling-park-beginnngs-1961/>.

Shed, Charles E. “Deerfield Village.” National Historic Landmark Inventory-Nomination Form, 1960.

Sheire, James H. “Greenfield Village and the Henry Ford Museum.” National Historic Landmark Inventory-Nomination Form. Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., 1981.

Sellers, Charles. *The Market Revolution, 1815-1846*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Smith, Kathryn Gettings, Edna Johnston, and Megan Glynn. “Loudoun County African-American Historic Architectural Resources Survey.” History Matters LLC, Washington, D.C., September 2004.

Souders, John and Bronwen. *Share With Us: Waterford, Virginia’s African-American Heritage*. Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 2002, reprinted 2012.

Stilgoe, John R. *Common Landscape of America, 1580 to 1845*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

Stipe, Robert E. *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-First Century*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Stokes, Samuel N., A. Elizabeth Watson, and Shelley S. Mastran. *Saving America’s Countryside: A Guide to*

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 102

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Rural Conservation. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Studio Ammons. "The Waterford Mill, Waterford Virginia: Historic Structure Report." Petersburg, VA, May 24, 2013.

Swisher, Kara. "AOL Planning Move to Loudoun County." *Washington Post*, February 24, 1996.

Tolbert, Lisa C. *Constructing Townscapes Space and Society in Antebellum Tennessee*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Trewartha, Glenn T. "The Unincorporated Hamlet: One Element of the American Settlement Fabric." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 33, no. 1 (1943): 32-81.

United States Conference of Mayors. Special Committee on Historic Preservation. 1966. *With Heritage so Rich: A Report*. New York: Random House.

Upton, Dell. "New Views of the Virginia Landscape." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 96, No. 4, 1988.

_____. "Vernacular Domestic Architecture in Eighteenth-Century Virginia." *Winterthur Portfolio* 17, No. 2/3, 1982.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources. "Waterford Historic District Survey." Architectural Survey Forms for DHR ID # 401-123-0001-0146. Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, 1980.

Virts, William Benton. "My Waterford Virginia Years." Accessed December 10, 2019. <http://www.virtsfamilies.com/showmedia.php?mediaID=75>.

Wallace, Michael. "Visiting the Past: History Museums in the United States." *Radical History Review* 1981, no. 25 (January 1981).

Warren, Leon, and Margaret Piatt. "Living-History Museums." In *History Museums in the United States*, Warren Leon and Roy Rosenzweig, eds. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989.

Waterford Foundation, Inc. "A Blind Man, an Heiress and a Builder: The Remarkable Origins of Waterford's Resurrection." In *Waterford Homes Tour and Craft Exhibit*. Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc., 2014.

_____. Annual Reports. Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc. Archives, 1990-2005.

_____. Board of Directors Meeting Minutes. Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc. Archives, 1943-present.

_____. Photo Archives. Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc. Archives.

_____. "Waterford Area Easements." Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc. Archives, 2019, unpublished document.

_____. "Waterford Annual Homes and Crafts Fair" booklets. Waterford, VA: Waterford Foundation, Inc.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 103

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Archives, 1944-2019.

Watson Elizabeth and Stefan Nagel. *“Establishing and Operating an Easement Program to Protect Historic Resources.”* Washington, D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2000.

Wheeler, Linda. “Phillips Farm Sold to Waterford Foundation.” *The Village of Waterford Virginia*. Accessed September 25, 2019, <http://www.waterfordvillage.org/looking-back/2003-phillips-farm-sold-to-waterford-foundation/>.

Zelinsky, Wilbur. “North Americas Vernacular Regions.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*70, no. 1 (1980): 1-16.

_____. “The Pennsylvania Town: An Overdue Geographical Account.” *Geographical Review*67, no. 2 (1977).

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 104

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- Previously listed in the National Register (fill in 1 through 6 below)
 Not previously listed in the National Register (fill in **only** 4, 5, and 6 below)

1. NR #: 69000256
2. Date of listing: June 3, 1969
3. Level of significance: National
4. Applicable National Register Criteria: A B C D
5. Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): A B C D E F G
6. Areas of Significance: Art, Commerce, Religion/Philosophy, Other: Village

- Previously Determined Eligible for the National Register: Date of determination:
 Designated a National Historic Landmark: Date of designation: April 15, 1970
 Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: HABS No. VA,54-WATFO
 Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: HAER No.
 Recorded by Historic American Landscapes Survey: HALS No.

Location of additional data:

- State Historic Preservation Office: Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR # 401-0123) Virginia Cultural Resource Information System (VCRIS)
Other State Agency:
Federal Agency:
Local Government:
University: University of Delaware, Center for Historic Architecture and Design
Other (Specify Repository):

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-934 (Rev. 12-2015)

OMB Control No. 1024-0276 (Exp. 01/31/2019)

WATERFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 105

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Historic Landmarks Nomination Form

8. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Catherine Morrissey, Associate Director
Michael J. Emmons, Jr., Senior Architectural Historian
Kimberley Showell, Historic Preservation Specialist

Assisted by: Mary C. Fesak, Graduate Research Assistant
Andreya Mihalow, Historic Preservation Specialist
Kevin Barni, Architectural Historian (mapping and survey)
Maxwell Sickler, National Park Service, National Capitol Area, Intern

Address: Center for Historic Architecture and Design
330 Alison Hall
University of Delaware
Newark, DE, 19711

Telephone: (302) 831-8097

E-mail: cmorriss@udel.edu ; mjej@udel.edu

Date: December 2021

Edited by: Kathryn G. Smith
National Park Service
National Historic Landmarks Program
National Capital Area, Region 1
1100 Ohio Drive, SW
Washington, DC 20242

Telephone: (202) 619-7180