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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT METHODOLOGY

In Spring 2006, students in HISP 619A: Archaeology and Preservation, a graduate-level preservation class at the University of Maryland’s School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, undertook the preparation of an Archaeological Overview and Preservation Plan for Tudor Place Historic House and Garden (hereafter “Tudor Place”) in Washington, DC as part of their coursework for the class. The project was carried out under the supervision of Professor Donald W. Linebaugh and in consultation with the organization’s Executive Director Leslie L. Buhler and Site Manager Jana Shafagoj.

The catalyst for the project was the desire to develop a plan to summarize and manage the archaeological resources on the property, as no management plan for archaeological resources had been completed prior to the start of the present study. In light of the rich historical and environmental resources of Tudor Place, and given that four limited excavations conducted in response to utility work and/or proposed construction work yielded archaeological resources of historical significance, it was considered critical that a plan be developed to address the ongoing protection and management of these non-renewable cultural resources. The Archaeological Overview and Preservation Plan for Tudor Place draws on existing information to develop a context for understanding and organizing the known archaeological resources, present an assessment of the archaeological potential of the entire site, and offer recommendations for the management of known and potential archaeological resources.

In addition to serving as a management resource for Tudor Place personnel, this plan is intended to:

- Contribute to the contextual understanding of the site;
- Provide baseline data for the interpretation of archaeology at the site;
- Serve as a tool for researchers;
- Provide guidance for future archaeological endeavors; and
- Provide recommendations for the management and preservation of the site’s archaeological resources.

The Archaeological Overview and Preservation Plan is an important first step in ensuring that the site’s archaeological resources are included in overall site management
considerations and expands on other management plans for the site such as the Cultural Landscape Report Phase I: History and Period Plans (2002) and the Architectural Analysis - Tudor Place: An Interim Report (Graham and Ridout 2002).

**Description of Project Area**

Although the history of Tudor Place is well documented in other publications, it bears repeating in order to provide a framework for the preservation plan; a brief description is provided here and a historical synopsis is included in Chapter II to complement and enhance the environmental section.

Tudor Place, a National Historic Landmark, is located in the northwest quadrant of Washington, DC (Figure 1). It was established in late 18th century as a country estate within easy traveling distance of the growing city of Washington, DC.

When Tudor Place was developed the property encompassed an 8½-acre lot in what was then the separate city of Georgetown. Purchased in 1805 by Thomas Peter and his wife Martha Custis (granddaughter of Martha Washington), the property provided ample space for a significant residence, outbuildings, gardens and modest agricultural production as befitted a prominent family. Over the next one hundred and seventy eight years, four members of the Peter family held title to the property and six generations of the family occupied Tudor Place almost continuously. This continuity was important in maintaining the integrity of the house and gardens, making the preservation plan even more urgent.

Only 5½ acres of the original 8½-acre lot remain intact; portions of the original lot were sold in 1855 and 1866 as noted in Cultural Landscape Report Phase I: History and Period Plans (Figure 2). Today’s urban estate is significant not only for its grand residence designed in the neoclassical style by architect William Thornton but also for its 19th-century suburban garden and open space.

Tudor Place’s present boundaries are delineated by 32nd Street to the west, 31st Street to the east, and Q Street to the south (Figure 3 and Figure 4). On the north side, the estate abuts residential lots which were formerly part of the original 8½-acre tract. The administration building for Tudor Place Foundation, Inc. is at 1670 31st Street NW. This structure is a circa 1860s residence located on the north edge of the Tudor Place property and facing east on 31st Street. Most of the 5½-acre property has been designated as archaeological site 51NW134.

**House and Landscape**

Originally designed by Dr. William Thornton, the architect of the U.S. Capitol, Tudor Place was constructed in several phases spanning two decades, from 1795 until its completion in 1816. Although some changes were made to the structure during the 19th century, the current configuration of the building is the result of a major renovation and modernization in the early 20th century.

Tudor Place was built in a symmetrical neoclassical style consisting of five parts: a central block with two hyphens that connect to east and west wings (Figure 5). The mansion’s most prominent architectural features, however, can be viewed on the south elevation.
Figure 2. Property Plan Speculative and Partial circa 1850s.
(Source: Cultural Landscape Report 2002:Drawing number PP1850s)
Probably the most noticeable feature is the circular domed portico, supported by four Doric columns on the central block’s south façade (Figure 6). The central block consists of three bays and is two stories high. Flanking both sides of the portico on the first floor are two tripartite double-hung pilastered windows set within arched recesses. The second floor has two double-hung tripartite sash windows that articulate the first story windows. A hipped roof covers the central block of the house along with four interior end brick chimneys. Both hyphens are low with a three-part fenestration. Ornamental balustrades span the length of the rooflines. The hyphens join the two-story, two-bay east and west wings with the central block. A stringcourse runs the length of each wing, separating the first and second levels. The four windows in the east wing (two on the first level and two on the second level) are single-hung sash windows. The west wing has two casement windows on the second floor and two single-hung sash windows on the first floor.
A hipped roof covers both wings; the east wing has two brick interior end chimneys while the west wing has one.

The main entrance to Tudor Place can be found on the north façade of the central block (Figure 7). Consistent with the south façade, the north is three bays. Three evenly spaced single-hung sash windows span the façade on the second level. The main entrance, accentuated with a fan light, is flanked by two single-hung sash windows on the first level. The entire exterior surface of the structure was once covered in “yellow washed” (or yellow-tinted) limewash stucco, but in 2007 a Phase II restoration was performed to replace the 1914 Portland cement with original limestone-based stucco.
Several other structures and dependencies were built at different times to service the needs of the household, including the earlier smokehouse (the present-day Pigeon house) and two garages. The one-room smokehouse (Figure 8), a wood frame construction dating to the late 18th century or early 19th century, was relocated to the west of the main house in the 20th century. It sits on a brick foundation and is clad in beaded weatherboard. Located across from it and similar in construction, the 20th century trash house visually balances the smokehouse.

Figure 5. First-Floor Tudor Place, 1850s.
(Source: Graham and Ridout 2002, Architectural Analysis of Tudor Place, I-4)

A green four-panel door with a three-light transom is positioned in the center of the main smokehouse façade; attached to this façade is an entry platform, supported by two brick piers. A casement window with a fixed elliptical window above is located in the center of the south façade. This outbuilding is topped with a pyramidal, slate roof and a vented cupola.

The original two-story garage, built circa 1913, is located to the west of the main house (Figure 9). It consists of three bays with three large, nine-paneled garage doors spanning the main façade on the first level. The wooden doors are painted green and have three two-over-two light transoms on top. A shed roof porch overhang supported by four white Doric columns with brackets shelters the first floor. On the second floor, three six-over-six, double-hung sash windows are evenly spaced; all have green shutters. A decorative cornice
Figure 6. South Elevation of Tudor Place, 2006.
(Photograph by Christina Hiett)

Figure 7. Tudor Place North Elevation.
(Source: Context photograph taken from a CD on 2003 Archaeology Investigation)
runs along the main façade just above the sash windows on the second floor. A slate gable roof tops off the garage.

A second two-story garage was added in 1967. One large, twenty-seven paneled wooden garage door with a nine light transom spans the first floor. The second floor has one six-over-six single-hung dormer window. The dormer is shingled in slate and has a pediment above the sash window. This additional garage has a slate gable roof.

The landscape and gardens at Tudor Place contribute to its beauty and historic significance. Although land sales and changes have shaped the Tudor Place grounds, much of the present-day landscape maintains elements of the original Federal period design enjoyed by Thomas and Martha Custis Peter in the early 19th century. As a result, the entire parcel provides a historically significant environmental and cultural context for the house. Within the larger parcel, seven specific locations are particularly significant:

- Bowling Green
- Flower Knot
- Tennis Lawn
- Boxwood Ellipse
- Thistle Terrace
- Japanese Tea House, and
- South Lawn with the Tulip Poplar

The Bowling Green, located in the estate’s northwest corner, is a flat, grassy lawn suitable for lawn bowling and similar recreational activities (Figure 10). The area includes a brick-edged lily pool and features a Summer House. Located east of the Bowling Green is the Flower Knot, a manicured garden planted with several different species of roses as well as moss, shrub, hybrid tea, old musk, and floribunda (Figure 11). Armistead Peter 3rd reconstructed the Flower Knot garden in 1929, after the original circa 1820 plans were discovered.

The Boxwood Ellipse (Figure 12) dates to the time of Thomas and Martha Peter and provides the focal point for the approach to the main house (north façade); it is centered on the center walk which was the original entrance to the mansion. The Tennis Court Garden is found to the northeast of the Boxwood Ellipse. The area was formerly occupied
Figure 8. Tudor Place outbuildings: trash house (left) and smokehouse (right). (Photograph by Christina Hiett)

Figure 9. Tudor Place Garage, 2006. 1913 garage to left and 1967 garage to right. (Photograph by Christina Hiett)
by a peach orchard as well as a tennis court which was part of the Tudor Place Lawn Tennis Club built in 1885. When the tennis court was removed in the early 20th century, a sweeping lawn was created and a screen of white pine, American holly and dogwoods were planted (Tudor Place 2002). Located southwest of the house is the Japanese Tea House (Figure 13) and adjacent Rose Arbor which is covered with a pale pink climbing rose and a coral honeysuckle. Different species of roses have grown here since the main house was built in 1816 (Tudor Place 2002). The Tulip Poplar tree (Figure 14) is perhaps the most significant landscape feature on the entire estate. This magnificent tree, located on the east side of the South Lawn, measures twenty feet in circumference and is over one hundred feet tall. More than two hundred years old, the tree is original to the property and in 2002 earned the designation of Millennium Landmark Tree for the District of Columbia from the America the Beautiful Fund (Tudor Place 2002).
Figure 11. Tudor Place Flower Knot Garden, 2003.
(Source: Context photograph taken from CD on 2003 Archaeology Investigation)

Figure 12. Tudor Place Boxwood Ellipse, 2003.
(Source: Context photograph taken from CD on 2003 Archaeology Investigation)
Figure 13. Japanese Tea House, 2006. (Photograph by Christina Hiett)

Figure 14. Tulip Poplar Tree, 2007. (Photograph by Gabriela Harris)
**Project Methodology**

In developing the archaeological preservation plan, the class was divided into four groups with each group responsible for researching and reporting a specific topic. The *Archaeological Overview and Preservation Plan* consists of six chapters; each chapter is detailed below with a summary of the research approach and sources.

I. **Introduction and Project Methodology** – This section contains an overview of the project and the project area; the project methodology and scope is also discussed.

II. **Environmental Context** – Waterways and floodplains, landform features, soil types, slope, vegetation, and climate, were considered in developing an environmental context for Tudor Place. Resources consulted include the United States Department of Agriculture soil survey for Washington, DC, 1976, the DC GIS Atlas in consultation with National Resource Conservation Services soil analysis reports (at both site and town levels), and U.S.G.S. topographic maps. The relationship between the environmental context of Tudor Place and the potential for and condition of archaeological resources was considered and is presented in this chapter.

III. **Prehistoric and Historic Context** – The prehistoric context for the Paleo-Indian (prior to 8000 B.C.) to the Woodland Period (1200 B.C. to A.D. 1600) was examined for the Georgetown area, and is summarized in Chapter III. The history of the Tudor Place property including a summary of the architectural history of the main house is also presented in this section. Resources consulted include secondary sources on the prehistory and history of the area and supplemental documentation on the structures and the property itself, particularly *Architectural Analysis Tudor Place: An Interim Report* (Graham and Ridout 2002).

IV. **Previous Archaeological Research** – Archaeological investigations in the vicinity of Tudor Place were reviewed in order to provide an overview of known archaeological resources in the area. Site specific archaeological work at Tudor Place was examined and consolidated into a summary format that offers an overview of the prior work as well as an accompanying interpretation based on the findings. To this end, archaeological reports on previous excavations at Tudor Place are presented in terms of artifact assemblages, soil stratigraphy, and identified features. The subsequent analysis of these findings was
invaluable in assessing the potential for archaeological resources in terms of both locations and estimated frequency of features.

V. Identification of Archaeological Potential and Sensitivity – This section presents research that drew on historic maps, photographs and other visual sources to assist in the identification of archaeological potential and sensitivity. The team consulted the Cultural Landscape Report Phase 1: History and Period Plans (December 2002), which proved to be an invaluable resource in terms of its collection of historical documents and maps. Three maps were created as a result of the research for this chapter: one identifies areas of archaeological significance by chronological period, another identified areas of archaeological significance by confirmed location, a final overlay map illustrates suspected and confirmed areas of archaeological significance. Six historical maps and conjectural plans, historic photographs, excavation reports and written documentation provided the basis for the overlay map. In addition, the group prepared a table which related to points identified on the maps and ranked areas across the property in terms of low, medium, and high interest. These summary maps were vital tools for providing management recommendations and guidelines.

VI. Management Recommendations and Guidelines – Under the guidance of Dr. Linebaugh students convened as a group to develop management recommendations and guidelines based on their research. Dr. Linebaugh compiled and edited the findings into the present report with invaluable assistance from Gabriela Harris, principal editor and graduate assistants Amy Bolasky and Darian Schwab.
CHAPTER II: ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

This section serves as a basic introduction to the environmental context for both the District of Columbia and Tudor Place in terms of waterways, topography, soil conditions, climate, flora, and fauna.

District of Columbia

The District of Columbia comprises approximately 68.3 square miles – 61.4 square miles of land and 6.9 square miles of water (United States Census Bureau). The city is divided into four quadrants: (Northwest, Northeast, Southwest and Southeast) and features three prominent waterways: the Potomac and Anacostia rivers and Rock Creek (Figure 15). The Anacostia River and Rock Creek are both tributaries of the Potomac River. Rock Creek, known for a high degree of slope with quick changes in elevation, runs north to south from Montgomery County, Maryland, and bisects the city, flowing for 33 miles before emptying into the Potomac. The Anacostia flows south approximately 8.4 miles from Prince George's County, Maryland, where it joins with the Potomac at Hains Point. The Potomac, which serves as the southwestern border for the city, runs for 413 miles and flows into the Chesapeake Bay (Hyde 1999).

Tudor Place is in the Georgetown section of the Northwest quadrant of the city, situated along the north bank of the Potomac and the west bank of Rock Creek. The general slope of lands within the city and Georgetown section trends from north to south (Figure 15 and Figure 16). Slopes range from 0 to 40 percent for the city as a whole and from 0 to 15 percent for Georgetown. Land areas containing slopes of 0 to 5 percent are considered stable, 5 to 15 percent generally stable, and 15 percent or greater generally to marginally stable provided that they “are not underlain by landslide deposits or bedrock units susceptible to landsliding” (Randolph 2004:228-229). Although it seems unlikely given the area’s high level of development, the United States Geological Survey has the District listed as a “high probability” for erosion and landslides (Godt 2005). This determination means that much of Washington, DC is underlain by unstable, and easily erodible deposits.

The highest point of the city, 410 feet above sea level, can be found in Tenleytown, northwest of Tudor Place. The lowest elevation is sea level, which occurs along the shores
of the Anacostia and the Potomac (Hyde 1999). Given its location along the Potomac, both a 100- and 500-year floodplain exist in Georgetown as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA 1999). FEMA has calculated the probability that a flood could occur in any given year: a 100-year flood plain has a one percent chance of a flood occurring on that land in any given year while a 500-year floodplain has a 0.2 percent chance (Figure 17). The 100-year flood plain along the Potomac River is well south and down slope of Tudor Place including the land along the Whitehurst Freeway and K Street. The 500-year floodplain extends to the north side of the Whitehurst Freeway (Figure 18).

There are 129 different soil types found within the District based on the 1975 Soil Survey of the District of Columbia prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service [USDA, SCS] 1975). Georgetown is primarily composed of soils designated as Ub, UsB, UsC, and UxC. Soil types are identified by two letter abbreviations and a third uppercase letter designates slope. B represents a slope of 0 to 8 percent and C 8 to 15 percent. Urban land (Ub) soil is generally covered by concrete, buildings or otherwise impervious surfaces and does not include slope component because of this completely altered state. Urban land-Manor complex soil (UsB, UsC) is a combination of urban land and manor soils. Manor soils are generally coarse and loamy and are classified from deep and well-drained to somewhat excessively drained (USDA, SCS 1975: 89). The Urban land-Sassafras complex (UxC) contains both urban land and sassafras soils (Figure 19). Sassafras soils are defined as fine-loamy, siliceous, mesic, deep, and well drained soils which “formed in old marine deposits of sandy sediment that contains moderate amounts of silt and clay” (USDA, SCS 1975: 91).

Along Rock Creek, soil types MdB, MdD, U1, and U4 predominate (Figure 20). Manor-Urban land complex soils MdB and MdD have slopes of between 0 and 8 percent and 15 to 40 percent respectively. Manor-Urban land complex soil is very similar to UsB and UsC and both contain the same strata, but MdB and MdD contain higher amounts of manor soil than urban land. Udorthents (U1) and loamy udorthents (U4) are a type of fill material normally used to create building sites (USDA, NRCS 1975) (Table 1).
Figure 15. Overall slope degrees for the District with Potomac and Anacostia Rivers. 
(Source: DC Atlas, Environmental Maps: http://dcgis.dc.gov) (See Figure 16 for legend)
Figure 16. Slope degrees for Georgetown; Showing approximate location of Tudor Place. (Source: DC Atlas, Environmental Maps: http://dcgis.dc.gov)
Figure 17. View of DC’s flood plains.
(Source: DC Atlas, Environmental Maps, http://dcgis.dc.gov) See Figure 18 for legend.
Figure 18. Georgetown's vicinity to 100 year and 500 year flood plains. 
Figure 19. Soil Analysis, Tudor Place (SgC), with Georgetown surrounding ((Ub, UxC, UsB, UsC) (Source: DC Atlas, Environmental Maps: http://dcgis.dc.gov)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>pH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>0-8%</td>
<td>6121</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UsB</td>
<td>0-8%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>dk brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>yellowish brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>15 in</td>
<td>brown, dk brown, strong brown</td>
<td>silt loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>23-60 in</td>
<td>variegated</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UsC</td>
<td>8-15%</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>dk brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>yellowish brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>15 in</td>
<td>brown, dk brown, strong brown</td>
<td>silt loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>23-60 in</td>
<td>variegated</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MdB</td>
<td>0-8%</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>dk brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>yellowish brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>15 in</td>
<td>brown, dk brown, strong brown</td>
<td>silt loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>23-60 in</td>
<td>variegated</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MdD</td>
<td>15-40%</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>dk brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>yellowish brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>15 in</td>
<td>brown, dk brown, strong brown</td>
<td>silt loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td>23-60 in</td>
<td>variegated</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>3.6-6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1</td>
<td>0-8%</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U4</td>
<td>0-8%</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SgC</td>
<td>8-15%</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5 in</td>
<td>very dk grayish brown</td>
<td>sandy loam</td>
<td>3.6-5.5</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>sandy loam</td>
<td>3.6-5.5</td>
<td>11 in</td>
<td>strong brown</td>
<td>sandy loam</td>
<td>3.6-5.5</td>
<td>31-60 in</td>
<td>strong brown</td>
<td>loamy coarse sand</td>
<td>3.6-5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UxC</td>
<td>8-15%</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5 in</td>
<td>very dk grayish brown</td>
<td>sandy loam</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>sandy loam</td>
<td>4 in</td>
<td>strong brown</td>
<td>sandy loam</td>
<td>31-60 in</td>
<td>strong brown</td>
<td>loamy coarse sand</td>
<td>3.6-5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Physical properties of soils within Georgetown.
The climate of Washington, DC is generally temperate. The National Climate Data Center tracks daily temperatures and precipitation at Washington-Dulles Airport located about 27 miles west of the District in Virginia. Winter averages are in the mid-30s (34.8º F in January), spring averages in the 50s (55.3º F in April), summers are hot and humid with average temperatures in the high 70s (77.9º F in July), and fall temperatures generally average in the high 50s (58.8º F in October). In 2005 precipitation totaled 44.55 inches with 17.30 inches of snow (NCDC 2005). The District is subjected to a limited number of weather phenomena, such as flash floods, strong winds, and occasionally the remnants of hurricanes, with 2003’s Hurricane Isabel being the most recent. Although Isabel did no major damage to the District because it lost a significant amount of strength upon reaching land, it did inflict heavy rains and wind on the city.

Figure 20. Soil analysis of Georgetown near the Rock Creek. (UxC, UsB, UsC, Ub, MdB, MdD, U1, U4). (Source: DC Atlas, Environmental Maps: http://dcgis.dc.gov)
**Tudor Place**

Compared to the surrounding neighborhood, the expansive open spaces, lush and unique gardens of Tudor Place are relatively unspoiled. According to the *Soil Survey of the District of Columbia* “about 81 percent of the area has been disturbed during urbanization or other related activities,” and only “about 19 percent of the area is relatively undisturbed” (USDA, SCS 1975: 1). Given Washington, DC’s growth and expansion in the last 30 years, the percentage of undisturbed open space in existence today is almost assuredly less than 19 percent. The Tudor Place estate reflects this general finding as it is completely surrounded by medium-density residential housing (see Figure 3, page 5).

The pristine condition of the estate is enhanced by the presence of specimen trees that may predate the construction of the mansion. These include several species of hollies, poplars, and white pine. Martha Custis Peter also planted many types of boxwood during her lifetime, many of which remain today. Ensuing generations of the Peter family planted dogwoods, magnolias, and additional white pines (Tudor Place Foundation 2002; USDA, SCS 1975: 3.) Approximately two-thirds of the estate is shaded by a tree canopy, with the majority of the remaining open space taken up by the expansive South Lawn. About 25 to 30 percent of the parcel is devoted to the seven formally landscaped sites noted in Chapter I (Bowling Green, Flower Knot, Tennis Lawn, Boxwood Eclipse, Japanese Tea House, Thistle Terrace, and South Lawn). Prominent plants include carefully manicured roses, lilacs, honeysuckle, and other flowers, as well as colorful shrubs such as crape myrtles and hydrangeas (Tudor Place Foundation 2002). Around 10 percent of the property is covered by buildings, drives, footpaths, parking lots, and other construction, leaving the remaining 60 to 65 percent as green space.

In addition to the floral resources mentioned, Tudor Place also includes many animal species. The District of Columbia exhibits a diverse fauna for an area that is principally urban in character. Approximately 35 species of mammals and 175 species of birds can be found within the boundaries of the District of Columbia throughout the year (Ford 1975:70). While most are songbirds, or squirrels, rabbits, raccoons, and other species commonly found in residential neighborhoods, there are also red foxes, owls, and hawks. Given that much of the Tudor Place estate remains open, these rarer species do exist and have been spotted on the estate.
Topography and soils are the final aspect of Tudor Place’s environmental context. The estate is elevated 40 to 50 feet above mean sea level, with the elevation increasing south to north. The entire property rests on an 8 to 15 percent slope (Figure 16), which increases in elevation toward Rock Creek – 2,300 feet to the northeast – and decreases to 0 percent at the Potomac River – 3,300 feet to the south (DC Atlas 2006). The soil composition is a Sassafras-Urban land complex, or SgC. This soil type shares the same characteristics of Georgetown’s surrounding Urban-land Sassafras (UxC) complex soil, except that SgC contains less urban land. Like all of Georgetown’s soil types, the Sassafras-Urban variety present at Tudor Place is mildly to strongly acidic depending on the individual stratum. This acidity can pose a threat to the longevity of certain categories of archaeological artifacts, including lithics, glass, glazes, shell, iron, copper, lead, silver, and organics such as bone, leather, and antler (National Park Service 2005).

**Conclusion**

Tudor Place is sited on a 5½-acre parcel of land in the heavily urbanized Georgetown neighborhood of northwest Washington, D.C. The United States Geological Survey has listed the District of Columbia as a “high probability” for erosion and landslides, including Georgetown. Additionally, because of its proximity to the low elevation environment and low slope of the Potomac River, as well as the Anacostia River and Rock Creek, FEMA has identified both a 100- and 500-year floodplain within Georgetown, although well downslope from Tudor Place. Tudor Place’s soil composition is a Sassafras-Urban land complex (SgC), one of the 129 distinct soil types present within the District of Columbia. The estate includes open spaces, gardens, and specialized recreational areas, many of which retain their original 19th-century designs. Approximately 25 to 30 percent of the grounds are devoted to seven formally landscaped sites, 10 percent to impervious cover, and 60 to 65 percent to unplanned green space. Several hundred specimen trees are located throughout the property, as well as approximately 35 species of mammals and 175 species of birds.
CHAPTER III: PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC CONTEXT

Georgetown is a historic neighborhood with rich social and architectural history. Visitors who tour the area’s rich architectural heritage are often unaware of the area’s early prehistoric history and inhabitants. Tudor Place and other historic sites in Georgetown shed light on the area’s evolving history by offering a glimpse into the social history of upper class life in the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries and the enslaved and free African American workers and later immigrant servants who built and ran the estate.

As a baseline for the archaeological management plan for Tudor Place, it is necessary to summarize the prehistoric and historic contexts of the greater Georgetown area as well as the specific prehistoric and historic context of Tudor Place. To this end, this section relies on secondary sources such as Grace Dunlop Ecker’s “A Portrait of Old George Town” (1951), William M. Gardner’s “Early and Middle Woodland in the Middle Atlantic: An Overview” (1982), Mary Mitchell’s “Chronicles of Georgetown Life of 1865-1900”, (1986), and reports from the National Park Service on Georgetown.

**Prehistoric Context**

In the Mid-Atlantic Region, which includes the Georgetown area and Tudor Place specifically, the prehistoric cultural context is subdivided into three major time periods based on changes in subsistence as exhibited by material remains and settlement patterns. These divisions are known as:

- Paleo-Indian period,
- Archaic period, and
- Woodland period.

A brief summary of each period is provided below, along with predictions of the potential for sites of the period to be found on or in the project area.

**Paleo-Indian Period (Prior to 8000 B.C.)**

The area around Georgetown has been inhabited since at least the Paleo-Indian Period, considered the first cultural occupation of the Mid-Atlantic region, beginning some time before 10,000 B.C. The Georgetown area was part of a freshwater river valley abundant in small game and plants. The Paleo-Indian period is most often characterized as the era of
extinct mega-fauna such as bison and mammoth (Gardner 1977). The earliest diagnostic artifacts which represent the Paleo-Indian period are fluted projectile points, typically made of high quality materials such as chert, chalcedony, or jasper (Gardner 1977). While Paleo-Indians are traditionally characterized as big-game hunters, most current views now hold that eastern Paleo-Indians were mainly foragers who emphasized hunting. Social organization of the Paleo-Indians consisted of relatively small bands of individuals who exploited a wide but defined territory. The majority of Paleo-Indian remains in the Mid-Atlantic are represented by isolated projectile point finds and what appear to be small temporary camps. Although a few larger Paleo-Indian sites, such as the Thunderbird site in Warren County, Virginia, have been recovered in the Mid-Atlantic region, they are relatively rare and usually associated with sources of high quality lithic materials used for tool making.

**Archaic Period (8000 B.C to 1200 B.C.)**

The Archaic Period, which is divided into Early, Middle and Late, generally coincided with the end of the Pleistocene epoch, and was marked in the region by a shift from a moist, cool period to a warmer, dryer climate. These climate changes brought about a variety of habitats for plant and animal resources which are thought to have coincided with an increased emphasis on seasonal migration and increasingly sophisticated technologies.

Settlement during the Archaic Period probably involved single band-sized groups of individuals living in base camps during part of the year and dispersing as necessary for hunting expeditions to create smaller micro-band camps. Archaic Period technology includes the emergence of soapstone or steatite storage and cooking vessels, a precursor to ceramics which appeared during the Late Archaic period (Gardner 1982).

Archaic sites, such as small activity areas for hunting and stone tool reduction, are typically found both on streams and small tributaries in the Mid-Atlantic region, indicating a movement from the major rivers to the interior headwaters, and exploitation of a broad range of both riverine and forest resources. Archaic period base camps have been recovered in bottomlands along the Potomac River as well as on ridges (Comer 1993). Due to the location of the study area on a high bluff above the Potomac River and Rock Creek, there is a low to moderate potential for the presence of archaic occupations on or near the property.
Woodland Period (1200 B.C. to A.D. 1600)

The Woodland Period is characterized by ceramic technology, a gradually developing dependence on horticulture, and increased sedentism. Three sub-periods (Early, Middle, and Late Woodland) have been designated based primarily on technological changes in ceramic and projectile point types as well as settlement patterns. The most widely used Woodland temporal scheme in the Middle Atlantic region is: Early Woodland, (ca. 1200 B.C. to ca. 500 B.C.); Middle Woodland, (ca. 500 B.C. to ca. A.D. 900); and Late Woodland, (ca. A.D. 900 to ca. A.D. 1600) (Gardner 1982).

The earliest Woodland ceramic wares, Marcey Creek Plain, are rectangular or oval and resemble the preceding Late Archaic soapstone vessels. These are followed by cord-marked, soapstone-tempered Selden Island ceramics, sand-and-grit-tempered Accokeek ceramics, and, in the upper part of the Potomac drainage, cord-marked and plain ceramics tempered with quartz, shale and other crushed rock (Gardner and Nash 1988; McLearen 1991.) By the Late Woodland Period (A.D. 900 to A.D. 1600), agriculture assumed an important role.

The adoption of agriculture provided a marked change in the prehistoric subsistence economy and settlement patterns. Expanses of arable land became a dominant settlement factor, and sites such as villages and small hamlets were located on fertile floodplain soils or, in many cases, on higher terraces or ridges adjacent to them. Some villages were highly nucleated, while others were dispersed over a wide area. Some villages were also fortified by circular or oval palisades. With the development of a more sedentary settlement-subsistence system, permanent habitation sites gradually replaced base camp habitation sites, which were more characteristic of those of the previous forager and hunter-gatherer groups. Various supporting camps such as short-term hunting and foraging camps, quarries, butchering locations, and re-tooling locations remained part of the day-to-day procurement of food and other resources. Also characteristic of the Early Woodland period across a broad region of the Mid-Atlantic and the eastern United States is complexity of and emphasis on ceremonial aspects, especially those concerned with the burial of the dead.

There is evidence of Woodland settlements in the area of Georgetown. Captain John Smith's map of 1608 showed the Indian village of Tohoga near present day Georgetown
Figure 21. John Smith 1608 Map. (Source: Sanchez-Saavedra 1975)
(Figure 21) and Henry Fleete, a British fur trader, wrote in 1632 of a Native American settlement in the area (Bergheim 1992). Other early maps showed the Naticoke Village of Queponca in the same area. In 1711 it was reported that present-day Theodore Roosevelt Island near Georgetown was inhabited by Native Americans.

Considering the favorable setting of Georgetown—on a bluff near the confluence of Rock Creek and the Potomac River—there is a high probability for the presence of Woodland occupations including both settlement sites and temporary camping sites. It seems likely, however, that the settlement sites would be located close to and along the Potomac or Rock Creek and not on the higher elevation of the Tudor Place property itself.

**Historic Context**

As mentioned in the Prehistoric Context section, it is clear that the first settlement of Georgetown was by Native Americans. Colonists began settling in and around the area in the 17th century, founding a community that slowly developed into the major shipping port and trading center of Georgetown (Ecker 1933). Well known voyagers such as Captain John Smith and Henry Fleete sailed up the Potomac and stopped to trade with the Indians in present-day Georgetown. The settlement continued to grow as a popular trading port well into the 18th century.

Modern Georgetown was not formally established until 1751 and may have been named in honor of King George II. Tobacco developed as the major cash crop in the region and the town prospered as a port for trading between Europe and the West Indies (NPS 2007). Industry also grew along the waterfront with the construction of wharves and flour mills. Additionally, the town served as the depot for the shipping of military supplies during the Revolutionary War.

Following the war, more industries, such as a textile mill, paper factory, and additional flour mills, were established. It was also after the Revolution that Georgetown became an independent municipal government of the federal District of Columbia. Georgetown was not formally annexed by the City of Washington until 1871 (D.C. Historic Preservation Office [SHPO] 2003). By the 1790s, Georgetown gained a reputation as the fashionable quarter of the capital city and drew visitors from all over the United States as well as other countries (NPS 2007).
After the Civil War, many freed slaves migrated to Georgetown where their labor helped the economy flourish. Unfortunately, the flooding of the Potomac River in the 1890s caused many businesses to go bankrupt. One of the affected businesses, the C & O Canal, handled a large part of the river traffic. The canal, an integral part of Georgetown since its opening in 1836, had been part of the Potomac Company whose founders included George Washington (SHPO 2003). The canal continued to be the main means of transportation for boats until it finally ceased operations in 1924.

The 1890s flooding was indeed a catastrophic event for Georgetown and its impact on its residents cannot be underestimated. The local economy went into a downward spiral (NPS 2007) and what used to be a town known for its affluent and prosperous neighborhoods and businesses became one of Washington’s worst slums. While the neighborhood decayed around it, the waterfront retained its industrial character into the first half of the 20th century, becoming home to a lumber yard, a cement works, and a meat rendering plant (SHPO 2003).

Some change came in the 1930s when members of the Roosevelt administration slowly gentrified the area. However, Georgetown was not to become truly fashionable again until John F. Kennedy took up residence while serving in the Senate in the 1950s (SHPO 2003). Slowly more political elites were drawn to the area beginning in the 1960s, restoring Georgetown’s reputation for affluence.

Although Georgetown has regained its pre-1790s preeminence, its historic fabric (with few exceptions such as the pre-Revolutionary Old Stone House on M Street) dates primarily to the 19th century. The variety of architectural styles is impressive: Georgian mansions, townhouses, Federal and Classical Revival houses, and ornate structures of the ante- and post-bellum periods coexist peacefully (NPS 2007). Several large homes and estates, including Tudor Place, have remained somewhat or largely intact and are operated as museums.

**Brief History of Tudor Place**

Francis Lowndes, a prominent landowner and shipper, acquired the original 8½-acre parcel that later became Tudor Place from Thomas Beale in 1794 for the tidy sum of $1,265. (Graham and Ridout 2002), (Figure 22). Lowndes began building his home ca. 1794-1805;
contemporary tax records indicate that three brick buildings existed on the property, of which only two survived. The two surviving structures would eventually become the east and west wings of the current house (Figure 23). On June 5, 1805, Francis Lowndes sold the property to Thomas Peter and his wife, the former Martha Parke Custis, for $8,000. Thomas Peter was the son of a successful Scottish tobacco merchant, landowner, and the first mayor of Georgetown; Martha Parke Custis was the granddaughter of Martha Washington. It was money left by George Washington to Martha Custis that allowed the Peters to purchase Tudor Place. With only the two wings extant when they purchased the property, the Peter family used the western wing as living quarters and the eastern wing as a carriage house and stable. The living quarters consisted of bedchambers on the upper floor, and a small parlor in the South room of what is now the west hyphen (Graham and Ridout 2002). Outbuildings, the smokehouse, and the laundry are also believed to have existed on the property during that early period.

Around 1808, Dr. William Thornton, the first architect of the U.S. Capitol and a Peter family friend, started to draw plans to connect the two wings, however the final design was not completed until 1813. The stately neoclassic mansion that was ultimately constructed linked the two earlier wings making the building one of the largest in Georgetown (Figure 24).

The Peters’ willingness to make their home into a fine estate was signaled by their naming the property “Tudor Place”. First recorded as Tudor Place in The National Intelligencer on May 7, 1811, the building was finally completed around 1816 (Graham and Ridout 2002). Tudor Place was built with entertaining in mind, and centers around public spaces on the first floor, such as a salon flanked by a formal drawing room and a parlor/dining room (Figure 25).

The large estate required a great deal of manual labor to operate, and like many wealthy families in early America, the Peters relied on slave labor. By 1820 there were 14 enslaved people living at Tudor Place; 6 adults and 8 children, some bequeathed by Martha Washington in her will (Schiavo 2004). While little is known about the earliest enslaved Africans working and living at Tudor Place, there are photographs and even a limited amount of biographical information about individual slaves living on the estate during the mid-19th century.
Figure 22. Map of Washington City, District of Columbia, 1856-1859. By A. Boschke. The Tudor Place mansion is shown between the letters R and G. (Source: 2002 Cultural Landscapes Report)
Figure 23. Original configuration of Francis Lowndes’ house.
(Source: Graham and Ridout 2002)

Very little was done to alter the house during the first half of the 19th century until the installation of gas lighting in the 1850s. Judging from early heat registers that survive, the building may also have had the first central heating system in the area, likely installed around the middle of the 19th century (Graham and Ridout 2002). At this time, Britannia Wellington Kennon, one of the Peters’ eight children, lived in the home with her daughter Martha Custis Kennon. Her husband, Commodore Beverley Kennon, had died in 1844 in an explosion on the U.S.S. Princeton. Britannia Kennon was known as one of the city’s most distinguished residents, and was a well-respected gardener. In 1872, a local newspaper showed off Mrs. Kennon’s Cycas revolute, a plant bearing fruit for the first time in 60 years, which her mother had bought in Philadelphia in 1812 (Mitchell 1986). Britannia Kennon lived most of her long life at Tudor Place, except between 1858 and December 1861 when the house was rented out (Ecker 1951).

During the Civil War, Mrs. Kennon moved back into Tudor Place and took in several Federal officers as boarders, under the condition that the affairs of the war would not be discussed (Ecker 1951). After all, Captain Beverley Kennon II, Commodore Kennon’s son from his first marriage, and Britannia Kennon’s stepson served in the Confederate Army, along with several other family members (Tudor Place 2002). In April 1867 Martha Custis Kennon married Dr. Armistead Peter, a prominent Georgetown physician, and they immediately took up residence at Tudor Place with Britannia Kennon. It was most likely around this time that changes were made to the stable wing and the north room of the east
Figure 24. Five part plan of Tudor Place in 1850s.
(Source: Graham and Ridout 2002)

Figure 25. First floor plan of Tudor Place, 1893.
From a Sketch by Walter Peter. (Source: Graham and Ridout 2002)

hyphen. The masonry partition between the conservatory and the northern half of the wing was raised so that the ceiling could be built higher in the northern half (Graham and Ridout 2002). In 1855 the uppermost portion of the estate adjacent to Dumbarton Oaks had been
sold and in 1866 the family again sold part of the estate, this time the lower north section. The lower parcel was divided into five lots of different sizes priced from $15 to $45 per square foot—all were sold within two weeks (Mitchell 1986). All of these lots were quickly built upon; the lot at 1670 31st Street is again owned by Tudor Place and serves as the museum’s administration building (Figure 26 and Figure 27).

In 1876 a new kitchen was added to the west wing of the house and the old kitchen was converted to a servants’ sitting room. A small access lobby was built to join the new kitchen to the servants’ hall. After Britannia Kennon’s death in 1911, Armistead Peter Jr., son of Dr. Peter and Martha Kennon Peter, purchased the other heirs’ shares in the property and took sole ownership of Tudor Place. Soon thereafter, the Peters undertook a major renovation of the building. Important structural repairs were performed and new bathrooms, electrical wiring, plumbing, gas, and a new roof were installed. In May 1914, the domestic servants moved from the house to new quarters in the garage (Figure 28). Since the 1913-1915 renovation campaign there have been only minor changes, and thus the estate retains most of its character from the early 19th century (Graham and Ridout 2002) (Figure 29).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tudor Place Chain of Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1794 – 1805</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1805 – 1854</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1854 – 1911</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1867</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1911 – 1954</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1954 – 1983</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1983 to Present</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2. Owners and residents of Tudor Place*
Figure 26. Detail of 1893 Plats of Squares and Subdivisions of Georgetown, DC. (Source: 2002 Cultural Landscape Report)
Figure 27. Administration Building, 1670 31st Street NW.  
(Photograph by Christina Hiett)
Figure 28. Construction of the foundation for the garage, 1913
(Source: 2002 Cultural Landscape Report)
Figure 29. Portion of a survey by Blake Gordon (1913) with layout of the property. Showing garden, smokehouse, and proposed location of garage. (Source: 2002 Cultural Landscape Report)
The Peter family retained ownership of Tudor Place until 1983; its last owner, Armistead Peter 3rd bequeathed the property to a Foundation. The mansion and the gardens opened to the public in 1988 under the stewardship of the Carostead Foundation, the predecessor of the Tudor Place Foundation.

**Conclusion**

Throughout its long history, from the prehistoric period through the twentieth century, Tudor Place and the surrounding grounds witnessed dramatic changes to Georgetown both in terms of inhabitants and physical landscape. While the home of an extremely wealthy and socially prominent family, the Tudor Place property was also home to enslaved workers and later paid domestic servants who maintained the estate and also were responsible for carrying out many of the physical changes to the building and landscapes that have left their mark in the archaeological resources. The prehistoric and historic context of the site plays an important role in understanding the potential archaeological resources of the property and their relationship to Georgetown and the larger region.

Although the history of Tudor Place in the 20th century is well documented, there are substantial gaps in our knowledge of how the estate evolved. Archaeological excavations have the potential to provide an understanding of the life of residents of Tudor Place, whether high-born or humble, free or enslaved. Despite the fact that archival resources have not been exhausted, archaeology can definitely provide answers about the early history (and progression) of the mansion and its gardens. Documents pertaining to Tudor Place may be held by other institutions and their discovery may corroborate archaeological findings and the oral history cited in family documents.
CHAPTER IV: PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

While the archaeological resources of the Tudor Place site remain largely unknown, preliminary excavations suggest it to be rich with historical and cultural information. This section summarizes the archaeological information from sites within the vicinity of Tudor Place and focuses on the specific archaeological history of the site itself. Data on sites in the vicinity of Tudor Place was gathered at the District of Columbia Office of Planning, Historic Preservation Office (DC SHPO) while site-specific information was derived from documentary records of the Tudor Place Foundation. The recovery of artifacts and features from archaeological sites, when coupled with their potential for interpretation, create a valuable resource for cultural and historical study. Summaries of previously identified sites in an approximately one-mile radius of Tudor Place are presented below along with previously identified resources on the Tudor Place property. These previously identified sites help predict and plan for the types of archaeological resources likely to occur on the Tudor Place property.

Previously Identified Sites in the Vicinity of Tudor Place

Twenty six archaeological sites (defined as physical locations in which evidence of past activity is preserved) have been identified within a one-mile radius of the Tudor Place property (Table 3 and Figure 30) and 36 surveys (defined as the collection and analysis of data related to the distribution of features and artifacts of past human cultures) were conducted in the area (Table 4). Table 3 summarizes archaeological sites by site number, location, report number (an internal DC SHPO reference number), the name of the entity that performed the archaeological work, the name of the site, the purpose of the project (e.g. utilities work that may impact the site) and whether the site is historic or prehistoric. Table 4 lists the area of survey, the scope of survey (Phase I, II or III)\(^1\), the report number generated by the survey, the governmental agency or private entity involved, the author of the survey and the legislation or mandate enabling the survey. Figure 30 combines the information identified in Tables 3 and 4 in a unified graphic format.

---

\(^1\) Phase I consists of identification and archeological sampling, Phase II consists of testing, and evaluation of the site and the actual excavation, Phase III consists of the salvage of artifacts, data recovery, cataloguing and final report of the findings. Each phase may have intermediate stages.
Of the 26 archaeological sites identified within one mile of Tudor Place, 15 have yielded a variety of artifacts relating to subsistence, architecture, domestic life, and trade; both prehistoric and historic sites, dating from the Early Archaic period to the present day, have been identified. Table 5 summarizes these findings by site number, site name, date of report, site type, temporal period, artifacts recovered, and representative features.

Eight of the 15 representative sites contained both prehistoric and historic artifacts, while the remaining seven contained only historic material. Many of the prehistoric artifacts are non-diagnostic and the stratigraphic integrity of these sites is low as a consequence of disturbance. As a result, two of eight prehistoric sites (25 percent) cannot be dated. All eight sites contain lithic artifacts ranging from stone flakes discarded in tool making to projectile points. Six of the prehistoric sites contain datable artifacts and are classified within the Archaic period. The Henry Foxall site (51NW76), for example, contains evidence of temporary hunting camps from the Archaic period. It is also one of two sites to provide evidence of the Early Woodland period, possibly a village location.

While approximately half of the 15 representative archaeological sites in the vicinity of Tudor Place contained prehistoric components, all had historic components dating between the 18th and early 20th century. Ten of these sites (66 percent) contained historic artifacts from the early period of Georgetown, identified as the mid-18th to early 19th century. Five sites (33 percent) dated from the mid-19th to the early 20th century. The majority of the historic period sites contain both artifacts and intact features. The artifact collections are typical for sites of these time periods. For example, ceramics, such as creamware, pearlware, whiteware, ironstone, and porcelain were present in 66 percent of the sites. Other domestic materials include bottle glass, tableware, and bone. Architectural artifacts such as nails, brick, and window glass were recovered from five (33 percent) of the sites. Twelve of the known archaeological sites (80 percent) contained typical urban features including a garden retaining wall, brick foundations, oyster shell roads or paths, brick walls, basements, wells, and cobblestone paving. The site reports also mention small amounts of personal artifacts, recent trash, and other miscellaneous items (see Table 5).

Further information about the findings of these excavations is detailed in the individual reports cited in the Report No. column of Table 3 and Table 4. These surveys, listed in
Appendix A in report number order, are voluminous and beyond the narrow scope of this project. They can be requested from the DC Office of Planning, Historic Preservation Office.

Historical sites discovered during archaeological investigations in the vicinity of Tudor Place provide a context in which to analyze the identified and potential archaeological resources of the Tudor Place property.

By combining the information from the datable sites in the vicinity of Tudor Place with the excavated resources on the Tudor Place property, it is possible to predict the types of resources that might be present and consider their impact on the interpretation of architectural, social, and economic patterns of life in the area over many years. This potential for analysis requires the continuing assessment of patterns and anomalies in the archaeological results from Tudor Place surveys, and previous and future archaeological surveys and excavations in the vicinity of Tudor Place.
Figure 30. Map of previously identified archaeological sites near Tudor Place.
Source: Dr. Ruth Troccoli, Archaeologist, DC Office of Planning, Historic Preservation Office
## Archaeological Sites in the Vicinity of Tudor Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51NW015</td>
<td>Wisconsin &amp; M Streets (3051 M St NW)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Old Stone House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW044</td>
<td>Rock Creek/E of Oak Hill Cemetery</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>D.L. Gill</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW048</td>
<td>Market St./on M St.</td>
<td>63, 316</td>
<td>J. Harrison</td>
<td>Georgetown Market</td>
<td>Georgetown Market</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW064</td>
<td>Southeast Corner of 34th and M Sts, NW at 3550 M St.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1986</td>
<td>Forrest-Marbury House</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Historic/Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW075</td>
<td>Square 1177</td>
<td>66, 319</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1987</td>
<td>Georgetown Waterfront</td>
<td>Georgetown Waterfront Park</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW075</td>
<td>Square 1178</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1987</td>
<td>Georgetown Waterfront</td>
<td>Georgetown Waterfront Park</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW075</td>
<td>Square 1179</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1987</td>
<td>Georgetown Waterfront</td>
<td>Georgetown Waterfront Park</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW076</td>
<td>3333 K St, NW Square 1184 Lot 49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1989</td>
<td>Henry Foxall House</td>
<td>National Development Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW084</td>
<td>Halcyon House, 3400 Prospect St., NW, Sq. 1204</td>
<td>Proposal only</td>
<td>Halcyon House</td>
<td>Was not excavated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW089</td>
<td>2521 K St., Sq. 15, lot 802. Cooper Houses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Milner 1990</td>
<td>2521 K St.</td>
<td>Cooper Houses</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW102</td>
<td>3406 M St. Sq. 1183, North end along street</td>
<td>60, 62</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1989, Milner 1994</td>
<td>Francis Scott Key Park</td>
<td>Francis Scott Key Park</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW104</td>
<td>Whitehurst Fwy. Georgetown</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Parsons/Versar 2006 II</td>
<td>Georgetown Warehouses-Whitehurst</td>
<td>Whitehurst Fwy</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Known archaeological sites in the vicinity of Tudor Place.
Information provided courtesy of Dr. Ruth Trocolli, Archaeologist, DC Office of Planning, Historic Preservation Office (DC SHPO)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51NW114</td>
<td>East end of Mitchell Pk, Sq. 2529, between Bancroft Pl. &amp; S.St.</td>
<td>247, 13</td>
<td>ATC 2000 Hill; Thunderbird 1980</td>
<td>Anthony Holmead House</td>
<td>Ph. III Mitchell Park</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW136</td>
<td>Dumbarton Oaks</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>EAC/A 2003 (Kirchen et al.)</td>
<td>Dumbarton Oaks - 1</td>
<td>Storm sewer pipeline survey</td>
<td>Historic/Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW137</td>
<td>Dumbarton Oaks</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>EAC/A 2003 (Kirchen et al.)</td>
<td>Dumbarton Oaks - 2</td>
<td>Storm sewer pipeline survey</td>
<td>Historic/Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW138</td>
<td>Dumbarton Oaks</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>EAC/A 2003 (Kirchen et al.)</td>
<td>Dumbarton Oaks - 3</td>
<td>Storm sewer pipeline survey</td>
<td>Historic/Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW139</td>
<td>2425 L Street, NW. Columbia Hospital for Women</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>Berger 2003 Griffiths&amp;LeeDecker</td>
<td>Columbia Hospital for Women</td>
<td>D.C./Local Law</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW153</td>
<td>Dumbarton Oaks Park; upslope, western locus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unnamed Dumbarton Oaks Park</td>
<td>NPS Rock Creek Park Survey</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW161</td>
<td>Montrose Park, demolished 19th-c. estate house location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unnamed Montrose Park Historic</td>
<td>NPS Rock Creek Park Survey</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW195</td>
<td>Res. #339</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>Louis Berger Group</td>
<td>Massachusetts Ave. Quarry</td>
<td>Rock Creek Park Survey</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW209</td>
<td>Sq. 1205, Lot 57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1988</td>
<td>Sq. 1205, Lot 57 (well)</td>
<td>Former Bank of Columbia</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17</td>
<td>26 &amp; Q Sts. Just east of Oak Hill Cemetery</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>Mt. Zion Cemetery Report</td>
<td>Mt. Zion/ Fem Un Band Cemetery</td>
<td>Mt. Zion Cemetery</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. (continued) Known archaeological sites in the vicinity of Tudor Place.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Name</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Rep No.</th>
<th>Related Reports</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mandate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Houses, Square 15, lots 802-803</td>
<td>Phase I Intensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bronberg, Inc.</td>
<td>Milner 1990 (Seifert)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Park</td>
<td>Phase I Intensive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>247, 136</td>
<td>Thunderbird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Zion United Methodist Church Community House</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;O Railroad ROW, Georgetown subdivision</td>
<td>Phase I Intensive</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Interstate Commerce Commission</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1987 (Crowell et al.)</td>
<td>NHPA (deaccessioning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Columbia Lot 57 Sq 1205</td>
<td>Combined Phase I/II</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; O Canal prism desilting monitoring</td>
<td>Survey Report</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>NPS 1981 (McGarry)</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosstown Watermain Parcel 2, park w of Rock Creek, Sq. 1216-17,1237</td>
<td>Intensive Archival</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Water supply?</td>
<td>Thunderbird 1981 (Fehr)</td>
<td>NEPA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosstown Watermain Parcel 3, park e of Rock Creek, Sq. 13</td>
<td>Intensive Archival</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Water supply?</td>
<td>Thunderbird 1981 (Fehr)</td>
<td>NEPA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrest Marbury House</td>
<td>Combined Phase I/II</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Science Inc 1986</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Foxall House</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>National Development Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>Engineering-Science</td>
<td>Local pressure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Scott Key Park, 51NW102</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Market House Site</td>
<td>Phase I Reconnaissance</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Archaeological surveys in the vicinity of Tudor Place.*

*Information provided courtesy of Dr. Ruth Troccoli, Archaeologist, DC Office of Planning, Historic Preservation Office (DCSHPO)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Name</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Rep No.</th>
<th>Related Reports</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mandate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Waterfront Park; between Wisconsin &amp; 31 St., South of K St</td>
<td>Combined Phase I/II</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1985</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suter’s Tavern - Georgetown Incinerator Property</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>314, 315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehurst Freeway Ph. I - Foggy Bottom</td>
<td>Phase I Intensive</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73, 228, 227, 224</td>
<td>DC DPW, FHWA</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1991 (Artemel et al.)</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehurst Freeway Ph. II - Foggy Bottom</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71, 228, 227, 224</td>
<td>DC DPW, FHWA</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1993 (Glumac et al.)</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Playground</td>
<td>Phase I Reconnaissance</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DC Parks and Recreation (DPR)</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1984 (Artemel et al.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Park Playground</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>DC Parks and Recreation (DPR)</td>
<td>Engineering-Science 1986 (Crowell et al.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek Park Erosion Control</td>
<td>Phase I Reconnaissance</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>NPS 1985 (Inashima)</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Holmead House Site Mitchell Park</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>136, 13</td>
<td>Friends of Park/ DC Rec &amp; Parks</td>
<td>ATC (Phil Hill)</td>
<td>Site already on NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Zion/ Female Union Band Cemetery</td>
<td>Survey Report</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mt. Zion Cemetery Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square 1215, former Phillips School</td>
<td>Phase I Intensive</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SJG Properties</td>
<td>Karell Archeol'l Svc 1995 (Koski-Karell)</td>
<td>DC Law 2-144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 bridges @ C&amp;O Canal</td>
<td>Phase I Reconnaissance</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DC Dept of Public Works</td>
<td>KCI Technologies Inc 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. (continued) Archaeological surveys in the vicinity of Tudor Place.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Name</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Rep No.</th>
<th>Related Reports</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mandate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University Canal Road Entrance</td>
<td>Phase I Intensive</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HDR Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>EAC 1995</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq 25 Columbia Hospital for Women</td>
<td>Intensive Archival</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Trammell Crow Company</td>
<td>Berger 2003 (Griffits &amp; LeeDecker)</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Georgetown Market</td>
<td>Intensive Archival</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stinson Capelli Architects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek Park Archaeological Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>352</td>
<td>300, 301, 309</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Berger (2007)</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek Park Year 1</td>
<td>Phase I Reconnaissance</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>300, 301, 309</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Berger (2007)</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek Park Year 2</td>
<td>Phase I Intensive</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>300, 301, 309</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Berger (2007)</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. (continued) Archaeological surveys in the vicinity of Tudor Place.*
## Architectural Sites in the Immediate Vicinity of Tudor Place Summarizing Representative Artifacts and Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Name of Site</th>
<th>Date of Report</th>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Time Period(s)</th>
<th>Representative Artifacts</th>
<th>Representative Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51NW1</td>
<td>Rock Creek Park**</td>
<td>1985-2004</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Early to late Archaic</td>
<td>Knapping debris, bone</td>
<td>Evidence of base camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>18th century to present</td>
<td>Ceramic, glass, plastic, shell, brick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW17</td>
<td>Georgetown Waterfront Park</td>
<td>1985-1987</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Period unknown</td>
<td>Lithic debris and stone tools;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>18th and 19th centuries</td>
<td>Artifacts related to early Maritime Trade</td>
<td>Brick floors, foundations, cobblestone paving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW48</td>
<td>Georgetown Market Historic Site</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>Glass bottle fragments, 19th century pipe bowl, whiteware</td>
<td>Fieldstone foundation well, rocks cobbles, bricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW64</td>
<td>Forrest-Marbury House</td>
<td>1986-1988</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Archaic Period</td>
<td>Quartz, quartzite, chert flakes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Late 18th to 19th century</td>
<td>Whitheware, ironstone, porcelain, milk glass, creamware, pearlware, window glass, nails</td>
<td>Brick pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW76</td>
<td>Henry Foxall House</td>
<td>1989-1989</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Late Archaic, Early to middle Woodward</td>
<td>Ceramics, Susquehanna Broad spear points, quartz, cord-wrapped stick</td>
<td>Evidence of a village site and hunting camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW89</td>
<td>Cooper House</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Mid-19th to early 20th century</td>
<td>Ceramics, glass, coal, bone</td>
<td>Retaining wall, graded land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW102</td>
<td>Francis Scott Key Memorial Park</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Late 18th century, Mid-19th century, Early 20th century</td>
<td>Modern glass, porcelain, ironstone, creamware, cut nails, wire nails bone, oyster shell</td>
<td>Retaining walls, basements, brick tile walkway Unique, intact 18th century site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Table of archaeological sites in the immediate vicinity of Tudor Place. Summarizing representative artifacts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Name of Site</th>
<th>Date of Report</th>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Time Period(s)</th>
<th>Representative Artifacts</th>
<th>Representative Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51NW104</td>
<td>Whitehurst Freeway</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>Fire cracked rock, quartzite, Rappahannock fabric impressed ceramic, lithic flakes, shell tempered ceramic;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>18th and early 19th centuries</td>
<td>Wire nails, coal, bottle glass, earthenware, oyster shell, bone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW114</td>
<td>Mitchell Park (Anthony Holmead Site)</td>
<td>1980-2000</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
<td>Quartzite flakes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Ca. 1795</td>
<td>Coal, iron fence bolt, pearlware bottle glass, delftware</td>
<td>Brick well, house foundation, evidence of outbuildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW124</td>
<td>Suter's Tavern</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Ca. 1820s and 1830s</td>
<td>Ceramics, bottle glass, tumbler, glassware, bone, window glass, nails, buttons, beads, pin, tobacco pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51NW209</td>
<td>Bank of Columbia</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Late 18th to 19th century</td>
<td>Glass, porcelain, creamware, earthenware, nail and iron fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17</td>
<td>Mt. Zion United Methodist Church Community House</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Early 19th and 20th centuries</td>
<td>Creamware, pearlware, whiteware, Metropolitan Police Button, shell button, clay marble</td>
<td>Brick wall, garden border, foundations from side porch and rear cellar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note — This site is part of the investigation conducted prior to the installation of the crosstown water main.
**Note — The Rock Creek Park investigations occurred on multiple properties. The information in this table relates only to those site locations within the one-mile radius of Tudor Place.

Table 5. (continued) Table of archaeological sites in the immediate vicinity of Tudor Places summarizing representative artifacts
**Archaeological Resources Identified at Tudor Place**

No professional archaeological work is known to have taken place at Tudor Place prior to 2002. Unfortunately, many opportunities to gather archaeological information were overlooked in the past. For example, the construction of the new 1876 west wing kitchen and the major renovation of the main house in the early 20th century clearly impacted archaeological resources. Thus, some of the mysteries relating to the phases of construction of the main house, which might have been revealed through careful archaeological investigations, persist to this day.

In 2002 Tudor Place was assigned archaeological site number 51NW134, referring to the entire 5½-acre parcel; Tudor Place has subsequently assigned a separate area number to each field investigation (for example 51NW134, Area #1). Since 2002, four archaeological investigations have been conducted at Tudor Place (Figure 31 and Table 6), all related to specific construction or maintenance projects. As of 2007, the entire property had not been systematically surveyed.

The investigation in Area #1 was an emergency archaeological salvage in 2003 that revealed two features: the remnants of a brick garden wall and a brick drain feature as well as domestic artifacts from the 18th and 19th centuries. Excavations at Area #2 were related to the installation of underground voice and data cables in 2004 and uncovered a shell path and cobblestone feature. In 2005 archaeologist Dennis Pogue conducted a limited archaeological survey of the administration building property at 1670 31st Street NW (Area #4). No features were identified, however many historic artifacts were found that relate to and in some cases predate the administration building. The most extensive excavation to take place to date occurred in 2006 and 2007 at Area #3, where archaeologists with DATA Investigations tested immediately around the house and found a range of features and artifacts from the 18th and 19th centuries.

The artifacts and features uncovered in these four excavations provide a valuable window on the archaeological resources and their potential for exploring the use, structure and evolution of the Tudor Place property. A more detailed discussion of these excavations is provided below.
Figure 31. Map of previous archaeological excavations at Tudor Place. Compiled by Gabriela Harris
Table 6. Archaeology Master List.
(Source: Tudor Place Foundation)
Site 51NW134, Area #1

The first professional archaeological work performed at Tudor Place was completed by John Milner and Associates in 2003 and was, in essence, an emergency archaeological salvage project. Broken steam pipes leading to the northwest corner of the main house and dating to the 1914 modernization had to be quickly replaced with new pipes to restore heat to the house. The Tudor Place staff hand excavated a 75 foot-long trench in order to protect valuable topiaries and to uncover the old lines, as the use of heavy machinery would have damaged both resources (Figure 32). The work was monitored by an archaeologist from John Milner and Associates who determined that the south side of the trench contained an intact soil profile reflecting the sequences that led to the current landscape at Tudor Place. The profile of the south wall was recorded with unique numbers assigned to each soil layer. Artifacts observed in each soil stratum were carefully recorded in context. The examination of the trench documented two features: the remnants of a brick garden wall and a brick drain feature which dated to the early period of the house. Artifacts uncovered from the trench include pearlware, Chinese export porcelain, creamware, mold blown bottle fragments, redware, and faunal remains, suggesting dates from the 18th and 19th centuries (Appendix D).

Interpretation

The two features found within the trench, a garden wall and a drain, provide an idea of the materials used in landscaping and maintaining the property in the immediate vicinity of the house. These features also offer clues about the appearance and use of the property prior to the construction of the main house. According to Bryan Corle, the John Milner archaeologist, the drain was constructed of handmade brick and its southeast angle does not align with the current house. The configuration of the drain suggests that it may predate the completion of the house and perhaps dates to the 18th century. The cut stone wall, which unlike the drain conforms to the current house, was likely constructed after the main house was already standing (Corle 2002).

The 55 artifacts recovered from the trench are primarily domestic ceramics and glassware dating from the 18th and 19th centuries. The variety of ceramics, such as pearlware, Chinese export porcelain and creamware, suggests an abundance of material goods and the implication of wealth. Other materials, such as redware, coarse earthenware,
Figure 32. Plan view of north elevation during trench excavation, Area #1.  
(Source: JMA Grid – 2003 and archaeological resources from the Tudor Place Foundation)
and ironstone suggest more utilitarian wares that may have been used in the kitchen, slave quarters, or servants’ wing. These inferences are consistent with available historical records documenting the Peter family and the operation of the estate.

**Site 51NW134, Area #2**

In 2004, the Tudor House Foundation connected the main house, the garage offices and the administrative building at 1670 31st Street NW via underground voice and data cables. The utility trench dug for this purpose ran along the central garden path (the garden path trench) and around the ellipse (the circle trench) (Appendices E and F). Dennis Pogue, the Associate Director of Preservation at Mount Vernon, monitored both sections of the trench after it was determined that it could contain valuable archaeological resources. Along the garden path, Pogue monitored 33 feet of the trench (4 inches wide by 14 inches deep); of the seven distinct strata uncovered the most unusual was a layer of oyster shells at three points within the first 25 feet (Table 7). An examination of the circle trench exposed a more interesting feature, specifically a stratum of cobblestones located between .15 and .55 feet below the ground surface and covered by pea gravel and cinder layers (Table 8 and Appendix F). The cobbles, measuring from 2 to 7 inches, were located in the trench extending roughly 9 feet into the circle from the grass edge and appear to have been very carefully placed (Schuler 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Sequence (ft)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - .15</td>
<td>Pea gravel from current path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.15 - .30</td>
<td>Multiple very thin layers of gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 - .50</td>
<td>Principally cinder with very small gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 - .60</td>
<td>Deteriorated brick/brick dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60 - .80</td>
<td>Cinders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.80 - .95</td>
<td>Oyster shells – both whole shells and fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.95 -</td>
<td>Yellowish brown silty clay (subsoil?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7. Strata in the Garden Path Trench. (Source: Schuler 2004)*
### Stratigraphy – Circle Trench

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Sequence (ft)</th>
<th>Description of Strata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - .05</td>
<td>Pea gravel (current surface)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05 – .15</td>
<td>Cinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.15 - .55</td>
<td>Cobbles set in dark brown silty clay and gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55 - .70</td>
<td>Deteriorated brick (like in the garden path)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70 - .95</td>
<td>Mixed silty loams (brown and yellow) with what appears to be deteriorated stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.95 –</td>
<td>Sandy yellow clay (subsoil?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8. Strata in the Circle Trench.
Source: Schuler 2004*

**Interpretation**

The seven strata revealed in the garden trench were interpreted as materials used to pave the pathway at various times throughout Tudor Place’s history. The surface material and the level of the garden path presumably changed to meet the needs and tastes of the respective occupants. Despite the distinct attributes of the layers along the path and in the circle, it has not been possible to determine exact dates for the individual stratum. Excavation of the circle revealed six strata, including a layer of cobbles believed to date to the 19th century, also reflecting surfacing materials from various time periods (Schuler 2004). According to Pogue, this type of stone treatment could date to the 19th century; however, it would be surprising to find an intact stone configuration so close to the ground surface given the intervening level of activity. It is also unclear from the limited excavation how large of an area the cobbles covered. Further investigation may reveal that certain pathways and areas of traffic flow have remained consistent since the earliest occupancy of the main house.
Site 51NW134, Area #3

Thane Harpole and Ben Bradshaw, archaeologists of DATA Investigations, excavated Area #3 in 2006. To date, this is the most extensive archaeological excavation at Tudor Place. The report on this work, Tudor Place: Drain Mitigation and Test Excavations at Site 51NW134, Washington, DC, completed in May 2007, is summarized below. DATA Investigations had two important missions related to their investigations: a) to monitor and document the installation of a new drain line and b) to investigate and identify archaeological resources that could definitively answer questions regarding the sequence of construction and use of the mansion.

Methodology

Although a series of seven test units (TUs) had been planned initially, only four of these 5 by 5 ft. test units were ultimately excavated. Three units were eliminated because of disturbances. Two additional 5 by 5 ft. units were subsequently tested when it was determined that they could contain significant resources. In addition, three shovel test pits (STPs) and a 2.5 ft. test unit were excavated beneath the kitchen floor. A brief description of the test units follows.

Test Units 1 and 5

TU1 was located at the southern corner of the intersection between the west wing and the kitchen (Figure 33). TU5 was placed adjacent to the south edge of TU1.

Stratigraphy – A complex mix of soils and modern materials with crushed brick and mortar that appears to be debris related to the 1914 renovation.

Artifacts – Mostly modern artifacts were recovered including shingle fragments, cut nails, and window glass. A 22-caliber bullet thought to have belonged to Armistead Peter 3rd, and an iron bucket used to provide structural stability to a no longer extant post were also recovered. The remnants of a capped ceramic drain pipe that led to the kitchen cistern were uncovered; documentary evidence mentions the replacement of the drain pipe. A builder’s trench for the kitchen and the drain pipe replacement was also discovered. Several of the artifacts recovered seem to have been part of earlier layers that were disturbed when the kitchen was built, including a small iron key, cut nails, painted
Figure 33. Location of Test Units for Area #3 excavations.
Source: Harpole and Brown 2007
creamware, Chinese porcelain, a carved bone likely crafted in England by prisoners from the Napoleonic wars, and a flowerpot rim. The footprint of a stone schist wall foundation suggests that an early 18th century porch was removed to make room for the 1876 kitchen. Brickwork impressions in a herringbone or simple diagonal pattern suggests paving dating from the 18th to early 19th century.

**Potential** – The existence of an undocumented early porch could provide insight into the phases of construction during the early history of the mansion. Although many of the strata were disturbed during the construction of the 1876 kitchen, there are potentially undisturbed cultural layers and features that could add to our understanding of life at Tudor Place.

**Test Unit 2**

TU2 extended 2.5 feet on either side of the joint between the southern hyphen (conservatory) and the east wing along the south façade (Figure 33).

**Stratigraphy** – This unit contained fill soils from the 1914 installation of a brick path and the excavation of the cellar under the east wing. The cellar’s excavation destroyed the relationships between the various strata.

**Artifacts** – Very few artifacts were recovered from TU2. However, portions of an early brick kiln feature were found near the northeast corner of the east wing and may provide clues into the early building history of Tudor Place. The cellar excavation destroyed any archaeological evidence that may have been used to date the construction of the east wing. Drainage trenches running south may date to the Lowndes era.

**Potential** – The builder’s trench for the east hyphen is intact and may contain additional features or artifacts. It should be investigated in the event that further work is planned. The kiln could also provide clues into the early activity at Tudor Place.

**Test Units 3 and 6**

TU3 was excavated along the north façade at the intersection of the west wing and northwest hyphen beginning at the west end of a large entry stone (Figure 33). TU6 was later placed directly north of TU3.

**Stratigraphy** – The soils were complex in this area, likely caused by modern intrusions.
Artifacts – Layers were mixed when pipes and utilities were installed in several phases, and included artifacts from the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries.

Findings – An early pathway, of un-mortared brick and laid in sand in a simple rectangular pattern, was uncovered. The rectangular feature marks the area of downspout discharge as shown in a ca. 1900 photograph. An even earlier treatment involved a compacted gravel and cobble path roughly matching the current pathways. Most of this early path has been lost, but a significant portion (partially uncovered by Denis Pogue’s excavation) survives by the west dependencies. This early path is difficult to date but its placement one foot below grade suggests that visitors to Tudor Place had a different perspective when walking up to the building, whose high placement projected grandeur and elegance. According to Harpole, Armistead Peter 3rd noted that the door jambs did not fit the cellar and had to be cut to fit, suggesting that fill soil had been put around the perimeter of the house to make the area surrounding the mansion level and thus covering part of the cellar.

Test Unit 4

TU 4 was placed adjacent to the south side of the southeast hyphen (conservatory) where it joins into the main block of the house; it was located west of TU2.

Stratigraphy – Soils included mixed fill of yellowish brown sand, red sandy clay and other types of fill; several strata were disturbed.

Artifacts – Artifacts from TU4 included coarse earthenware, flower pot fragments, and various ceramics.

Findings – This test unit provided important information about the relationship between the east hyphen and the main house block. Intact builder’s trenches for the east hyphen and the main house indicate that the builders were very careful to match the east hyphen foundation to the main block, suggesting that the hyphen wall was built after the main block.

Potential – The areas immediately adjacent to the south side of the east hyphen may contain additional cultural layers that should be investigated.
**Test Unit 7 and Kitchen Shovel Tests**

TU7 was located beneath the floor of the kitchen which had been removed due to deterioration therefore exposing the cistern.

**Stratigraphy** – Soils included architectural rubble and various soil sequences that did not provide any clues.

**Artifacts** Artifacts found in this unit include glass, nails and a small iron buckle. The work indicated that the downspout to the cistern had been moved twice.

**Shovel Tests** – STPs were not conclusive as the construction of the cistern heavily disturbed the area impacting any features that may have been present. Although it is known from archival records that the cistern predates the kitchen, shovel tests did not reveal any additional evidence.

**Potential** – The work indicated that there are few potential intact resources beneath the kitchen floor. Potentially intact cultural deposits both north and south of the kitchen will likely provide additional clues of activities in this area.

**Interpretation of Artifacts in Area #3**

Numerous fragments of ceramics recovered during the excavations suggest that the owners had simple and elegant, but not extravagant, taste. The pieces were part of a large service with specialized service wares. Harpole was able to date a pearlware plate to the late 18th century by comparing its pattern to catalogues of historic patterns.

Harpole noted an absence of cylindrical wine bottles, very common at archaeological digs, and attributed it to the residents’ fine taste in wine containers, such as decanters and stemmed glasses. Specialty food containers found at the site also point to refined dining. Questions remain about the lack of discarded kitchen refuse, perhaps because the kitchen was placed away from the house.

Flower pots and children’s toys and games recovered during the excavations also shed some light on the domestic life at the mansion; it appears that the Peters used their mansion to promote their status and engaged in social activities that accommodated their wealth and social class.
The investigations by DATA Investigations revealed important facts about the chronology of the main house construction while also providing insight into the “changing use of the buildings, the lifestyle and activities of the inhabitants, and possible occupations dating prior to the late 18th century” (Harpole and Brown 2007). Their work, while important, does not fully unlock the secrets of Tudor Place and its residents.

**Site 51NW13, Area #4**

In 2005 Dennis Pogue conducted a limited archaeological survey of the backyard at 1670 31st Street NW behind the current administrative offices for the Tudor Place historic site (Figure 34). This area had been designated for future development and an initial assessment was needed to determine the area’s potential archaeological significance. Ten shovel tests, measuring roughly 1 ft. in diameter and 1.5 ft. in depth were excavated in the yard (Figure 35). The shovel test units were aligned in two parallel rows, with five tests in each row spaced at 20-foot intervals. The tests were hand excavated, the sidewalls were trowelled and examined, and the soils were screened for artifacts. No features were identified and all artifacts were recovered from a relatively homogeneous plowzone within seven of the ten test units. The artifacts included ceramics, glass, a possible slate pencil, structural remains (bricks and nails), coal, and shell (Appendix G). Of the artifacts that can be dated with any precision, at least six date to the 18th and early 19th centuries. These consist of pearlware, German Rhenish stoneware, lead-glazed earthenware, and green bottle glass.

**Interpretation**

Thirty-five historic artifacts, primarily domestic materials, were recovered by Pogue from seven of the ten units (Pogue 2006). The selection of artifacts attributed to the 18th and early 19th centuries, clearly predate the ca. 1867 dwelling now used as the administration building. These artifacts suggested to Pogue that an early domestic building, possibly slave quarters, may have been located in this area. Evidence of a plow zone also suggests that the land was farmed prior to the construction of the main house and may have been used as a garden even after the main house was constructed. This agricultural use of the land and its proximity to the main house add to the proposed interpretation that a slave cabin may have been present on or near the current
Figure 34. Boundary of Area #4 investigation.  
(Source: Pogue 2006)
Figure 35. Shovel Tests of 1670 31st Street NW.
(Source: Pogue 2006)
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administration building. Pogue, however, cautions against any specific interpretation without further investigation (Pogue 2006).

**Summary of Archaeological Findings**

The four archaeological investigations conducted at Tudor Place between 2002 and 2006 have provided a fuller understanding of the phases of construction of the mansion and offered tantalizing glimpses into the lives of its residents. However, the sequence of construction of the main house is still in question and the daily lives of the residents lack context. More importantly, vast expanses of the property still wait to be investigated.

**Area #1.** The drain found within the trench suggests that an earlier structure existed on the property, perhaps dating to the Lowndes era. As there is no archival evidence of any structure on the property prior to the Lowndes ownership, further investigation is needed to interpret this feature and to relate it to evolution of the buildings at Tudor Place.

**Area #2.** Changes in landscape materials may help determine the evolution of various landscapes at Tudor Place. The excavations in Area #2 may suggest that the garden pathways have remained essentially the same with improvements only in paving materials. Further investigations could confirm this hypothesis.

**Area #3.** The kiln, the cobble path and the drainage lines could provide important information about industrial activity and changes in landscape over time. Brickmaking is a labor-intensive activity and the kiln raises questions about the composition of the workforce at Tudor Place. The area surrounding the 1876 kitchen is rich in potential artifacts and could enrich the knowledge of everyday life at the mansion and the use of the house. The test areas west of the kitchen include many types of building materials and therefore several construction phases can be inferred. The area around the kitchen was a locus of activity for domestic personnel and is invaluable in assessing the food preparation for the household.

**Area #4.** Investigations in this area suggest that a slave quarter may have been located on this part of the property. The fact that the area continued to be used for farming and gardening strengthens this conclusion but does not confirm it. Further excavations are necessary to confirm this theory.
**Conclusion**

The artifacts and features uncovered in these four excavations have provided valuable glimpses into the use, structure, and evolution of the Tudor Place property. The four distinct archaeological investigations have uncovered many artifacts and features that speak to the continuing domestic presence on this property. While there is a great variety of material reflecting these domestic periods, the archaeological history of the property is still incomplete and fragmentary at this point in time. Some of the artifacts and features uncovered in Areas #1 and #4 may reflect occupation of the property prior to the Peter house, and may indicate slave housing on the Tudor Place property. While the nature of the domestic artifacts and their location in relation to the main house may hint at this interpretation, there are no clear material signifiers of slave life on the Tudor Place property, only evidence of an earlier occupation.

The information on previous and ongoing archaeological investigations has been derived primarily through informal documentation and personal communications with the archaeologists. With the completion of the site reports for the 2006 archaeological work, a clearer understanding of the development of the main house and immediate surroundings is now possible. These reports, combined with the previous archaeological discoveries at Tudor Place, provide the groundwork for future interpretation while concurrently offering guidance about archaeological resources across the entire property and thus assisting with planning for the stewardship of archaeological resources on the Tudor Place property.
CHAPTER V: IDENTIFICATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

A critical and often neglected aspect of planning for the overall management of historic sites is the identification of archaeological resources and archaeologically sensitive areas, and the development of approaches for utilizing and applying this information as part of the daily operation of the site. The challenge in any approach to determining resource sensitivity lies in identifying and prioritizing specific resources and using this information to project the potential for discovery of additional archaeological resources. In order to assess the property for its archaeological potential, the previous chapters have provided summaries of both the archival evidence related to the use history of the property as well as previous archaeological investigations both in the vicinity of the Tudor Place site and on the property itself. It is the combination of this archival and archaeological information that allows us to make an educated prediction as to where resources are likely located across the property.

The process of identifying areas of archaeological potential on the Tudor Place property involved developing a series of maps to spatially organize and present the archival and archaeological data developed in Chapters III and IV. The first map was designed to portray the chronological development of the property (Figure 36 and Table 9). Both extant and conjectural buildings and landscape features are identified and highlighted on the map. Documentation for the chronology of features was garnered by reviewing six chronological site plan compilations spanning the years 1850-1972 along with a host of historical photographs of the property. (Tudor Place Cultural Landscape Report, Phase 1: History and Period Plans 2002, quoted as TPCLR).

A second map highlights the certainty of both suspected and confirmed feature locations (Figure 37). It is important in identifying significance that the actual location of a relevant resource be known and supported by documentation. By surveying existing features on the Tudor Place property and correlating Tudor Place’s extensive photograph collection with historic maps and documentation from evidence found during previous archaeological excavations a feature’s existing or historical location could be plotted.
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Figure 36. Map of existing and suspected buildings and landscape features. By chronological period. Delineated by Daniel Lamp.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Relevant Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>Mansion</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>Constructed 1794 – 1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>Administration Building</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible from public right-of-way</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>Constructed 1967 - 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>Tea House</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible from several angles</td>
<td>c. 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>c. 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>Pigeoneer</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible east of the North facade</td>
<td>1850s, formerly the smokehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9</td>
<td>Lily Pond</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>c. 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td>Birdbath</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>c. 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td>Benchseat</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>1850s or earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td>Grape Arbor</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>c. 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X13</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X14</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>c. 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X15</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>c. 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Tool Shed</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>1975-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Unknown Feature</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Map VV1933 of the TPCLR, Tudor Place Archives photo</td>
<td>Pre 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Cold Frame</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Figure V.8 of the TPCLR, TUD_air1937.jpg, Photograph</td>
<td>Existing by 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Tennis Lawn</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Figure V.8 of the TPCLR, TUD_air1937.jpg, Photograph</td>
<td>Ca. 1887 still existing by 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Garden Arbor</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Diary of Martha Custis Williams, Drawing PP 1850's of the TPCLR</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Map VV 1870s of the TPCLR</td>
<td>1870s, replaced by 1913 garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Smokehouse</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Drawing PP 1850s of the TPCLR</td>
<td>1850s or earlier, realigned in 1920s, now the Pigeoneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Map VV 1870's of the TCPLR</td>
<td>1870s, was perhaps the original kitchen later used as laundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Drawing PP 1850's of the TPCLR</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>A2_043.jpg, Figure III.9 of the TPCLR, and Tudor Place Archives Photograph</td>
<td>Existing by 1900, style points to the 1870s or 1880s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9. Existing or probable features on the Tudor Place property
Based on documentary evidence and with location on the Chronology Map, Figure 36.*
Figure 37. Map of areas of archaeological significance, by feature location
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The third map illustrates the archaeological potential of the property by prioritizing sensitive areas (Figure 38). Three levels of significance were identified: high, medium, and low, and represent the likelihood that the area contains archaeologically significant resources. The area encompassing the main house and back gardens are considered to have high sensitivity. Having been almost continuously inhabited for over two centuries, the likelihood of discovering additional features and artifacts in this location is very high. Due to its edge location, the area bordering the west, north, and east perimeters of the property is believed to be of medium sensitivity. The entire front yard on the south side has been designated low sensitivity, there are no known features in that location, and therefore human activity is considered to be less than the other two areas. Of particular future interest are the two main axes of the garden and circular driveway. Evidence indicates that those two paths have maintained their integrity; it is believed that they have served as north/south and east/west dividers since the late eighteenth century when the property was first developed.

These summary maps are vital tools in providing management guidance for the future. By crafting a comprehensive visual picture of potential archaeological resources on the property based on both archival information and previous excavations, property managers will be better equipped to carry out their curatorial responsibilities in determining which areas may be threatened by disturbances. The maps will ultimately provide baseline data that will allow the management team to curtail or redesign any future projects that could pose a threat to the archaeologically sensitive areas. This information also provides an important framework for designing future research excavations.
Figure 38. Map of probable artifact location.  
Designed by Daniel Lamp  
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Archival and Architectural Evidence

Mansion

Although archival and deed information is inconclusive, it appears that the two wings of the mansion were constructed by Francis Lowndes in the 1790s prior to selling the property to Thomas and Martha Peter in 1805. The Peters lived in the west wing and inexplicably did not finish their elegant mansion until 1816 despite a growing family and considerable inherited wealth. One possible explanation is child mortality: five of the Peters’ ten children died in infancy, three between 1806 and 1810. Another reason—offered by Armistead Peter 3rd—may be the War of 1812 and the scarcity of labor it produced.

Family oral tradition, historic paint analysis, architectural details, and tax records indicate that the east and west wings as well as the hyphens predate the construction of the central block (Graham and Ridout 2002). Architectural details in the west wing, such the baseboard and chairboard, the architrave trim and mantelpieces are typical of the late 18th-century federal style (Graham and Ridout 2002). A further argument for this building sequence is provided by Armistead Peter Jr. (Tudor Place 1969) who refers to an 18th-century custom of building the wings of a five-part building first to provide housing for the family while the rest of the house was completed. For example, the five-part Riversdale Mansion in Prince Georges County, Maryland, was constructed in a very similar manner. During the construction of the main block (and while the Peters were residing in the west wing) the east wing was reportedly used as a stable. The east wing appears in one of the late Thornton drawings as a large rectangular space, unheated and pierced by three openings in the east wall, perhaps confirming the Peter family oral tradition of its original use as a stable (interestingly, one of the wings (west) of Riversdale was also used as a stable). Additional evidence for the use of the east wing as a stable was uncovered during the removal of the exterior stucco which revealed large openings on the east façade as well as architectural details on the formerly exposed brickwork.

Several additions and changes to the mansion during the 19th and 20th centuries have been well documented and can provide information about potential for archeology. In 1876 the kitchen was built as an addition to the west wing. A cistern already in use, was incorporated under the new kitchen which, as Armistead Peter 3rd writes in Tudor Place,
was much larger than originally planned because the walls caved in during construction. Despite soil disturbances in this area, the possibility for further archaeological investigation remains.

During the 1914 renovations to the property, a cellar was excavated under the east hyphen and east wing. Thus, the integrity of soils in this area is questionable and it is likely that artifacts in this area will be in disturbed contexts.

Peter family tradition also supports the existence of a Lowndes-period wooden house located at the corner of R Street and 31st Street. This house was purportedly located on that portion of the original property sold in 1855 to satisfy Martha Peter’s will and is currently occupied by private residences. Originally used as slave quarters, the house became a storage building in later years. Previous archeology work in Area #4, at the 1670 31st Street property, tentatively concludes that slave quarters may have existed in the general area. However, it is unlikely that archeological investigations can be conducted on the parcel containing the wooden house.

In summary, the building sequence and building construction periods for the Tudor Place main house remain conjectural despite archeological work that corroborated the earlier date of the two wings. The removal of the stucco confirmed that the two wings were erected first, an issue that had been previously unresolved. That said, the general evolution of the building seems relatively clear and points to specific areas that might contain archaeological evidence of these changes.

**Outbuildings**

Several of the many outbuildings on the property deserve mention for their archaeological potential, and were utilized when developing the three interpretive maps of the property's archaeological potential.

The smokehouse was, according to Armistead Peter 3rd, contemporaneous with Thomas and Martha Peter and was used to cure ham brought from their farm. Armistead Peter 3rd transformed it into the Pigeon House for his ailing father. Peter also notes in *Tudor Place* that the former smokehouse was curiously not aligned with the main house which led him to conclude that the smokehouse predated the house. He rebuilt the foundation and
realign oned the smokehouse with the main house in the 1920s. Thus, evidence for the original foundation may exist as archaeological deposits.

Peter also mentions a building, demolished when the new kitchen was built, sited between the main house and the smokehouse. This building was used as a laundry and, according to Peter family lore, was the original summer kitchen before the central part was built. As with the smokehouse, remains of this earlier building may exist and this area should be carefully approached in terms of future ground disturbing activities.

The 1913 garage was built where a large old barn had originally stood. It seems likely that the construction of the garage would have heavily impacted evidence for the earlier structure, although barnyard debris and deposits may remain around the footprint of the garage.

**Landscape**

Upon completing their grand mansion, the Peters landscaped their property both for pleasure and utility based on the English landscape design popular at the time. Although the early configuration of the landscape is unknown, Thomas Peter was awarded a prize in 1811 for his sheep which implies the presence of a grazing pasture at Tudor Place, probably on the north side of the mansion (TPCLR 2002:II.2). Details of the landscape design emerge in the 1856 Boschke map which shows a barn on the north side of the house. Other documentary sources indicate that a Gothic-style summerhouse and outbuildings existed on the property. A formal garden, also mentioned in contemporary accounts, included an elliptical boxwood hedge, the four-quadrant box garden with a knot garden in the northeast quadrant, bowling green and a semi-circular bench (TPCLR 2002:drawing PP1850s).

The south lawn was designed in the English pastoral style with open space affording panoramic views and with trees surrounding the lawn (TPCLR 2002:II.4). It looks today much as it did in the early 1800s and therefore seems to hold little promise for archaeological deposits and features.

During the Civil War, the gardens fell into disrepair. Britannia was forced to sell part of the property to raise funds and take in boarders. The new configuration of the estate required that the entrance drive be redirected to conform to the new boundary of the estate. The box knot garden was removed and although most of the boxwoods were also
removed, the spatial demarcation of the four quadrants was preserved. A new box knot
garden was rebuilt in 1934 in the southwestern quadrant of the former box garden. It
seems likely that evidence for these earlier landscape features remains intact as evidenced
by the various garden path paving materials identified in previous archaeology related to
laying communications cables.

Armistead Peter Jr. took over the maintenance of the landscape in the 1880s. He was an
avid horticulturist and took great interest in the gardens. He built the tennis court (later
dismantled) ca. 1887 on the east side of the north garden and also replanted or introduced
many plants and flowers as well as ornamental structures to the Tudor Place landscape.
The work of his son, Armistead Peter 3rd, was devoted to documenting and preserving the
landscape. Because of this relative consistency, archeology can be successful in uncovering
the evolution of the materials used to pave paths and the changes in connecting pathways.
The investigation of outbuildings shown on historic maps and no longer standing can also
provide important clues to the agricultural practices of the time. Large parts of the estate
were continuously used for agriculture making them unsuitable for archeological
investigations other than to determine plant materials.

Archaeological Evidence

As outlined in the previous chapters, the archaeological investigations undertaken so far
have produced important but rather piecemeal and incomplete data. Based on those
results, several areas of the property hold high research potential.

- The northwest corner of the main house—where John Milner and Associates found an
  old garden wall and a brick drain feature dating to the early period of the house—could
  provide valuable clues about the buildings already on the property when the Peters
  purchased it.
- The perimeter of the 1876 kitchen has not been investigated outside the two test units
  excavated by Harpole and Bradshaw and may contain undisturbed cultural layers and
  features.
- Harpole and Bradshaw uncovered a brick kiln near the northeast corner of the east
  wing. Only a small portion was excavated and valuable clues about the sequence of
  construction of the wing and hyphen are still likely preserved in this area.
• The junction of the west hyphen and the west wing has been partially investigated by Harpole and Bradshaw but need further investigation.

• The area surrounding the smokehouse/Pigeon House and the demolished laundry building is a high probability location for archaeological investigations that could provide more information on the use of the property by Thomas and Martha Peter.

• The north garden pathways could offer information about the sequence of paving materials going back to Thomas and Martha Peter. In addition, investigations could confirm whether the integrity of the formal garden has been maintained.

• The barn in the north garden in an area previously used for agriculture could provide important clues about the domestic life at Tudor Place and its inhabitants.

• The backyard of the Administration Building investigated by Dennis Pogue was likely an area of agricultural activities on the original property (prior to the construction of the Administration Building) and deserves further investigation.
CHAPTER VI: MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS AND GUIDELINES

Tudor Place confronts archaeologists with extraordinary challenges. Every aspect or feature of the mansion, outbuildings, and landscapes has significance, whether historical, architectural, archaeological, or horticultural. It is virtually impossible to investigate one area of significance without affecting another area, especially in the case of archaeology which by its nature is destructive. So it is not surprising that all of the archaeological investigations so far have been reactive or in response to planned or proposed work. However, archaeology holds the key to unlocking many unanswered questions about Tudor Place and must be incorporated into future development plans.

The architectural, landscape, and archaeological investigations discussed in this document have pointed out numerous areas of the property that may contain important cultural resources. In addition to the specific recommendations made in those reports and summarized in the previous chapter, it is important to plan strategically so that every research and maintenance decision is viewed in the context of identifying and protecting archaeological resources.

**Recommendations**

The University of Maryland team that worked on this project developed the following recommendations that take a more holistic approach towards incorporating archaeology into the activities of Tudor Place, particularly in terms of maintenance, research, and interpretation. These recommendations will be prioritized in a section that follows.

1. **Establish a grid across the property for recording all future archaeology.**

   A professional archaeologist and/or surveyor should establish a formal grid (in feet) across the entire property and install a minimum of two permanent survey markers for future reference (Figure 39). At least one of these markers should be placed in the front yard area and one in the back garden area. The survey markers should be standard brass marker pins, placed in concrete and flush with the ground surface (approximately two feet deep and 6 to 8 inch in diameter). The location of these markers should be shovel tested in advance of placing the permanent survey markers. These markers should be identified on a plan map of the property that should show the grid (at a 10 ft. interval), along with all cultural and natural features. In addition, the elevations of these markers should be
established for vertical control on the site. This map should be prepared in digital format and presented as a hard copy to the Tudor Place Foundation.

2. **Complete a close-interval shovel test of the entire Tudor Place property.**

   As soon as funding will allow, undertake a complete shovel test survey of the entire property in order to further identity potential deposits and features of archaeological importance. The archaeological fieldwork completed to date and the background research done as part of the current archaeology planning process suggests that there is a high potential for significant archaeological resources within the property boundaries. An archaeological survey will further delineate areas of potential significance and allow for better planning regarding routine maintenance, restoration activities, and research into lifeways on the site. This survey would be organized using the grid established on the property (see Priority 1 – establish a grid) and entail the excavation of shovel tests at intervals of approximately 20 feet across the entire property. This type of systematic survey would allow for the use of standard plotting programs (i.e., Surfer®) to facilitate mapping artifact distributions and concentrations across the property. Understanding the distribution of artifacts provides a direct correlation to the location of potentially significant features and deposits.

3. **Create a protocol for recording and processing surface finds (for example, gardening-related discoveries).**

   Several approaches are recommended in terms of recording and processing surface finds. The property can be divided into smaller areas that allow for some level of control for recording artifacts (Figure 40). For example, the area immediately surrounding the mansion house is one specific area (Area X), while the front yard is another (Area Y). These areas of the property can also be specifically delineated within the grid system to provide more control over the locations of important finds (see below).

   In terms of protocol for surface finds, the most basic approach would be for the location of the item to be flagged with a pin flag and plotted on the base map within its specific area (as closely as possible). The artifact(s) should be placed in a ziploc® bag and marked (using a permanent marker like a Sharpie®) with the Site #, Area #, and Surface Find #. The Surface Find # would be an arbitrary number assigned to each Surface Find, beginning
Figure 39. Grid system with suggested permanent datum and monument locations.
Figure 40. Archaeological areas for general proveniency of artifacts and features.
with #1 and continuing in numerical order. A Surface Find log should also be maintained that provides the Site #, Area #, Surface Find #, and a general description of the object. Each surface find should receive its own Surface Find # and log entry. In addition, a digital photograph should be taken showing the pin flag in the larger context of the area where discovered and a detail of the artifact itself. This photograph should be archived using the Surface Find # assigned to the object (for example, SurfaceFind#1.jpg).

A more precise approach would be to mark the location of the find with a pin flag and have it recorded relative to the actual grid system (i.e., a northing and easting coordinate). This could be done by an archaeologist or surveyor using either a transit or simple triangulation (from permanent grid points). The procedure would be as described above, except the bag and log should also include the specific grid coordinates of the Surface Find.

4. **Develop a triage plan for unexpected discoveries during ground disturbing activities.**

   While the completion of a systematic shovel test survey will go a long way toward preventing unexpected discoveries during ground disturbing activities, it would be prudent to have a procedure in place for dealing with an unanticipated discovery such as a concentration of artifacts or a feature (for example, a brick wall or shell walkway). The best approach would be to stop all work immediately (do not allow workmen to continue to dig, regardless of how interesting the find may be), contact your archaeologist or archaeological consultant (see #7 below) and arrange for them to examine the area as soon as possible, take digital photographs of the work area and any artifacts that are discovered, keep all artifacts together in the area found (place in ziplock bag(s)), and cover the area with a tarp to protect it against weather or vandalism. It would be prudent to have contractual language in all contracts for ground disturbing activities that indicates that work may have to be stopped due to the discovery of archaeological finds and that this type of work stoppage would not incur penalties to either party for delay of work.

5. **Develop a standardized cataloging system for artifacts.**

   Working with an archaeological consultant, develop a standardized artifact cataloging system in order to systematically and consistently identify and record all archaeological materials recovered from the site. This system could be based on examples from professional research programs at area sites (such as the archaeological program at Mount
Vernon) or developed using one of the software systems for artifact processing (such as ReDiscovery®). Most systems can be set up and run using standard database programs such as Microsoft Access. Once this type of system is established for Tudor Place, all future analysis should be completed using the system, thus avoiding having artifacts catalogued within various systems that are not compatible or easy to use for later comparison or analysis. In addition, curatorial staff should consult with local repositories and Federal regulations (36 CFR 79) in order to establish a curation policy for archaeological materials that meets professional and regulatory standards.

6. **Create a GIS database of archaeological resources.**

As soon as possible, create a GIS database in order to map all archaeological work (including surface finds, etc.), both past and future. This type of project would likely entail the work of a specialist to create and maintain the system, particularly in the absence of a staff member with this type of training. This would be a particularly good project for a graduate student in archaeology or geography (see #7 below). The GIS should include layers of data that provide basic site information (buildings, landscape features, topography), the archaeological grid, the archaeological areas, surface find plots, as well as overlays of previous excavation work at the site by project.

Ideally, this type of GIS project could also map and plot utilities and other infrastructure systems that may result in impacts to archaeological resources (and thus serve as an initial checkpoint for upcoming projects in a specific area). For example, the replacement of underground water pipes could impact archaeological resources and, therefore, knowing the relative locations of these utilities and any potential archaeologically significant resources would allow for better project planning. A project to digitize old maps and plans of the property showing utility lines, etc., could be done as time and money become available. This type of inclusive GIS system would allow for the integration of the archaeology plan with other maintenance records (landscape, electrical, etc.) for easy reference by maintenance staff.
7. **Form a partnership with an organization/research university to provide archaeological services in order to foster continuity and external “monitoring” of plan implementation.**

Most of the recommendations provided in this section would be more easily implemented with the help of professional consultants in archaeological resource management. Many research universities have centers that provide this type of assistance in conjunction with their anthropology and archaeology programs (for example, the Center for Heritage Studies at the University of Maryland), and these organizations can often be kept on retainer to provide regular guidance related to archaeological issues. In some cases, this type of arrangement can be maintained using graduate student interns or externs or graduate student researchers completing a specific project or independent study (this can also lower the cost of these services). Projects like the shovel testing of the property could also be undertaken as a field school (class) project during a summer session. Another approach would be to establish an arrangement with a professional cultural resource management firm in the area who can provide guidance on an as-needed basis (but who can have one archaeologist assigned to be a liaison with Tudor Place for continuity sake).

8. **Integrate archaeology into employee training, both docents and administrative support staff, to enhance both protection and interpretation of resources.**

Develop a handbook for docent and staff training re: archaeological resources, issues, and procedures. This handbook would summarize the findings of the *Archaeological Preservation Plan* and provide specific actions that should be taken re: the discovery of surface artifacts and subsurface features and for the interpretation and protection of resources vis-à-vis the daily operation of the site. The handbook should be presented to the staff by a staff archaeologist or archaeological site consultant at regular training sessions. Staff should also receive briefings and reports resulting from subsequent excavations whether project related or research activities.

9. **Investigate funding sources for further excavations and plan implementation.**

Work with development staff to identify potential funding sources at the individual, NGO, and government agency levels. For example, using the *Archaeological Preservation Plan*, develop thematic research goals for archaeology that can be implemented on a project by project basis and then present these opportunities in regular communications with
members and donors. At the same time, explore possible funding through the National Science Foundation (NSF) or the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) as well as with local foundations.

10. **Use the plan for a conservation-based interpretive approach.**

Integrate findings of the *Archaeological Preservation Plan* into an overall conservation-based interpretive plan for the site. This type of plan would utilize both the process and outcomes of conservation activities toward the interpretation and preservation of the property. This type of interpretation focuses on the processes (historical research, architectural research, materials research, archaeological research) through which we understand the property (how do we know what we know?). Thus, a conservation-based interpretive approach can teach both about the site and about the many disciplines that are engaged in its study and preservation of the stories and physical remains that make up the property.

11. **Investigate types of non-intrusive or minimally obstructive signage to interpret previous archaeology on grounds.**

Using the reports on previous archaeological investigations along with the *Archaeological Preservation Plan* develop options for interpreting findings via signage across the property. An alternative solution might be to prepare podcasts that can be accessed at various points on the property to deliver interpretive information on archaeological research and resources.

12. **Prevent unnecessary maintenance work that disturbs the ground.**

Using the information on archaeological resource sensitivity provided in the *Archaeological Preservation Plan*, develop a cyclical maintenance plan for the structures and grounds, integrating archaeology into the daily operation of the property (see Priority 8 – Training). Work with the maintenance team to limit or eliminate ground disturbing activities and/or develop alternative approaches that minimize disturbance or restrict it to very specific areas that can be investigated during the survey and cleared for the presence of sensitive archaeological resources. In all cases, utilize the plan to direct improvements and minimize disturbances towards the least sensitive areas in terms of archaeological resources.
13. **Include archaeology in public outreach/promotional/development materials.**

Continue to include and expand the use of archaeology for public programming, promotion, and development. Recent projects by Harpole and Bradley have been successfully integrated into programming (lectures, tours, etc.) and in promotion of the site (newsletter, website). Continue and expand this type of promotion and connect it explicitly to the *Archaeological Preservation Plan* in terms of the importance of archaeological resource planning and protection. In all cases, these materials should stress the importance of this “invisible” resource base in terms of its importance for understanding the development and use of the property through time.

**Implementation Schedule**

While it would be hoped that all of the above recommendations could be implemented quickly, limited time and resources will undoubtedly dictate that these recommendations are operationalized more slowly. Given this likelihood, the following priorities have been established to implement the various recommendations:

**Priority 1.**

#1 – Establish a grid across the property for recording all future archaeology.
#3 – Create a protocol for recording and processing surface finds.
#4 – Develop a triage plan for unexpected discoveries during ground disturbing activities.
#12 – Prevent unnecessary maintenance work that disturbs the ground.
#8 – Integrate archaeology into employee training.

**Priority 2.**

#7 – Form a partnership with an organization or research university to provide archaeological services.
#9 – Investigate funding sources for further excavations and plan implementation.

**Priority 3.**

#2 – Complete a close-interval shovel test of the entire property.
#5 – Develop a standardized cataloging system for artifacts.
#6 – Create a GIS database of archaeological resources.
Priority 4.

#10 - Use plan for a conservation-based interpretive approach.

#11 – Investigate types of non-intrusive signage to interpret previous archaeology.

#13 – Include archaeology in public outreach/promotional and development materials.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE INVENTORY FORM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District of Columbia**

**Historic Preservation Division**

**614 H Street NW**

**Washington, DC 20001**

---

1. **SITE NAME (S)**
   - Tudor Place

2. **DCSHPO SITE NUMBER**
   - Other number(s): 51 NW 134 area # 1

3. **STREET & NUMBER**
   - (Parcel/Reservation #: detailed description of how to reach)
   - 1644 31st Street [site if appropriate]

4. **OWNER(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)**
   - Tudor Place
   - Public
   - Private

5. **SITE LOCATED BY**
   - /&/CRM Survey /&/Avocational Collector /&/Other (specify)

6. **PERIOD(S)**
   - /&/Paleo
   - /&/Early Woodland
   - Early Archaic
   - /&/Middle Woodland
   - Middle Archaic
   - /&/Late Woodland
   - Late Archaic
   - /&/Unknown Prehistoric
   - Unknown

7. **Estimated Occupation Range:**
   - 17th Century
   - 18th Century
   - 19th Century
   - 20th Century

8. **DATING METHODS**
   - /&/C14

9. **SITE TYPE**
   - Prehistoric: /&/Camp /&/Village /&/Quarry
   - Historic: /&/Fishing Camp /&/Workshop
   - /&/Farm /&/Domestic /&/Military
   - /&/Industrial /&/Commercial
   - Unknown
   - Other (specify)

10. **SITE DESCRIPTION**
    - Describe site type & function
    - Domestic Residence

11. **SITE DIMENSIONS AND BOUNDARIES**
    - Site is approx 5 acres in size and occupies y2 of a city block

12. **STRATIGRAPHY**
    - Stratified
    - Not stratified
    - Stratigraphy not determined

13. **SURFACE INDICATORS**
    - No visible evidence
    - Surface finds
    - Other (specify)
    - Standing ruins

14. **SOIL**
    - USDA Soil Series
    - Contour Elevation
    - 

---

Appendix B. Archaeology Excavation Area#1 Form
(Source: DCSHPD)
Appendix B. Archaeology Excavation Area#1 Form (continued)
Appendix C. Garden Wall Feature (top) and Drain Feature (bottom).
Area #1 Excavation Partial Drawing by Bryan Corle from Excavation Report.
(Source: Tudor Place Foundation)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT</th>
<th>PROVIDENCE</th>
<th>ARTIFACT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>APPROX. DATE RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Peachware, Hand-Painted Underglaze Blue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 rims, 2 vessels represented</td>
<td>1775-1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Chinese Export Porcelain: Canton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 rims, mant</td>
<td>1800-1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Chinese Export Porcelain: Underglaze Blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Necking hooker</td>
<td>1820-1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Chinese Export Porcelain: Underglaze Blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1820-1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Chinese Export Porcelain: Plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1820-1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Hard Paste Porcelain: Plain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Early 19th century—present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Industrial Stoneware Bottle: Light-Brown Glaze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ink bottle, missing finish</td>
<td>1810-1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Creamware: Acanthus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>1780-1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Creamware: Lighter Yellow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 rim</td>
<td>1770-1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Creamware: Muted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 rim</td>
<td>1760-1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Faunal: Bone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mixed species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Pearlware: Blue Transfer Print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1780-1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Pearlware: Hand-Painted Underglaze Blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1775-1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Undecorated Ceramic: Burnt Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18th or 19th century bottle glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Undecorated Bottle Fragment: Olive Green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Embossed: &quot;BMRESON&quot;</td>
<td>1860-1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Blown-In-Mold Bottle Fragment: Cobalt Blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19th century-turn of the 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Blown-In-Mold Bottle Fragment: Aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19th century-turn of the 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Blown-In-Mold Bottle Fragment: Aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19th century-turn of the 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Blown-In-Mold Bottle Fragment: Aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19th century-turn of the 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Redware: Unglazed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Painted rim design, mend</td>
<td>18th century—present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D. List of artifacts found at Area #1.  
(Source: Tudor Place Foundation)
### Appendix D. List of artifacts found at Area #1, cont’d.

Source: Tudor Place Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT</th>
<th>PROVENIENCE</th>
<th>ARTIFACT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>APPROX. DATE RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Coarse Earthenware: Salmon Body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Missing glaze</td>
<td>18th century--present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Ironstone: Molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1813-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trench 1, General Collection</td>
<td>Whiteware: Plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1810-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trench 1, SU 1.3</td>
<td>Whiteware: Blue Transfer Print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1825-1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trench 1, SU 1.3</td>
<td>Pearlware: Transfer Print, Willow Pattern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1790-1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trench 1, SU 1.3</td>
<td>Pearlware: Blue Transfer Print</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mend</td>
<td>1784-1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trench 1, SU 1.3</td>
<td>Blown-in-Mold Bottle Fragment: Aqua</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mend, pontilled base, embossed: &quot;AYER’S COMPOUND EXTRACT OF SARSAPARILA&quot;</td>
<td>1848-1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trench 1, SU 1.3</td>
<td>Whiteware: Transfer Print, Willow Pattern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>1820-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trench 1, SU 1.3</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Glass Tableware: Wine Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hand blown base</td>
<td>19th century--present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trench 1, SU 1.3</td>
<td>Domestic Gray Stoneware: Blue Decorated Salt Glaze</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1/2 gallon jug fragments, mend, incised 1 1/2 in circle on neck</td>
<td>1871-1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trench 1, SU 1.13</td>
<td>Unidentified Bottle Fragment: Olive Green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18th or 19th century bottle glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Trench 1, SU 1.16</td>
<td>Chinese Export Porcelain: Underglaze Blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nanking border on rim of shallow vessel</td>
<td>1800-1830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Area #2 excavation, Circle Trench.
(Source: Schuler 2004)
Appendix F. Area #2 Excavation, Garden Trench showing intermittent oyster shell strata
(Source: Schuler 2004)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shovel Test</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Shovel Test</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 lead-glazed earthenware, rim</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 clear flat glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 clear flat glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 clear curved glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 oyster shell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 coal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 iron object (possible nail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Whiteware, undecorated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 Pearlware, undecorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 slate cylinder (possible pencil)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Pearlware, hand painted blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 iron object</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 burned shell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 Porcelain, undecorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Pearlware, blue transfer print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 flower pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 gray Rhennish stoneware with incised and applied cobalt decoration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 clear flat glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 iron object (possible nail)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 green bottle glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 brick</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 sandstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 clear flat glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 clear curved glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 clear flat glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 green bottle glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix G. Artifact Catalogue (51NW134 Area #4)*
(Source: Pogue 2006)