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Introduction

“In its best sense preservation does not mean merely the sitting aside of thousands of buildings as museum pieces. It means retaining the culturally valuable structures as useful objects, a home in which human beings live, a building in the service of some commercial or community purpose.”

Lady Bird Johnson made this statement as a part of her forward to the 1966 *With Heritage so Rich* volume of essays. This seminal report was the call to action that led to the National Historic Preservation Act (1966). The act serves as the legislative document that created the National Register of Historic Places and the list of National Historic Landmarks.¹ The Chesapeake region is one of the richest landscapes for nationally registered and preserved early American architecture. These civic structures, religious structures, cultural landscapes, districts, residences, and commercial buildings provide a valuable source for interpreting our history. In this thesis I am particularly interested in taverns and inns that were constructed in the eighteenth-century and survive in operation today in their original capacity, still “in service” for their commercial purpose. Four such inn structures in Annapolis, Maryland and Williamsburg, Virginia serve as case studies in this thesis. This thesis provides a historical analysis of inns in the Chesapeake from their eighteenth-century founding through to their economic revitalization in the twenty-first century and demonstrates that the adaption of a historic building to their original purpose can contribute to the economic development of a city.

The Maryland Inn (Figure 1), Governor Calvert House (Figure 2), and Middleton Tavern (Figure 3) in Annapolis, Maryland demonstrate how eighteenth-century inn and tavern structures can be adapted over time to continue to operate as an active hospitality venue. The Maryland Inn and Governor Calvert House operate as boutique inns today for guests visiting the capital of Maryland in the same way they did over two hundred years ago. The Middleton Tavern has been restored as a functioning tavern restaurant near Annapolis’s wharf to serve patrons in the same way it did after its construction in 1750. The three inns are privately owned and have been uniquely adapted. Their history shows the role of private owners and developers in historic preservation, and perhaps more importantly the power of a foundation’s resources combined with a developer’s vision.

The three privately owned Annapolis case studies are compared to the Market Square Tavern (Figure 4) in Williamsburg, Virginia, constructed in 1749. Today the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation owns the Market Square Tavern as a part of their “Revolutionary City”. The tavern exterior has been restored to its 1771 appearance. The interior has been adapted to serve as guest rooms for contemporary visitors to Colonial Williamsburg. Through the comparison, readers can see the similarities and differences in the rehabilitations with the goal of maintaining profitable guest rooms under both private and foundational ownership.

These buildings are four of the oldest operating inns in the United States. The properties are not only registered as a part of their respective historic districts in Annapolis and Williamsburg; they are registered with the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Historic Hotels of America program (example of the program marketing logo in Figure 6). The program, founded in 1989, contains over 295 registered hotel members. Each registered inn or hotel
maintains its authenticity, sense of place, and architectural integrity. These items will be evaluated as a part of the heritage of use that is being preserved at each property.

This thesis is conceived as joining a conversation regarding the value of active use that developed surrounding the National Historic Preservation Act. Today, preservationist and developers alike are creating comprehensive plans to allow buildings to remain in active use or become adapted for reuse as a strategy for preservation. Stephanie Meeks, current President of The National Trust for Historic Preservation, in her book The Past and Future City (2016) continues to challenge community leaders to think of preserving buildings in a way that allows them to stay on the tax roll and avoids the overused house museum model. This thesis provides case studies of eighteenth-century inns in America that are still contributing to this goal.

This thesis is structured temporally and thematically. Jane McWilliams’s book City of the Severn is the most contemporary and complete source on the history of Annapolis. I map the architectural heritage of each building and the formal changes of the case study buildings in Annapolis on to her social history of the city. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation has published a history of the colonial city of Williamsburg through their online resources. Tracing the adaptations to the case study inns through time, the economic and social conditions in Annapolis and Williamsburg are revealed by the architecture itself.

Chapter One provides a brief history of the development of Annapolis and Williamsburg as British North American colonial capitals. I examine the influence of Colonial Governor Sir Francis Nicholson in both cities and the developing role of the Chesapeake tavern in an urban context. The historic role of the inn or tavern in early America has been defined and redefined by


many authors. Carl Lounsbury is the preeminent architectural historian defining the role of taverns in the Chesapeake region. He outlines taverns ranging from private dwellings with a public license to purpose-built structures in his chapter entitled “Taverns and Clerks’ Offices” in *The Courthouses of Early Virginia*. He goes on to say that, in early American towns, the tavern provided rooms to accommodate travelers, serve meals and spirituous drinks, acted as a business exchange, and often was the sight of theatrical performances, lectures, debates, and gambling. In Williamsburg specifically, the 1973 archeological study commissioned by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation determined that the tavern was typically compromised of six to ten rooms. The primary spaces included a kitchen, bar, public rooms, bedchambers, and the quarters of the innkeeper’s family. Sharon Salinger, author of *Taverns and Drinking in Early America*, also offers insight into the primary role of the tavern and the British origins of those roles in colonial British North America. Chapter One examines how early American were derived from Old World inns and tavern such as London’s Tabard Inn (Figure 5).

Chapter One will also address the terms inns, taverns and public houses in the early American context. Authors who address taverns, inns, and Southern ordinaries in the seventeenth and eighteenth century must grapple with the differences in the terms. Lounsbury deals with this dilemma by referencing a statement by an Englishman travelling through Virginia in the early 1780s. The Englishman said, “there is no distinction here between inns, taverns, and ordinaries, and public-houses; they are all one, and are known by the appellation of taverns”. Historian, Andrew Sandoval-Strausz opens his study of the evolution of the hotel in the United States with the statement, “Public house was the formal name for an establishment that sold alcoholic drinks

---

6 Lounsbury, 265.
and rented lodgings to travelers. Public houses were more commonly called taverns, inns, and sometimes ordinaries, terms that were used interchangeably”. Thinking of the Market Square Tavern or Middleton Tavern as a public house provides the reader with a greater understanding of the multi-functional purposes of the spaces. They were social spaces, full of merriment, politics, and commerce. Understanding the terminology and the early operations of the case study inns provides a better picture of how they can be educational tools as adapted spaces today.

Chapter Two provides an in-depth reading of the adaptation and rehabilitation process that was undertaken by the owners of the case study inns. The chapter provides evidence of their use and adaptation of the structures from 1801-1949. The adaptations and renovations are examined as direct reflections of the changing economic environment in Annapolis and Williamsburg. Primary source material such as the Maryland Gazette, Virginia Gazette, ownership records, wills, and photographs serve as evidence to tie architectural changes to economic changes within a city. Chapter Two introduces several visionaries and organizations in both Annapolis and Williamsburg that influence the rehabilitation strategies used for all four case studies beginning in the mid-twentieth and early twenty first centuries.

Chapter three serves as an analysis of the steps taken by Paul Pearson, Anne St. Clair Wright (Historic Annapolis, Inc.) and later Remington Development as owners of the Maryland Inn, Governor Calvert House in Annapolis. The chapter examines the preservation easement strategy taken on the Middleton Tavern following a devastating fire and compares the aforementioned strategies to the Colonial Williams Foundations to modernizing the interior of the Market Square Tavern. The importance of economic viability in historic structures as a participant in local economic development is explored. Donovan Rypkema investigated the

concept of historic preservation in his work, *The Economics of Historic Preservation: A Community Leader’s Guide*. The case studies challenge the traditional idea of preservation. They perpetuate that preservation of the inn building type in such a way that harnesses their heritage of use and encourages the flourishing of local economies. Through adaptive-rehabilitation and renovation projects, the historic fabric has a new life as a functional, revenue-generating space. Alternative, profitable methods of historic preservation must find greater acceptance by the historic preservation community. At the end of the 20th century, historic preservation was offered as a remedy for declining business and visitation to urban cores of many cities and towns across America.¹ Today, real estate development is still awakening to the value in an approach that engages the heritage of use. Restoring and adapting an eighteenth century structure to allow the building to operate in its original capacity is a valuable and underused approach to preservation. Embracing the heritage of use rather than simply saving volumes of historic fabric can even have positive local economic development benefits. Americans must consider the origin of their cities and the value of preserving the spaces and their functions.

The conversation includes taking a look at the programs and registration procedures adopted by the National Trust for Historic Preservation. John Sprinkle’s 2014 book, *Crafting Preservation Criteria: the National Register of Historic Places and American Historic Preservation* argues that the current registration procedures require a thorough re-evaluation. Architectural Historian and Preservationist Richard Longstreth agrees in his edited conference volume, *Sustainability and Historic Preservation*. Sprinkle and Longstreth suggest that we shift away from a strict registration process toward a more flexible and perhaps creative model. Annapolis and Williamsburg are registered as National Historic Landmark districts, but I must

---

consider how this designation assists or prevents vital adaptations of the building. This thesis suggests that adaptation of historic structures to promote community building, bolster tax basis, and promote overall economic vitality should be considered. Recent publications addressing historic preservation acknowledge that the National Register for Historic Places has become an outdated listing and does not effectively allow for sustainable preservation practice for many urban environments. Furthermore, these architectural historians and preservationist have established that we must not view historic structures out of their urban context. That is to suggest that adapting inns and taverns might not be as effective in rural or suburban settings. The field must shift toward a more holistic approach that includes entire cities, districts, memories, and social histories as a major part of historic preservation.
Chapter One: Constructing the Colonial Inn Identity

“There are indeed severall places allotted for towns, but hitherto they are only titular ones, except Annapolis where the Governour resides. Governour Nicholson hath done his endeavor to make a towne of that. There are in it about fourty dwelling houses, of [which] seven or eight whereof cann afford good lodging and accommodations for strangers. There is also a Statehous and a freeschoole built with bricke which make great shew among a parsceall of wooden houses, and the foundation of a church laid, the only bricke church in Maryland. They have two market daies in the week, an had Governour Nicholson continued there some years longer he had brought it to some perfection.”

Hugh Jones wrote this description of Annapolis Maryland in 1699, at the turn of the eighteenth century. Jones was the young rector of the Christ Church in Calvert County in the Colony of Maryland. The letter reflects the formality of the city as a capital representing the authority of the British Crown. The description is a direct reflection of the Baroque street plan that had been implemented under Sir Francis Nicholson. Jones’s description is actually written only two months after Nicholson had resigned his post as the Royal Governor of Maryland to become the Royal Governor of Virginia. Hugh’s journey to Annapolis was made easier by the cleared roads and sandy soil that made them “very convenient for travelling.” The standard size for roadways leading to ferries, churches, and courthouses in 1700 was twenty feet wide with marked trees on either side. To market Annapolis to visitors and merchants, Nicholson had clearly marked the roadways and intersections leading to the city “on the face of the Tree in a

---

10 Michael Kammen, 368.
smooth cut for that purpose with the Letter A.A. sett on with a pair of marking Irons and Coulered.”  

**Developing Two Colonial Capitals**

Just four years before Hugh Jones’s visit to Annapolis, in 1695, Royal Governor Sir Francis Nicholson submitted a unique Baroque street plan (Figure 7) for the small city of Annapolis to the British Crown. Nicholson drew upon the influence of Sir Christopher Wren's plan (Figure 8-9) and John Evelyn’s plan for the City of London after the Great Fire (Figure 10). Nicholson aimed to establish a city that would stand as the symbol of the Crown as the capital of the Colony of Maryland. The features of the baroque street-plan and several outstanding examples of high Georgian architecture still survive.

Annapolis is significant as the seat of Anne Arundel County as well an important economic center of the Upper Chesapeake Bay region (Figure 11).  

By 1750, the city had grown to one of the most active eighteenth-century ports and commercial centers along the Chesapeake Bay. Annapolis was a major port of entry that connected the colonies to Europe and the Caribbean; one of only two ports in Maryland that were allowed to import and export English goods. The port grew rapidly over the next 80 years into a bustling port as pictured in Professor F.E. Zerlant’s 1838 sketch (Figure 12). Due to Annapolis’s eighteenth-century trading status; merchants and government officials visited the city often. Dining and lodging businesses were important and developed quickly within the city as the region grew.

---

12 *Annapolis Historic District Maryland Historic Inventory Nomination* (1984)
13 It is estimated that between 600-650 full-time residents inhabited the city by 1750. This number cannot be confirmed, as no census existed at the time.
Royal Governor Sir Francis Nicholson also developed a baroque city plan for the Williamsburg, the capital city of Virginia: the Cypher Plan. The baroque nature of the street plan is visible in the overlaid 1782 Frenchman’s map (Figure 13) that has been redrawn digitally by Colonial Williamsburg staff (Figure 14) and serves as a reference for the modern-day reconstruction. Nicholson conceived the street plan while he was the Royal Governor of Virginia. Historian John Reps considers the Cypher Plan to be Nicholson’s more successful plan because of the simplicity and harmony. The Williamsburg plan also demonstrates his mastery of English and French landscape and urban design\textsuperscript{14} such as the 1660s palace and garden design for Versailles (Figure 15). Annapolis and Williamsburg were located along major colonial coaching roads connecting them to other towns such as Alexandria and Fredericksburg. The coaching roads were also land connections to the Northern colonies of Pennsylvania and the Massachusetts Bay Colony as well as the Southern colony of Charleston. Nicholson was specific to identify the location of major civic buildings in his street plans and allowed the remainder of the town to develop organically around the roundels and prominent squares. Both Annapolis and Williamsburg developed in the early eighteenth century based on the formal plans proposed by Nicholson. Williamsburg; however, was not an original port city, nor the original capital of Virginia Colony.

In October of 1693, an act of assembly designated the “Middle Plantation” as the site proposed for the “free school and college” of William & Mary. The assembly declared the “Middle Plantation” to be “the most convenient and proper for that design.” A location, west of the Yorktown settlement was considered initially but, the present campus location was further protected from intrusion and clearly a successful choice. Reverend James received the royal

The college was established as the second-oldest college in British North America.

By 1698, the Virginia colonists realized that Jamestown was less suitable as a colonial capital than a location within the Middle Plantation (Figure 16). Concerns with brackish waters and the spread of disease in Jamestown had arisen. The assembly decided that the Middle Plantation should become the new capital of the Virginia colony. Williamsburg was to be built on the secure Middle Plantation. The location was also chosen in the wake of 1676’s Bacon’s Rebellion in which Jamestown, the standing capital of Virginia, was heavily burnt by rioters. The students of the College of William & Mary petitioned the House of Burgesses for the colonial capital to be moved. Their request was granted and the capital was permanently relocated. Surveyor Theodorick Bland surveyed the land and began developing a plan along with Sir Frances Nicholson for a village near the college under the name Williamsburg after King William III of England. Bland’s plan used existing buildings such as the college building and the newly constructed Bruton Parish Church as landmarks.

**Taverns’ Role in the Early Chesapeake Bay Economy**

Having a formal street plan as in Annapolis and Williamsburg was very rare in colonial British North America. By the mid-eighteenth century, most villages in British North America consisted of a road with at least a single tavern. Elise Lathorp, in *Early American Inns and Taverns*, illustrates that the landside edges of Chesapeake Bay contained many coaching roads dotted with inns and taverns that served both political and mercantile travelers seeking lodging as

---

16 Ibid.
they traveled through the area. The Chesapeake region is one of the richest landscapes for the inn and tavern building type, with a rare collection of extant examples. In Annapolis alone there are seven extant tavern or inn structures. For each extant structure, there are nearly a dozen public houses that have been razed since the late seventeenth century.

Inns and taverns played a critical role in the local economy of colonial cities. Merchants, ships captains, and political leaders traversed through the cities frequently and were often in search of a venue for political conversation, bargaining, alcohol-induced merriment, and overnight accommodations. Francis Blackwell Meyer captured the activity on Francis Street in his 1876 painting *Old Annapolis* (Figure 17). The tavern and inn were crucial parts of the urban setting in Annapolis and Williamsburg. Selling, leasing, renovating and expanding these properties have been central to maintaining inns’ functionality from very early on in American history. A glimpse into the role and placement of colonial taverns comes from Sidney King’s *Yorktown Main Street - West* painting (Figure 18) depicting a man riding through Yorktown on horseback. A common tavern sign for the White Swan Tavern appears on the white building in the background.

In the eighteenth century, the term inn or tavern was interchangeable. The buildings were also more formally called public houses. In the Southern colonies, establishments that served alcoholic beverages and rented lodging spaces were called ordinaries. Authors who address taverns, inns, and Southern ordinaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries must extract the differences or determine the terms are interchangeable. In his chapter entitled

---

17 See Appendices I, II, III, IV for more information on the ownership and renovations completed concerning each of the case study inns.
18 For example, George Washington wrote of “the Tavern of a Mrs. Haviland at Rye; who keeps a very neat and decent Inn.” in a travel journal entry dated Thursday October 18, 1789.
“Taverns and Clerks’ Offices” within *The Courthouses of Early Virginia*, Carl Lounsbury addresses taverns as private dwellings with a public license through purpose-built structures. He states that in early American towns the tavern provided rooms to accommodate travelers, served meals and spirituous drinks, acted as a business exchange, and often was the sight of theatrical performances, lectures, debates, and gambling.\(^\text{20}\) He expands the definition in a way that is certainly applicable to the inns of Annapolis. Much like the terminology of the venue, the role and building layout of the inn were also fluid. A 1973 archeological study commissioned by Colonial Williamsburg, determined that a tavern was typically comprised of six to ten rooms. The primary spaces included a kitchen, bar, public rooms, bedchambers, and the quarters of the innkeeper’s family.\(^\text{21}\) In large colonial cities such as Annapolis and Williamsburg, each tavern served a specific population and performed a unique role within the urban fabric of the city.

Lounsbury also claims that taverns in Virginia served as a public-house where many judicial and legislative decisions were deliberated. Throughout this study, I refer to southern ordinaries, taverns, and public houses by their primary role. In Annapolis the Maryland Inn and Governor Calvert House historically served as lodging spaces so I refer to them as inns. Annapolis’s Middleton Tavern and Market Square Tavern primarily served as dining and mercantile spaces so I refer to them as taverns. As an Englishman, J.F.D. Smith traveled through Virginia in the early 1780s records that, “there is no distinction here between inns, taverns, ordinaries, and public-houses; they are all one”; he found them “all very indifferent indeed.”\(^\text{22}\) By the last decade of the eighteenth century the terms began to change once again. The French


hotel came into general use to designate the places with superior accommodations to separate them from the poorer sort that often gave pubic hostelries a bad name among travelers.”

In Annapolis, The Maryland Inn, Governor Calvert House, and Middleton Tavern are all termed differently today: an inn, a public house, and a tavern, respectively. Each space served a slightly different role within the colonial capital with unique functions. Each of the three inns in Annapolis had a decidedly different grouping of patrons as related to their placement within Sir Francis Nicholson’s city plan. This included their relationship to the surrounding civic, religious, and commercial buildings in the city. The seventeenth-century colonists who inhabited Maryland and Virginia spent most of their childhoods in communities in southern and central England, specifically in and around Bristol and London. The societal origins of colonial cities in the Chesapeake Bay region were decidedly birthed from English society. Annapolis and Williamsburg are two of the clearest examples of this kind of transculturation. Thus, the concept of an inn would have come from Britain and been transplanted into the budding urban landscapes of the Chesapeake.

---

23 For the low opinion that most travelers held for the Virginia tavern, see, for example, The Journal of Nicholas Cresswell, 1774-1777 (New York, 1928), 20; Francis Baily, Journal of a Tour in Unsettled Parts of North America in 1796 and 1797, ed. Jack Holmes (Carbondale, Ill. , 1969), 20-21.
25 Professor of comparative literature Kevin Hutchings and historian Michael H. Fisher note that traditional models of colonial history point to "transculturation" as a one-way process. They do this to make the claim that the identities of non-European colonists, indentured servants, and slaves go through a much more complex process of "selective adoption and adaptation." Romantic Ecologies and Colonial Cultures in the British Atlantic World 1770-1850. (Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2009), 23. We commonly think of non-Europeans personally and culturally acculturating to the society of British North America. Louis P. Nelson is one of many scholars of the British Atlantic World that have found this claim supported by material culture. For further information see Maudlin and Herman, Building the British Atlantic World.
Origins of the British North American Inn

In the early seventeenth century, alehouse and inn in Britain meant different things to different classes of patrons. For the elite – gentry class, the alehouse or tavern offered a location for men to sit and discuss philosophy, politics, and engage in erudite conversation whilst enjoying the liberty afforded by alcoholic beverages. Smoking tobacco was a mainstay for the elite men who could afford such a luxury. The ordinary tavern for the plebian citizens of London or Bristol was also marked by decorum and drink. Often patrons would play music and dance, others might engage in light conversation and general merriment in more modest surroundings. This type of behavior is evident in William Hogarth’s 1733 satirical painting series, *Rake’s Progress* that tell the store of the fictional Tom Rakewell as he inherits family wealth and falls into a pattern of decline in a series of eight paintings. Rakewell is clearly influenced by the ills of society. In the third painting, *The Orgy*, (Figure 19) Rakewell is drunk in a tavern in the wee hours of the morning and surrounded by spirituous liquors and prostitutes that inhabit such space. By 1750, the plebian taverns in England had been transformed into a much more bleak scene of drunkenness and disorder. Liquor was no longer considered to contribute to civilized life. Regulations to limit the trade in alcoholic beverages were put in place by the English government to combat the realities of the debauchery of the common tavern. An informal tavern licensing process originated in the Late Middle Ages and was in use only in some parts of England until Parliament introduced statutory licensing in 1552. Licensing primarily only controlled the location and quantity of alehouses until the late sixteenth century. Class increasingly divided public drinking houses in England. Inns and taverns, which by law were
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required to provide accommodations to travellers were owned and patronized by members of the middle and upper class. The lower classes of society patronized more modest alehouses.\textsuperscript{27}

During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, working class society in England was plagued with poverty. This socio-economic condition directly impacted the alehouse patrons’ use of the buildings as refuges from the poor conditions at home. The elite felt the alehouses were becoming hotbeds of anti-establishment antics by the immoral and irreligious poor. For the elite, the existence of the alehouse presented a threat to social order and they felt it must be regulated.\textsuperscript{28} This call for action resonated with the colonial governors as well. Although society was not nearly as stratified in the British colonies, colonial governors and local leaders also wanted to ensure that taverns did not become prevalent sources of social upheaval.

By 1655 the Virginia General Assembly had passed legislation relating to the regulation of sales within inns and taverns. County courts had been granted the authority to license inns and taverns. By the first decade of the eighteenth century, many colonies and counties had set rates for commonly offered services. These services regularly included: nightly lodging per individual, twenty-four-hour stabling and fodder per horse, a quart of wine, a quart of brandy, a quart of rum, a quart of cider, and a quart of beer. This level of regulation on the part of county courts was done in order to prohibit owners from taking advantage of travelers and discouraged drunkenness amongst seaman, apprentices, servants, and slaves; whose leisure activities required close surveillance.\textsuperscript{29}

The operation of an inn was well regulated. Throughout British North America, a license was required to operate an inn or tavern. Colonial or local officials granted licenses. A tavern license involved a simple quid pro quo: innkeepers were given the authority to enter into the
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highly profitable business of selling alcoholic beverages in exchange for offering overnight accommodations to the public.\textsuperscript{30} Drunkenness was a threat to order in the young colonies. Innkeepers were expected to maintain order. The colonial governments used licensing to hold a tavern keeper responsible for their patrons, ensure travelers had accommodations during their journey, and established a source of revenue in the form of licensing fees.

\textbf{Industry, Construction, and Early Inn Operations 1720-1801}

Annapolis and Williamsburg developed during the aforementioned period of colonial regulation under the county courts in a formalized manner. By the 1740s both cities had grown into bustling colonial capitals with residents who were engaged in trade, shipping, and politics. In Williamsburg, the Market Square became the town’s commercial and trading center. The merchants and residents petitioned to have a tavern near the square (Figure 20). In 1749 their request was granted when the Market Square Tavern (Figure 21) was established in Williamsburg, Virginia. The building is one of the original 88 eighteenth-century structures acquired by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation in the twentieth century. The original owner of the property was John Dixon who leased the property for a period of 21 years beginning in 1749. Dixon expanded the property and added a store. In an advertisement to sell the property he noted, “a new Store adjoining the Market Place in Williamsburg, subject to ground rent. Dixon did not complete his lease term, but instead passed his lease on to John Hood, a merchant from Prince William County, Virginia. In 1760, Robert Lyon secured the lease of the tavern. Lyon

was a barber, tavern keeper and merchant. During the period the dwelling on the property often had spaces for lease to students attending the nearby College of William & Mary. Thomas Jefferson often stayed at the inn during his time as a student at the College. Williamsburg grew into an intellectual hub for the Chesapeake region. Gentry-class young men would come to the city for education and to participate in the formation of a colonial governing body. Tradesmen, merchants, doctors, farmers, and wealthy landowners all brushed past one another along Williamsburg’s Duke of Gloucester Street.

One such tradesman was Thomas Craig. In 1761, Craig secured the lease from Lyon. Craig was a local tailor turned tavern keeper. Craig altered the dwellings that stood on the property and at the sale of the property he advertised, “a dwellinghouse, fine cellars, stable large enough for 30 horses, large fodder loft, kitchen, large smoke house and added room, good shop, lodging room, and a store.” In 1771 Gabriel Maupin, a saddlemaker, began paying the ground rent having purchased the property at a public sale of Craig’s possessions. Maupin announced that he was making, “considerable Additions and Improvements, for the Purpose of Keeping Tavern.” Maupin also announced that he would be moving his saddlemaking business to the shop. After Maupin’s additions, the tavern had grown from a one-room structure into a multi room, multi floor venue. This is the moment in time that has been reconstructed by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. By 1770, Williamsburg had grown into an established city laid within the rural agrarian landscape of colonial Virginia.

Just before the American Revolution, Williamsburg had a stable, but limited, economy as well as a variety of tradesmen and government officials living in the city. In her study of
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Williamsburg, Sylvia Fries identifies the lack of established towns, economic diversity, and formal education in the Southern colonies. In some cases Fries found the agrarian southern colonial economies to be profitable, cultural pitfalls. Colonial rulers such as William Berkeley, James Blair, and Governor Francis Nicholson were all concerned in the case of seventeenth-century Virginia that the lack of a port or market town would be problematic for the tobacco-driven colony. In the larger mid-Atlantic context, Annapolis was already a functioning port as a developing capital city for the Maryland colony. Williamsburg and Annapolis developed as successful capitals out of necessity for a prominent colonial city in their respective colonies. They shared commonalities down to the names of their streets. Duke of Gloucester Street in both Annapolis and Williamsburg contained a large merchant and tradesmen societies in the eighteenth century.

Shipbuilding developed as an industry in Annapolis between 1715 and 1763. This is characterized as the second of four periods of growth between the founding of the city to the American Revolution. The second period of growth brought bureaucratic growth and the expansion of small industry. The government grew to a year-round operation and population changes related to the convening of the General Assembly each fall waned. The city attracted ship captains, maritime traders and craftsmen. Carpenters, caulkers, sail makers, and rope makers flocked to Annapolis not only because of the port, but also because the city came with access to financial capital. Nicholson’s Annapolis was known for skilled labors, congenial colleagues, political gatherings, skilled servants, and a diverse market. Many taverns and inns were
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constructed in Annapolis during the eighteenth-century to accommodate the food, drink, and lodging needs of the growing cosmopolitan population. Horatio Samuel Middleton built a tavern on Annapolis’s Market Space adjacent to the wharf in 1754. Middleton and eventually his widow Anne Middleton operated the inn near the wharf servicing merchants, sailors, and the citizens of Annapolis. The tavern was identified as “an inn for seafaring men” (further supporting the interchangeable terms for the structures).

Middleton tavern (Figure 22) was built on a lot in Annapolis that Sir Francis Nicholson had originally set aside in his plan along the northeast side of Nicholson cove for two active shipyards. The shipyards contributed vessels for the coastal and transatlantic trade through the early eighteenth century. Ashbury Sutton purchased the original lot rights for a shipyard in 1742, but shortly thereafter, the city government cancelled the maritime zoning of the upper section of the Ship Carpenter’s Lot. Government officials cited the fear of accidents “from Building Breaming and Graveing Ships Sloops Boats and other Vessels” in a section of the city that “had greatly increased in it’s [sic] Inhabitants who had good Houses and Improvements.” Ashbury Sutton’s son-in-law, Horatio Samuel Middleton took over the upper section of the lot. He built a wharf and started a ferry service (similar to the nineteenth-century Spa Creek ferry service pictured in Figure 23) across the Chesapeake Bay to the Eastern Shore of the colony.

Annapolis contained a particularly active eighteenth and nineteenth-century harbor (Figure 24) with numerous trading, military, and transport vessels (Figure 25), some of which may have been built in the city. Although trade and transport such as the Middleton ferry service connected the Chesapeake Bay region, the region still did not contain the same range of craftsmen and tradesmen that English colonists and traders were used to. Mid-Atlantic social societies differed from that in England in several respects. The gentry and aristocracy did not
participate physically in the colonizing of the cities. Social status related to Old World occupations was missing, leaving most rank to be determined by the wealth of the individual. Those with the greatest estates and largest tracks of land were thought best qualified to govern. Political power was very closely intertwined with the economic capacity. Inn owners and operators had access to more financial gains than was common in seventeenth and eighteenth-century cities. Cary Carson states that period houses were notable for their “smallness” and for the “inconsequential nature of the construction methods and materials.” Gloria Main estimates that two-thirds of households in Maryland lived in dwellings of three rooms or less, and even among the top third it was rare to find houses of more than six rooms.  

Although society was structured slightly differently in Maryland and Virginia, wealth and land ownership separated the middling colonist and the gentry-class leaders in both colonies and the cities attracted the wealthy.

Annapolis and Williamsburg were prominent cities that contained greater populations of wealthy residents than any other cities in Maryland and Virginia. As a cosmopolitan colonial capital, Annapolis was defined in the eighteenth century by its fashion and elegance. Prominent men such as Samuel Chase, Charles Carrollton, William Paca and Thomas Stone (all four signers of the Declaration of Independence from Maryland) resided in Annapolis. Prominent houses in Annapolis were built in the Georgian tradition. One such example in Annapolis was Captain Charles Calvert’s house – later termed the Governor Calvert House. Captain Charles Calvert (1688-1734) constructed the original structure in 1728 at 56-58 State Circle within parcel 17 of
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Annapolis. Charles Calvert served as Colonial Governor of Maryland from 1720-1727 thus; the original structure at 56-58 State Circle was constructed as he left office.

The Governor Calvert House is directly adjacent to the Maryland State House. The Maryland General Assembly has convened in the State House every year since 1772. The prominence of the house’s location is directly related to Annapolis’ status as a prominent capitol in British North America. Between November 1783 and August 1784, the city even served as a temporary capital of the nation making the Maryland State House the capital building. During this time the Continental Congress, meeting in the State House, ratified the Treaty of Paris ending the Revolutionary War and accepted the resignation of George Washington as Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army.

The Governor Calvert House was primarily a residence, but did frequently entertain high-profile guests. The Calvert family members included the founders and early political leaders of Maryland. They were prominent land and slave owners. The Calvert family is said to have occupied the “apex of the social pyramid” in England and prospered in Maryland as well. Evidence of the affluence of the family and their lavish dining practices comes in the form of a zooarcheological investigation of food waste food on the lot and within the hypocaust from the eighteenth century. Justin Lev-Tov completed a comparative study of the Calvert House site and the Jonas Greene house site and found that the Calvert family was serving ocean fish such as red snapper that was not widely available in the Chesapeake Bay region. This evidence leads him to conclude that the Calvert family was closely connected to sea captains with the capacity for
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deep, ocean fishing and had the financial capital to fund extravagant dinner featuring these catches.\(^{43}\) The location being adjacent to the Maryland State House and one block from the port was essential to the role the house played as an inn for prominent elites. The building has been owned and operated by several prominent families including Governor Charles Calvert.

Governor Calvert purchased the land and a small wood dwelling on the land built by the previous owner at the end of his gubernatorial term in 1727. The remains of the wooden dwelling were sketched as a part of a building survey in 1994 (Figure 26). The first renovation project on the site occurred in 1728 under Charles Calvert’s direction. The renovated building was a Georgian, one-story house with a basement and a gambrel roof. The exterior was constructed in a Flemish bond set in five bays. The interior consisted of a central-passage plan, typical in British North America. One of the most unique features was the subterranean hypocaust\(^ {44}\) that was constructed under the house to conduct hot gases from a furnace into the rooms above through a hollow floor and tile flues within the walls. The hypocaust is the oldest surviving example in North America and was used to heat an orangery in the mid-eighteenth century. After Charles Calvert’s death in 1734, Rebecca Calvert (wife) and Elizabeth Calvert (daughter) inhabited the Georgian brick house and continued housing guests. The one-story building remained largely unaltered on the site until 1764 after being partially destroyed by fire. A second phase of construction began with renovations, likely related to restoration after the fire, preparing the house to rent. In 1765 the building was advertised for rent in *The Maryland Gazette*, when Elizabeth moved to the country. Unlike the Maryland Inn, the Calvert House was not used in its


\(^{44}\) A hypocaust is a mud brick heating system used in Ancient Roman times to conduct hot gases from a furnace into the rooms above through a hollow floor and tile flues within the walls.
full capacity as an inn. The guests here were of a much higher standing and only dined on certain occasions.

The Calvert household is one of several examples in Annapolis of refinement that the upper class urban residents in British North America were adopting. In his work, *The Refinement in America*, Richard Bushman identifies the division between the rising middle class/genteel society and the lower classes of society as “the great divide.” He creates a dichotomy of the haves and have-nots when explaining the early nineteenth century within American culture. John Crowley and Richard Bushman agree that there were many influences on culture in the nineteenth century. Crowley claims that literature and social pressures may have played a larger role. He points to nineteenth-century literary works by Andrew Jackson Downing and Catherine Beecher on the furnishing or landscaping of houses. In the case of these guidebooks and pattern books, Crowley makes the point that as information about how a house should be maintained, should be furnished, and should be landscaped contributes to a change in expectations about a house. Richard Bushman points to the level of refinement in the household appointments and physical architecture as the driver for more comfortable domestic environments. For the Calvert family, their Georgian home appointed with imported British household goods was a symbol of their social standing and their ability to comfortably lodge and entertain the colonial elite.45

Just two blocks from the Calvert House on Church Circle, sits one of the most prominent manifestations of higher lodging standards illustrative of Bushman’s refinement. The Maryland Inn is an imposing tavern on the flat iron site formed by Church Circle abutting Main Street and Duke of Gloucester Street. The site is one of the most prominent in historic Annapolis. The owner of the property in 1718 had the lot “heretofore set aside for the use of the Drummer of the

“Town” at the request of the Mayor’s Court. This original “drummer’s lot” was gifted to Henrietta Maria Chew as a wedding present upon her marriage to Edward Dulany on February 18, 1748. Before relocating to Newport, Rhode Island, in 1772, Dulany leased the property to a respected Annapolis merchant, Thomas Hyde. Hyde constructed the original flatiron inn on the lot as a business to accommodate visitors to Annapolis. The original inn was a three and half-story Georgian brick building. The inn was purpose built to accommodate elite visitors to the city of Annapolis. Throughout the late eighteenth century, the Maryland Inn and Governor Calvert House remained prominent venues for lodging and a favorite rendezvous point for political, military leaders, and wealthy merchants visiting the capital of the Colony of Maryland.

In the eighteenth century, inns, taverns, public-houses, and ordinaries were not strictly defined. Their programs were often fluid. The accommodations were often determined by the social rank of the guests who frequented them. Inns and taverns were much more than establishments that sold alcoholic drinks and rented lodgings to travelers. The spaces were manifestations of individual social order during the seventeenth century and eventually the laws surrounding citizens’ order in place at the time. Taverns became a prominent part of the urban and rural landscape in British North America in the eighteenth century. Inns and taverns in Annapolis and Williamsburg are strong evidence of the role of this vernacular space as well as the force of economic conditions within each city.

The Governor Calvert House and Maryland Inn were certainly elite spaces for prominent upper class, political leaders and established merchants of Annapolis. In this case, these prominent structures and features of the town make a generalized point about the population


47 According to the deed, Mathias Hammond leased the vacant lot to Thomas Hyde in 1772; by 1782, the Maryland Gazette advertised that the property contained a three-story building.
changes and social hierarchy within the spaces. This social context is essential in understanding the urban forms and ideas that shaped the American colonies. The Middleton Tavern and Market Square tavern were constructed as a response to local development within the ship builder’s lot of Annapolis and the border of Williamsburg’s Market Square, respectively. The development of these taverns provides insight into the class structures, elite society, and the economic models of colonial British North America.
Chapter Two: Preserving a heritage, adapting a space

“An elegant brick house adjoining Church Circle in a dry and healthy part of the city, the House is 100 feet front, three-stories in height, 22 rooms, 20 fireplaces, 2 kitchens. Rooms mostly large and well-finished, and is one of the first houses in the State for a house of entertainment, for which it was originally intended”⁴⁸

This real estate advertisement was published in the August 1782 Annapolis edition of the Maryland Gazette. Thomas Hyde, a respected merchant and builder, ran the advertisement for the Maryland Inn following his construction and long-term lease of the building.⁴⁹ In early Maryland and Virginia, real estate listings were a common way to advertise to citizens of a locale that a property was available or to announce that a building was changing ownership or undergoing operational changes. We see evidence of the transfer of property, closures, and new construction advertised in Maryland Gazette, based out of Annapolis, and the Virginia Gazette in Williamsburg. Inns and taverns – considered “houses of entertainment” – were commonly advertised as commercial venues in search of patrons. Throughout American history we can trace the construction, renovation, and rehabilitations of prominent buildings through local newsprint.

Rehabilitated and renovated eighteenth-century commercial spaces such as those advertised in Williamsburg, Virginia and Annapolis, Maryland perpetuate the idea that historic preservation must consider the heritage of use within vernacular building types such as taverns, inns, and ordinaries. The four case-study inns have all undergone various levels of restoration and rehabilitation. The Maryland Inn, Governor Calvert House, and Middleton tavern (overlaid
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⁴⁸ The Maryland Gazette, August 26, 1782, Annapolis edition, 3.
⁴⁹ According to the deed, Mathias Hammond leased the vacant lot to Thomas Hyde in 1772.
on the city map in Figure 27) have always been privately owned. Their renovations and
rehabilitations have been largely market-driven with the goal of ensuring that the building is able
to generate revenue.

Each building has a unique history that unfolds over a series of renovation,
rehabilitation, and eventually preservation projects. In Annapolis, the Maryland Inn, has
undergone renovations largely to maintain the building as a functioning modern inn – save the
early twentieth-century partial conversion of the building into office space. The Governor
Calvert House has undergone five phases of construction or renovation. The property began as a
dwelling with guest spaces for elite visitors. Eventually the Calvert House was converted into a
merchant space, leased apartments, and finally a full-service inn and event space. The Middleton
tavern, on the Annapolis wharf, has operated since it was constructed as a tavern. In
Williamsburg, the Market Square tavern operated as a tavern throughout the eighteenth century,
but the building did undergo at least partial renovation to serve as a commercial store in the
nineteenth century. The renovations have since been erased by the Colonial Williamsburg
Foundation restoration. As we saw in Chapter One, the function of taverns changed through
time. Restoring and adapting structures that are several centuries old to allow the buildings to
operate in their original capacity are valuable and underused approaches to preservation.

**The Maryland Inn**

The Maryland Inn was built between 1772 and 1782. The original flat-iron brick structure
was a 3 and 1/2-story Georgian building (Figure 28). The building has brick exterior walls laid
in a Flemish bond set on a stone foundation. Two brick chimneys with corbelled caps project
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Maryland Gazette advertised that the property contained a three-story building.
from the center of the roof of the original section of the building. The later alterations that were added between 1868-1877 were Second Empire and included a mansard roof (Second Empire renovations shown in Figure 29-30). The mid-nineteenth century alterations included the addition of three more chimneys and a cupola in an Italianate style. The 1860s alterations also resulted in the footprint of the building to resembling a U-shaped plan (Figure 31) with a central open courtyard.

When the original land owner, Henrietta Maria Dulany, passed away the lots were divided between her daughters Mary Paca and Margaret Bordley. By 1782, Matthias Bordley, son of Margaret Chew Bordley owned the property and chose to convey ownership of Lot 49 to Thomas Hyde. As stated in the 1782 Maryland Gazette ad at the opening of the chapter, Thomas Hyde built the original structure for the accommodation of visitors and as a “house of entertainment.” Sarah Wall, who served as the Maryland Inn’s manager in the 1780s, frequently drew in crowds of statesmen, governors, and revolutionary military leaders. Members of the 1783-1784 U.S. Congress stayed at the Maryland Inn when George Washington resigned as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army. An advertisement posted in a 1784 printing of the Maryland Gazette stated that Wall had “opened a tavern at the house formerly kept by her, fronting Church (now Duke of Gloucester) Street; having supplied herself with everything necessary and convenient, she solicits the favors of her old customers and the public in
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51 The 1794 watercolor of Church Circle attributed to C. Milbourne, as well as the 1858 Sachse Birds Eye View of Annapolis show the Maryland Inn was originally covered with a cross gable roof, with projecting central gable on the Duke of Gloucester Street elevation. The mansard roof as added to the building during the 1860s addition and alterations.
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53 Annapolis Mayor’s Court Proceedings, Liber DD 6 Folio 651
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55 George Washington did not stay at the Maryland Inn. He stayed at the nearby Annapolis Hotel that sat about 150 yards East of the Maryland Inn (towards the wharf) on Main Street.
general.” Following the death of Thomas Hyde in 1795, the divided lots changed hands several more times. 

In 1869, Hiram McCullough sold the inn, referred to as “McCullough’s Hotel” to Robert Fowler. During his period of ownership, Fowler renovated the building and replaced the gable roof with the mansard roof. He also completed the rear addition to the hotel completing the U-shaped plan. According to a deed of mortgage between Robert Fowler and a buyer, the property was referred to for the first time as the “Maryland Hotel.” Between 1877 and 1914, the property was bought and sold several times. Some owners were successful in operating a profitable inn and others were not so fortunate.

Just as Mr. Fowler opened the inn as the “Maryland Hotel”, the United States fell into a worldwide economic recession that was at the time referred to as “The Great Depression” until that title was transferred to the economic crisis of the 1930s. The recession that impacted the building culture along the East coast of the United States, dated from 1873-1896 is now called the “Long Depression.” The causes of the recession are commonly thought to be a combination of the passing of the Coinage Act of 1873, which ended the bimetallic standard forcing the United States to rely on pure gold alone. This caused banks to panic and a general destabilization of the investment climate. This led to the Panic of 1873, know as “the first truly international economic crisis,” after the panic resulted in soaring stock prices in central Europe and the collapse of the Vienna Stock Exchange in May 1873. The New York Stock Exchange
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60 Previously the United States had relied on both gold and silver backing of currency. The Coinage Act of 1873 forced the country to rely solely on a pure gold standard for the first time. This drew down the cost of silver mines, even as new silver mines were being established in Nevada; upsetting the balance of supply and demand. Silver coin production was banned, unbeknownst to many silver miners in the western United States. For further information see Loomis, Noel M. (1968). Wells Fargo. pp. 219–225.
suffered a similar fate on September 18, 1873 (known as “Black Thursday”) and was closed for ten days following the failure of the banking house of Jay Cooke and Company of the Northern Pacific Railway. The bank failed following an unsalable bond being issued by the U.S. government and caused several other major U.S. banks to fail in its wake.61 Amidst these widespread bank failures, Robert Fowler defaulted on his mortgage for the Maryland Hotel and he lost the property.

The years following the turn of the century brought on significant changes for the inns and taverns in Annapolis. In the early 19th century America was primarily an agricultural and natural resource processing economy. Two key inventions that began to transform the American economy were Eli Whitney’s cotton gin in 1793 and his experimentation with interchangeable parts in gun manufacturing in 1801. The cotton gin transformed the pace at which cotton could be processed, but it was the interchangeable part and subsequent American system of manufacturing that changed the way goods were produced in America. Captain John H. Hall is credited with mastering interchangeable parts based on a letter in 1822 sent from the Harper’s Ferry armory.62 Interchangeable parts in manufacturing introduced disposable parts and materials. The later invention of mass-produced goods slowly reduced the need for people to reuse building materials to save building costs. In America, the revolution in science and technology came with the notion that it was “cheaper to throw the old one away and get a new one.” Buildings were certainly not exempt from this phenomenon. The Maryland Hotel sold for $20,000 to George T. Melvin in 1901. By 1915 the value of the George T. Melvin’s Maryland Inn property had increased in value to $35,000. During the World War I period (July 1914-

November 1918), the function of the Maryland Inn as a high-end hotel became obsolete. Many of the rooms converted into offices and apartments. Following World War I the Maryland Inn had been converted into office spaces to be used by the Department of Defense. This was one of many changes, the quiet coastal town and home of the United States Naval Academy was seeing.

**The Governor Calvert House**

The original owners of the Governor Calvert House were much less interested in the profitability of the building. The Governor Calvert House did not officially function as an inn during the eighteenth century; however, distinguished guests were invited to stay at the residence. Notable guests arriving to conduct business at the Maryland State House may have stayed at the Governor Calvert House. As time elapsed, the building has been renovated to meet the changing needs of the occupants. The Governor Calvert House was subjected to five phases of construction and renovation. Each phase is reflective of the overall stylistic changes occurring within the Annapolis Historic District (Figure 32).

Prominent merchants throughout Annapolis were not only looking for places to stay temporarily in the city, but they were looking to set up spaces to sell their imported goods by the late 1760s. Further construction projects served to prepare the building to be leased for commercial purposes by 1772. Two *Maryland Gazette* advertisements serve as evidence that the property was placed for rent as a commercial space. Elizabeth Calvert ended up leasing the house to the mercantile firm of Wallace, Davidson, and Johnson.63 The second phase of construction consisted of incorporating the remaining one-story dwelling into a two-story Georgian residence. Today, no physical evidence of this interior renovation exists. We know that turning the space
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63 Land Records of Anne Arundel County, Liber SH 7, Folio 426.
into the advertised space to sell wares would have typically included interior renovations, but none have been recorded. By 1789 tax assessments for the city of Annapolis indicate Calvert’s property with “a two-story brick dwelling house 40x20 with a one-story shed 40x15, one frame outhouse 15x12, one brick smokehouse 12x12, assessed at $1000.00”.

The Calvert family owned the property and leased it out until 1810, when the property was sold by Edward Henry Calvert – heir of Elizabeth Calvert – sells the property to long-time tenant Robert Denny. Following Denny’s death the property was purchased in 1818 by Jonas Green for $2110.00. The next sale of the property occurs after a lawsuit precipitates the sale of the Green property to Robert Welch of Ben in 1842. By 1853, the property has caught the attention the mayor of Annapolis Dr. Dennis Claude who sets out to purchase the property. Just as Dr. Claude was chosen as the State Treasurer of Maryland in 1854, phase three of construction began on the house. This phase included a major renovation to turn the two-story Georgian dwelling into a three-story Italianate L-shaped plan structure. The exterior was renovated in Italianate brick ornamented with dormer windows. This renovation plan is in line with the transition to what historian Roger G. Kennedy describes as “the American picturesque”. By the 1840s American building culture was catching up to British building fashion. Transatlantic travel became easier and more accessible to the growing numbers of wealthy citizens. A wealthy doctor and political appointee like Dr. Claude would have had access to architectural pattern books displaying classical and Georgian architectural styles. Instead, he chose the businesslike

64 1798 Federal Direct Tax Record
65 Maryland Historic Building Inventory Annapolis Survey, Inventory No. AA-692.
66 Anne Arundel County Chancery Records 103:347
67 Land Records of Anne Arundel County, Liber WSG 26, Folio 175.
68 A member of the prominent Claude Family in Annapolis sketched the 1834 map of Annapolis in Figure 33.
69 Maryland Historic Building Inventory Annapolis Survey, Inventory No. AA-692.
Italianate form for his renovation of the Calvert house. Kennedy suggests that this style may have been preferred by the wealthy that were simply bored by the classical. Following the renovation, Dr. Claude’s real estate value was listed at $7,500 in the 1870 Census.

Dr. Dennis Claude died in 1901. He left the Governor Calvert House property on State circle and his property on Maryland Avenue to his wife. After her death, the property was bequeathed and divided equally amongst his six children. After 1891 a one-bay wooden portico was constructed at the center of the plan, and by 1908 phase four of construction had begun under the six children and ran between 1908-1913. During this time the wood frame portico was removed and a two-story brick portico was constructed. Also, the gable roof was replaced with a mansard roof. The property interior was also divided equally into six separate apartments. A drawing was completed during Dennis Claude’s tenure of the family occupying the house with its new Italianate facade. The Italianate structure and style of dormer windows (Figure 34) may have served as one inspiration to the author’s of the Annapolis Historic District Design Guidelines for New Construction on the limitation of dormer windows on an exterior face throughout the Annapolis Historic District (Figure 35).
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72 U.S. Census Bureau (Census Record, Maryland) 1870, Microfilm, M7233, p. 726/76, MSA No. SM 61-248. His real estate value did include his property on State House Circle as well as the property on Maryland Avenue. His personal estate value was listed at $4,000.
73 Anne Arundel County Register of Wills, Liber RB1, f 59. Claude’s will states that all real estate from State House Circle to Main Street would be deeded to his sons, and that all property from State House Circle to East Street would be deeded to his daughters.
Market Square Tavern

In Williamsburg, the Market Square tavern operated organically until its acquisition by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. The private owners renovated the building to maintain its operation as a tavern, a store, and a lodging space. The tavern was purchased in 1929 by the Williamsburg Holding Corporation\(^\text{75}\) The foundation has restored most of the building to the era of 1771 as a part of the “Revolutionary City” museum. The restoration coincides with the first colonial enlargement of the tavern under owner Gabriel Maupin. By 1771, the tavern had grown from a one-room structure into a multi room, two-story venue\(^\text{76}\) In the early years of the Williamsburg restoration project, the foundation decided to maintain the Market Square Tavern as an inn where guests could stay right on Duke of Gloucester Street. In order to keep the tavern operational as guest quarters, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation has undergone a few key renovations of the interior and exterior spaces. The post-renovation floor plan includes spaces for guest rooms (Figure 36) and modern en-suite bathroom updates (pictures in plans, Figure 37). The renovations did include scraping off over 150 years of additions and enlargements to the structure in order to return it to the 1771 condition.

The restoration removed a later the addition to the tavern as well as the counting room. These spaces were added in 1808 after the heirs of Gabriel Maupin, following his death in 1801, conveyed the property to Peter R. Deneufville. The surviving family of Peter Deneufville conveyed the property to several lessees, but no significant alterations to the structure were recorded; however, several written accounts by Williamsburg citizens suggest several


\(^{76}\) Whiffen, 156
commercial functions of the building. Mrs. Victoria M. Lee, gave her impression of the city in
1861.

“Where now stands the restored Market Square Tavern, stood a long, frame story
and a half building very much like it. This building was the home of Dr. Charles
Waller. Connected to this long building was a tiny store, end to the street, and
entrance to the west side of the house. Mrs. Hazelgrove kept a candy shop in this
part of the building.”\textsuperscript{77}

Citizens of Williamsburg, such as Mrs. Lee have suggested several functions of the
building through statements and interviews. Previous functions may have including a candy
shop, post office, and a school. These functions are documented within a written record held by
the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, but they are not included in the present-day interpretation
of the site. The historic preservation and reconstruction teams work diligently to ensure that any
original (1771 or earlier) building fabric is minimally affected by the renovations, while restoring
and bringing the building up to building code. The tavern has been renovated to include 11 guest
rooms and bathrooms. The foundation replaced mechanical systems including the plumbing,
electrical, and added fire suppression systems following a 1999 building inspection. During the
systems renovations, the foundation added exterior brick access ramps to the south porch of the
tavern and the kitchen outbuilding to make them ADA accessible in combination with one
accessible guest room.\textsuperscript{78} These changes allow the Market Square Tavern to be an economically
viable hospitality space serving the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation today.

\textsuperscript{77} “Williamsburg in 1861,” by Mrs. Victoria M. Lee, p. 78; typescript in Research Department.
\textsuperscript{78} Cynthia D. Jaworski, \textit{The Market Square Tavern – Planned Preservation Project Completion Report},
Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Library
The Middleton Tavern

The taverns in Annapolis have always been privately owned. Under private ownership, most of the renovations and adaptations have been in order to promote business or real estate market needs. In contrast to the Williamsburg Market Square Tavern, none of the Annapolis case studies have undergone a holistic period restoration process. They have had a much more organic renovation and rehabilitation process that has been influenced by social and economic changes in the city of Annapolis. The inn with the least fluid history, and possibly the strongest comparison to the Market Square tavern of Williamsburg, is the Middleton Tavern. Middleton tavern served a much less elite crowd. Middleton tavern is accessible even today as a restaurant and piano bar near the Annapolis city docks.

Middleton Tavern’s location on the ship carpenters lot—originally set aside by Governor Sir Frances Nicholson around 1696 for “use of such Ship Carpenters”—was a prominent gathering spot for fraternal circles in colonial Annapolis. The Middleton tavern, like the Market Square tavern was also built on a prominent open space in town called the “Market Space” (Figure 50). Throughout the period of the American Revolution, while Maupin was adding his shop on to Market Square Tavern, George Mann was operating Middleton Tavern in Annapolis. As the inn owner, Mann provided lodging and meals within the tavern to visitors and distinguished guests such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. In 1793, John Randall purchased the property and oversaw rehabilitations to the building for the use as a store and dwelling. Randall was an apprentice to renowned architect William Buckland. The end-unit rowhouse at 50 Randall Street abuts the original 1754 Middleton tavern structure. The end unit was conveyed into the original Middleton lot since the rowhouses were constructed in the mid-
eighteenth century (likely during the Randall ownership and renovations). In the nineteenth century, the tavern was used primarily as a hotel and later renovated to include commercial space. By 1939, the building was renovated by the Mandris family to serve as the Mandris Restaurant.

A Yacht, A Developer, and a Preservationist

In the spring of 1949, Annapolis celebrated their three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city. By the time of the celebration, leisure travel had once again become more commonplace in Annapolis. The affects of rapid population increase and subsequent housing shortage caused by preparations for World War II had begun to wane. The yacht-building businesses resumed full production and once again Annapolis returned as a popular stop for travelers along the inter-coastal waterway. The area’s tourism increased as a result of initiatives such as the conversion of the old Severn Boat Club into the Annapolis Yacht Club.

Soon afterwards the Yacht Basin Company was formed and a club with more than a hundred slips and a gas dock was constructed along Compromise Street. Beginning with the major establishment of a yacht club and the advising of the commodore of the New York Yacht Club. Annapolis soon became the start/end point of the Newport-Annapolis Classic (Figure 39). An important figure in the rise of Annapolis as a sailing capital was New Englander; Arnold Channing Gay, who arrived in Annapolis aboard his wooden schooner Delilah in 1946 with just $1.46 in his pocket. At that time the Annapolis waterfront was dilapidated and rat-infested. He acquired land along Spa Creek and proposed new docks, to “support local business.” Gay was sure that yachting would be the key to attracting people with “money in their pockets” and

---

79 Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties Trust No. AA-1817
promoting the economic health of the city. It so happens that one such person attracted to the sailing amenities offered in Annapolis would be polo-playing Washington D.C. based entrepreneur and real estate developer Paul M. Pearson II (1925-2001).

Pearson started with a condominium project, but quickly fell in love with the historic core of Annapolis and began investing in the taverns and inns around town. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the lure of the water and sailing drew people to Annapolis. The new Washington-Annapolis Expressway (Route 50) and the completion of the Chesapeake bay Bridge Developers began to take notice of the opportunity. Eastport was an early condominium development neighborhood that was targeted at sailors who wanted to live on the water and commute to D.C. Americana Apartments (1960), Farragut House (1960), and Severn House (1964) were a few examples of these projects. The projects often embraced their location on either Spa Creek or Back Creek offering waterfront views with boat slips. A community that cropped up in this period was Georgetown East – a name that reveals the developers’ marketing strategy to appeal to former D.C. residents. Paul M. Pearson II entered into the Annapolis waterfront development scene in 1968 with the luxurious multistory Tecumseh townhomes project. Pearson was regarded as exploiting Annapolis for his own personal financial gain in the early years of his operation, but he would become the visionary behind the intricate rehabilitation and preservation of both the Governor Calvert House and Maryland Inn.

In a 1989 Sun interview, Pearson said he first visited Annapolis in 1968 to go sailing. He recalled a sleepy, mildly run-down town where downtown shops were boarded up or sold mainly functional goods such as work clothes, hardware and groceries.

---

80 AA CCT Plat 1627 (Americana Annapolis Apartments); AA CCT Plat 1896 (Marine Terrace, later Severn House Apartments); AA CCT Plat 1770 (Admiral Farragut Apartments); AA CCT Plat 1841 (Georgetown East);
81 AA CCT Plat 1981 (Tecumseh Townhouses) also referenced in McWilliams, 333.
"But, good God, you could see the potential," he said. "We couldn't believe it. Waterfront property that cheap." Soon after the Tecumseh condo project, Pearson acquired the Maryland Inn with its long-standing history as the most prominent inn in the city of Annapolis in mind. Paul purchased the property in 1968 in a dilapidated or underperforming state. He worked to preserve the properties in partnership with Anne St. Clair Wright (1910-1993) of Historic Annapolis, Inc (Figure 40). Both parties frequently corresponded via letter and email. They both maintained the goal of an accurate and economically viable restoration of the inn. Pearson, a lover of jazz music, developed the King of Frances Tavern in the basement of the inn as a jazz bar.\footnote{Jacques Kelly. “Paul M. Pearson, 76, developer, jazz promoter who owned hotels” Baltimore Sun. October 23, 2001.} The partnered Historic Annapolis and Paul Pearson Trustees completed a restoration designed to preserve the original colonial three-story design of the Maryland Inn (Figure 41-42) and provide updated modern interiors (Figure 43) and amenities. Margaret (Peg) Bednarsky has been the Innkeeper at the Maryland Inn and Governor Calvert House since 1970. She recalls that Mrs. Wright was very well connected. This was evident in many accounts; Anne St. Clair Wright even toured Secretary of the Interior Stuart Udall around Annapolis during one of his visits (Figure 44). She was commonly known as a preservation force to be reckoned with. Ms. Bednarksy said in an interview with the author, “She [Wright] knew a lot of people and Paul had an amazing vision. together they were able to get a lot done!”

Paul Pearson had a similar impact on the Governor Calvert House. Members of the Claude family lived in the renovated governor Calvert House until a default on the mortgage of the property prompted a sale in 1977.\footnote{Land Records of Anne Arundel County, Equity 21,801, Liber 2935 Folio 166.} After several years of abandonment and neglect the property caught the attention of Paul M. Pearson II, he purchased the Inn in 1982 (the condition at the inn at the time of the sale in Figure 45). Once again, he enlisted the help of Anne Wright
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\footnote{Land Records of Anne Arundel County, Equity 21,801, Liber 2935 Folio 166.}
and Historic Annapolis, Inc. to help guide the rehabilitation process. The fifth phase of construction on the Governor Calvert House began in 1983 and continued through 1984. During the rehabilitation, the University of Maryland and the Historic Annapolis Foundation conducted an archeological excavation around the hypocaust heating system under the direction of Anne Yuntze. The three-story residence was restored and converted into a modern inn once again (Figure 46). The two exterior brick chimneys were restored, wedding and conference event rooms (Figure 47) were added at the rear of the property (not visible from the street), and a new two-story underground parking garage was added to accommodate guest valet parking. Every effort was made to preserve the historic materials including saving all of the 9/9 windows dating from the original 1727 one-story building.

The original preserved fabric was of particular importance and is a topic of mention in several letters between owners and interested parties. One letter dated June 17, 1977 from Anne St. Clair Wright, President and Founder of Historic Annapolis, Inc. to the Executive Director of the Maryland Historical Trust writes in reference to the Governor Calvert House, “The value of the building lies in the fact that the lower part of it contains the only remnant of an early 18th century mansion in which we know a Maryland Provincial Governor resided while serving in office.” The façade was restored to its most recent Victorian Gothic style or ornamentation. Today the building is historically larger in size and scale. The central hall has been maintained although it now leads to a rear addition containing guest rooms, elevators, and an atrium.84 At the conclusion of the renovation in 1984, the Governor Calvert House was added to the Maryland Historic Inventory as well as the National Registry of Historic Places. The structure now serves as the flagship property for the Historic Inns of Annapolis.

84 Maryland Historic Building Inventory Annapolis Survey, Inventory No. AA-162.
Before his death in 2001, Paul Pearson sold the inn to the private hotel development company Remington who owns and manages the Maryland Inn and Governor Calvert House (Figure 48) along with the Robert Johnson House under the title The Historic Inns of Annapolis. Today all three inns successfully attract guests who are visiting the city and want the convenience of staying within the historic district near the Maryland State House, historic churches, restaurants, and the docks.

Preserving these eighteenth-century structure in a way that allows the structure to function as active restaurant and inns allows the structure to contribute to a local economy. Identifying resources within a city that can be leveraged to support asset-based economic development. Community leaders should direct investment in infrastructure, quality of life, education, or workforce development in order to support the historic assets.85 This idea clearly contrast with the previous model of preserving a space as a relic to be viewed, but not actually touched (behind the velvet rope). Considering the economic impact of historic preservation on a town or city can encourage private investment, one key component to saving historic assets.

---

85 Anna Read, Asset-Based Economic Development: Building Sustainable Small and Rural Communities, (ICMA Center for Sustainable Communities, 2010), 1-8.
Chapter Three: Contributing to the Economy

“Historic Preservation: The careful management of a community’s historic resources; avoidance of wasted resources by careful planning and use; the thrifty use of those resources. To use or manage those historic resources with thrift or prudence; to avoid their waste or needless expenditure; to reduce expenses through the use of those historic resources.” 86

Donovan Rykema, author of *The Economics of Historic Preservation*, offers this definition of successful historic preservation. He begins to define a new relationship between economics and historic preservation. Rypkema transcends the “preserve those old buildings because they’re beautiful” argument and points to over 100 economic advantages to saving and reusing old buildings in today’s society. Successful preservation through restoration and adaptation as the inns and taverns found in Annapolis, Maryland and Williamsburg, Virginia perpetuate further preservation and adaptation of the building type. The four case-study inns encourage the local flourishing of hospitality-based heritage tourism in their respective cities. In our post-2008 recession economy, small-scale adaptive-reuse projects that harness the historic fabric of vernacular inn structures should be encouraged by historic preservation entities. This type of preservation could be a common ground between preservationists and real estate developers and serve as a way to save more historic spaces, whilst encouraging business opportunities within the hospitality industry in towns across the United States.

In our modern society we are not pushing the potential of historic buildings. Instead of partnerships with developers or considering rehabilitation, the preservation community often

relies on the house museum model. As Stephanie Meeks states, “Today there are more house museums in the United States than McDonald’s restaurants. There are two house museums for every CVS pharmacy and three for every Wal-Mart.”[^87] Many of these museums are not bringing in enough revenue to stay staffed and properly maintained.[^88] Now is the time to take steps toward implementing new options. When government and foundational funding is scarce, historic properties must find a reliable internal method generating revenue. Restoring and adapting structures to allow the buildings to operate in its original capacity is a valuable and underused approach to preservation. Embracing the heritage of use rather than simply saving volumes of historic fabric can also have positive local economic development implications. Today, hospitality-based heritage tourism and rehabilitation projects contribute to job creation, tax revenue, and overall economic stimulus while fostering a connection to the history of a community. Any building that is open and active on a community tax rolls is more beneficial than a vacant or tax-exempt structure.

As examined in Chapter Two, the approaches to restoring the inns in Annapolis and the Market Square Tavern in Williamsburg have a variety of similarities and differences. Primarily, Annapolis did not receive an endowment by philanthropist John D. Rockefeller, Jr.[^89] In Annapolis the program of preservation has been a long process of historic designations and case-by-case preservation projects. One of the first steps taken toward preserving the colonial core of Annapolis was acquiring the 1965 National Park Service, National Landmark District Designation for the area laid out in Nicholson’s plan. Contrarily, Colonial Williamsburg developed through Reverend Dr. W.A.R. Goodwin’s 1920s vision for a preserved community of

[^87]: Stephanie Meeks, “Past and Present Future”, 137.
[^88]: Ibid, 137-140.
buildings, implemented using Rockefeller investment. In Annapolis, Anne St. Clair Wright, (Figure 40) or “St. Clair” as she preferred to be called due to the generic nature of “Anne,” provided instrumental recommendations toward the preservation of colonial Annapolis. Wright encouraged or in some cases, forced partnerships with landowners and developers to press her preservation agenda.

Anne St. Clair Wright was a central figure to the establishment of Historic Annapolis Incorporated (currently Historic Annapolis Foundation). Mrs. Wright worked to ensure the preservation of the historic core of Annapolis by setting up an innovative revolving fund. She created partnerships with local residents and business owners to encourage the mission of preserving the historic late-seventeenth and eighteenth-century core of the city. In Wright’s 1992 manifesto “A Present and Future Legacy for Annapolis” she outlined four imperatives for city officials, preservation professionals and developers in Annapolis:

“I. A  Preservation Partnership between nonprofits, restoration and conservation organizations and the City of Annapolis

II. A  Revolving Fund for restoration and enhancement of Historic District properties and environment

III. A museum for the City of Annapolis

IV. Workable access to the Preservation Data Bank for scholars, architects, property owners and public officials.”

These imperatives serve as a window into the progressive forms of preservation that Mrs. Wright was pursuing within Annapolis. She was interested in forming partnerships to encourage restoration. She made it a goal to “enhance” the Historic District. This thinking led her to form

alliances with investors and developers who were willing to work towards that goal. Her partnership with Paul M. Pearson II led to the restoration of the Maryland Inn, Governor Calvert House, the Robert Johnson House, and Reynolds Tavern.\textsuperscript{91} Personal involvement in the restoration process and private or private-public partnerships have had an enormous impact on historic preservation efforts in the United States. Annapolis and Williamsburg provide two examples of how guidance by a foundation coupled with private investment can positively alter the course of a historic district.

**Key Steps and Examples Toward Economically Viable Preservation**

Donovan Rypkema and St. Clair Wright’s imperatives toward preserving Annapolis have been further affirmed through research. Hyojung Cho, Associate Professor of Heritage Management at Texas Tech University, identifies that “the collective economic values of historic properties have induced the expansion of stakeholders in the preservation field for the purpose of regional development.”\textsuperscript{92} Although her research centers on the role of National Heritage Areas and public policy, her conclusion that intergovernmental and intersector partnerships that developed out of executive orders in the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush administration is relevant.\textsuperscript{93} The relationship between Wright and Pearson during the rehabilitation of the Maryland Inn and Governor Calvert House are an example of intersector, collective efforts toward historic preservation.

In order to focus preservation efforts in Annapolis and Williamsburg their historic cores were designated as National Historic Landmark districts. Policies in the 1960s-70s, including the

\textsuperscript{91} Margaret “Peg” Bednarsky (innkeeper), interview with the author, February 2017.
\textsuperscript{93} Cho, 243-244.
NHPA of 1966, enabled this registration and designated prevented historic districts from undergoing large-scale aesthetic and programmatic changes. Another such policy in Annapolis is the *Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction* written in 1978. One example that impacted the Governor Calvert House is the preferred dormers outlined in the guidelines section 6 (Figure 35) and the dormers as they were restored on the inn (Figure 34). A more contemporary rooftop, as outlined, would not have been permitted within the National Historic Landmark district. The private investment of Paul Pearson and his attention to historic details in this 1982 restoration was obviously guided by these regulations. He was also influenced by St. Clair Wright’s activism on behalf of Historic Annapolis Inc. Emails exchanged between Mr. Pearson and Mrs. Wright detail conversations over paint use and the façade of the Governor Calvert House.\(^{94}\) New legislation also had a major impact on restorations in Annapolis. After the National Historic Preservation Act was signed into law in 1966, the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976 began to encourage private investment. It appears this act was a force in creating a “pro-market preservation” whereas for-profit private investment and real estate firms became interested in preserving historic properties. The historic preservation tax credit combined with a promise of increased property values spurred an interest through the remainder of the 1970s and 1980s. This was the era when private citizens and investors took an interest in the historic inn spaces in Annapolis.

In addition to developing a historic district, design guidelines, and generating funding through private partnerships, Anne St. Clair Wright and the preservation community in Annapolis have been very opportunistic. Instead of generating a comprehensive plan that required purchasing real property outright and maintaining it, Historic Annapolis (formerly Historic Annapolis, Inc.) and the Maryland Historical Trust looked for opportunities to restore

\(^{94}\) Email transcripts and letters found in the Archives of Historic Annapolis.
and preserve buildings through partnerships, grant funding, and architectural easements. In 1971 a fire severely damaged the Middleton Tavern (Figure 49). The owners, Cleo and Mary Apostol, did want to reconstruct the building after the fire in order to reopen their restaurant. Staff at the Maryland Historical Trust and Historic Annapolis saw this as an opportunity to promote the restoration of the remaining historic fabric of the tavern. In 1971, the Anne Arundel Committee was processing data related to nine to fourteen properties in addition to the Middleton Tavern for inclusion in the easement program. Kent Mullikin of the Maryland Historical Trust identified that an advantage to the easement program is that properties continue to contribute to the economic vitality of Annapolis and remain on the city tax rolls.\textsuperscript{95}

In 1971, the General Assembly of the Maryland State Senate appropriated funds for the purchase of architectural easements. In a letter to Senator William S. James, President of the Senate, Kent R. Mullikin wrote:

In fiscal year 1971 the purchase of historic or architectural easements in Annapolis is authorized in the Capital Improvement Budget. As we explained at the budget hearing in March, the easement program enables the Trust to secure architectural protection and often restoration of important historical buildings without purchasing the buildings. As many important structures are not for sale or too expensive to buy, the easement program is an ingenious method of protecting the public’s interest in the States architectural heritage.\textsuperscript{96}

Following the fire within Annapolis’s Middleton Tavern, there was a sense of urgency to ensure that the building was preserved. Kent Mullikin, Trustee and Treasurer for The Maryland Historical Trust references the “easement purchase proposal” ahead of the easement purchasing

\textsuperscript{95} Kent R. Mullikin, Letter to Senator William S. James, Historic Annapolis, August 13, 1970.
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid
schedule proposed by the Maryland State Senate. The goal was to purchase the architectural easement for the Middleton Tavern after the fire had gutted the interior.\textsuperscript{97} The exterior walls of the building and the brick chimneystacks were not damaged.\textsuperscript{98} The goal for the Maryland Historical Trust, easement was to have the exterior of Middleton Tavern restored to its eighteenth-century appearance using the restoration funds already being invested by the owner to repair the building. Mullikin and other proponents of the restoration were successful in obtaining a deed of easement with an architectural covenant for the Middleton Tavern.\textsuperscript{99} The rehabilitation undertaken by the Mandris and Apostol family members restored the exterior of the building to its eighteenth-century aesthetic (restored in its original site on the Market Space in Figure 50). Much of the interior was rehabilitated into a functioning tavern restaurant space. Any remaining salvageable historic materials were reused in the rehabilitation.

**Impacting Local Economies Through Preservation**

Many researchers, urban planners, and economists agree that historic structures remaining viable is beneficial to the overall economy of a town or city. Professor Suzanne Morse Moomaw recognizes existing historic structures in a community as an invaluable asset. She agrees with Donovan Rypkema that historic preservation can be one of the answers to a need for local economic development. Moomaw makes the claim in her book *Smart Communities* that community members must be involved and willing to work for the change that they want to see in their communities. She puts forth that “community building” goes far beyond buildings themselves. Activist such as Goodwin and Wright have brought this kind of holistic thinking to

\textsuperscript{97} *Maryland Gazette*

\textsuperscript{98} Kent R. Mullikin, Letter to Senator William S. James, Historic Annapolis, August 13, 1970.

\textsuperscript{99} Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties Trust No. AA-1817, Section 8, page 1.
Williamsburg and Annapolis. In Annapolis, the economic viability was possibly more crucial because the buildings are the lifeblood of the city. The historic buildings serve civic, residential, hospitality, service, and commercial functions for public and private owners alike (Figure 53). Although we often think in terms of what construction or renovation project might help a community, construction is often not a catalyst for development or change on its own. Morse argues that people have to rally around the bigger idea of developing their own community.

Adaptive reuse or renovation-based construction has proven particularly effective within the hospitality and tourism industry due to a combination of using recognized historic structures, high-property-value building sites, easement programs, and historic preservation tax credits. Momentum behind the sustainability movement has also provided a rationale for companies and communities to revisit their opinion of reusing a historic space. Communities are now reevaluating the pragmatism embedded in reusing built spaces as opposed to destroying them. Rypkema states that “Historic preservation emerges as an economically sound, fiscally responsible, and cost-effective response to the challenges of today’s economic environment.”

Studies around the topic of the economic benefits associated with historic preservation projects have drawn similar conclusions. Virginia Commonwealth University recently completed an economic impact study in 2014 commissioned by Preservation Virginia that found that preservation projects that “bring buildings back to life” have contributed upwards of $3.9 billion to the state and local economies of Virginia. The study goes on to state that, “Rehabilitation expenses and their domino effect have also created more than 31,000 full and part-time jobs during a 17-year period and generated an estimated $133 million in state and local tax

---

The economic benefits can be leveraged to lobby and obtain tax credits for the rehabilitation or reuse of historic structures. If the ultimate goal is to provide an economic stimulus for a town or urban center, historic preservation of hospitality spaces can become a part of the answer.

Preserving historic buildings can generate more stable jobs than new construction. Rypkema points out in his book *The Economics of Historic Preservation*, “historic preservation has significant and ongoing economic impact beyond the project itself.” The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation identified the following community benefits from historic preservation:

1) new businesses formed; 2) private investment stimulated; 3) tourism stimulated; 4) increased property values; 5) enhanced quality of life, sense of neighborhood, and community pride; 6) new jobs created; 7) compatible land-use patterns; 8) increased property and sales tax; 9) pockets of deterioration and poverty diluted.

The Maryland Inn and Governor Calvert House in Annapolis were purchased by Paul Pearson in an underperforming and vacant state, respectively. The rehabilitation enables the inns to function as businesses that are generating revenue, employing staff members, and contributing to the tax base in Annapolis.

Sustainable growth and rehabilitations includes understanding how buildings can be preserved or at absolute least, recycled. James Marston Fitch presents the history of historic preservation practices including rehabilitations in his book *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World*. He begins his chapter on the economic sense in recycling building materials by pointing to the global tradition of keeping buildings standing for as long as possible and then reusing the materials once the buildings have become dilapidated. He notes
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101 Randy Jones. “VCU Study Finds Historic Preservation Contributes to Virginia’s Economy by Upwards of $3.9 Billion”.
this tradition in Periclean Athens where temple columns were reused as materials to build a retaining wall to support the modernized Acropolis and the Roman tradition of Spoglia being recycled to be incorporated into new temples, cathedrals, and villas. In British North America, the tradition of recycling rare building materials was brought from the Old World. It was not uncommon for an early colonist to alter their houses and reuse pieces of wood that were labor-intensive to cut in different portions of their structures. Early settlers would even burn their earth fast or cabin structures to recover the more expensive iron nails, straps, and hardware before moving on. The idea of preserving and reusing valuable historic fabric within a building has been paramount in preservation efforts. Within Annapolis and Williamsburg both foundation entities, Historic Annapolis and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, have worked to ensure they preserve historic fabric whenever it is feasible.

According to the annual report by the Virginia Department of Environmental Equality, construction and demolition debris accounted for nearly 20% of the 20,160,344.28 tons of solid waste in Virginia in 2014. Construction waste has been cited as one of the largest contributors to the overuse of landfills and carbon-based fuels in recent years. One proposed solution has risen from leaders within the Historic Preservation community. Simply save old buildings, reuse them, and adapt them to meet the contemporary needs of their communities. In addition to being more environmentally friendly and economically stimulating, the practice of preserving historic buildings provides a tactile educational environment. This educational and community driven tool has really begun to take shape within the hospitality industry.

In Williamsburg, the partnership between the City of Williamsburg, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, and the Anheuser-Busch Companies, Inc. have developed a tourist center for the Commonwealth of Virginia offering both heritage and amusement park tourism. The Market Square Tavern is one of the functioning taverns on the Colonial Williamsburg property. The building is unique for the foundation because it provides lodging in the same manner it did for the town of Williamsburg in the eighteenth century (a renovated guest room pictured in Figure 36). For Annapolis the historic district, the shipbuilding industry, and the United States Naval Academy all have a significant economic impact. The Historic Inns of Annapolis including the Maryland Inn and Governor Calvert are unique assets to the city as two of the oldest hospitality venues in the United States. The Middleton tavern is one of the oldest operating taverns as well. The preservation of these spaces has required the attention of private citizens, advocates of the historic preservation community, and investment of owners or real estate developers.

At the end of the twentieth century, historic preservation was offered as a remedy for declining business and visitation to urban cores of many cities and towns across America. Today, real estate development is awakening to the value in an approach that engages the heritage of a space. State historic preservation offices in Virginia and Maryland have published the economic benefits enabling them to leverage that information in an effort to lobby and succeed in obtaining tax credits for the rehabilitation or reuse of historic structures. The preservation of the Maryland Inn, Governor Calvert House, Middleton Tavern, and Market Square Tavern emerged from special interest in preserving the historic use of the space and capitalizing on the function. Pearson, Cleo Apostel, and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation
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Staff embarked on adaptive-reuse and renovation projects in hopes to restore the profitability of the properties. In doing so, they contributed to local economic growth by ensuring the properties would continue to generate tax revenue and supply jobs.

In the edited collection *Investing in What Works for America’s Communities*, author Ben Hecht proposes the idea of a “living city” in his article entitled “From Community to Prosperity”. He explains that a living city is one that would evolve and change around the current pressures and needs. Hecht urges that, “the community development sector must change the way it works and with whom it works.” This sentiment is exactly the kind of thinking that would facilitate a revisiting of the partnership between historic preservationists, urban planners, and real estate developers to advance the renovation and adaptation of historic inns to provide an economic stimulus. Preserving or rehabilitating a small business in the form of an inn nestled in a historic home or a corporate hotel inserted into adapted historic façade could create enough of a destination to stimulate other local businesses. This is the essence of the heritage of use. In Annapolis, the Maryland Inn was purchased in an underperforming state. The prominent structure had latent potential to contribute to the local economy of Annapolis realized by Paul M. Pearson and Anne St. Clair Wright. Together their vision and resources rehabilitated the inn and adjoining bar and restaurants to become profitable entities within the city. This goal was not achieved through the simple investment in a restoration project. Pearson’s restorations were closely integrated with the mission and vision of Historic Annapolis, Inc. The foundation supported Pearson and the staff members provided guidance during the Maryland Inn, Governor Calvert house, and Reynolds Tavern rehabilitations.

---

Suzanne Morse Moomaw, Professor of Urban Planning at the University of Virginia states that, “communities can use their past to positively affect their futures.” Much like the approaches she outlines in her book *Smart Communities*, this proposal is more than suggesting a singular restoration of buildings. This approach is a system of using the past to encourage positive developments in order to foster a successful future of a city or town. Beginning with a small adaptive structure and allowing for a growth from this nucleus is a system. If we must commit to long-term systems innovation in order to foster responsive “living city”¹⁰⁹, then registering historic districts and partnering with real estate developers to encourage the renovation of lodging facilities as an economic start-up in those districts.

National historic district designations combined with the preservation, renovation, or adaptive reuse of hospitality spaces to accommodate visitors can certainly provide economic stimulus within historic districts. An overall building, preservation, or beautification campaign occurring alongside the development enhances the effects of the economic stimulus. In order for this solution to be sustainable, it is important for the sites to be treated in a respectful manner to preserve the maximum amount of the historic fabric of the building that is being renovated or adapted to become a hotel. It is also important to know the difference between projects that are providing economic stimulus through an adaptive reuse that is not displacing a population. Developers and preservationist must be sensitive to recognize when the project has become a part of a larger urban renewal or gentrification project. The goal should always be the careful management of a community’s historic resources and avoidance of wasted resources by use.

¹⁰⁸ Suzanne W. Morse *Smart Communities: How Citizens and Local Leaders Can Use Strategic Thinking to Build a Brighter Future* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004), 122.
¹⁰⁹ Hecht, 198.
Conclusion

“From the Start, I wanted to create something unique, offering a European flavor, good value and a sense of fun. Whether you are traveling for work or pleasure, you often arrive tired or worried, and a hotel should lift your spirits, not put you to sleep as you step through the door.”\(^{110}\)

Hotelier Bill Kimpton, in a *Hospitality Design Magazine* interview, spoke these words concerning his new boutique hotel concept. Kimpton is acknowledged in the hospitality industry for pioneering the smaller, “boutique” hotel in the United States. He began with a rehabilitation of the Bedford Hotel in San Francisco. From there he committed the Kimpton brand to redeveloping and rehabilitating smaller, older buildings into profitable hotels. “Since the 1980s, historic and boutique hotels have proliferated, benefitting from both surging popularity in heritage tourism and renewed vigor in our urban cores.”\(^{111}\) A renewed interest in our heritage is a driving force within the fields of business and preservation. The heritage of use within boutique historic hotels and inns is the nexus. In the post-recession environment, small rehabilitation projects with economic incentives, provided by the federal historic tax credits, have played a large role in the recovery of the hospitality industry.\(^ {112}\) Kimpton built his idea around the heritage of the inn and tavern in America. Smaller, more intimate spaces with a European origin.


\(^{112}\) Ibid.
In Annapolis and Williamsburg, the inns are structures that are derived from a European origin as discussed in Chapter One. The experience of staying or dining at the Maryland Inn, Governor Calvert House, Middleton Tavern, or Market Square Tavern gives you the sense of walking through time. Their adaptations and renovations allow guests to experience the evidence of change and adaptation through the years. Each addition or aesthetic change is evidence of a new era in the surrounding cities of Annapolis or Williamsburg. This experience is the culmination of years of hard work by people like W.A.R. Godwin in Williamsburg or Paul Pearson II and Anne St. Clair Wright in Annapolis. The “truly complete” environment provided by these four case studies harkens back to Wright’s 1992 “Legacy for Annapolis Statement”:

“My vision has been to create a plan of action to free Annapolis from the lethargy and ignorance that has long prevented its full emergence as a truly complete environment for fruitful living, historic enlightenment and economic stability”\(^\text{113}\)

Visionaries like Wright and their partnerships in Annapolis, Maryland and Williamsburg, Virginia have led the charge to preserve the heritage of use in their cities. Royal Governor Sir Francis Nicholson provided the initial, formal vision for Annapolis and Williamsburg. He provided the grand baroque street plan and thought out the location of major civic buildings, churches, and market squares. Private owners constructed the inns and taverns to serve a purpose within each city. They created a destination for merriment, hospitality, and community building. Today the actions of preservationist, government entities, philanthropist, and developers have provided the resources and vision that enable each of the inns to remain economically viable. These partnerships allow the Maryland Inn, Governor Calvert House, and Middleton Tavern to

stay on the local tax rolls in Annapolis and the Market Square Tavern to generate revenue for the Colonial Williamsburg foundation.

Each historic inn or tavern that lies dormant in an urban setting might be an opportunity for the hospitality industry. John M. Tess of the Heritage Investment Corporation states that the hospitality industry has played an important role in the growth of America. Inns and hotels help to urbanize small town Main Streets and large city centers. For Tess, “the industry itself is reflective of the increasing mobility of American society since the country’s inception. It is also reflective of the country’s economic health.” The inn has been a recognized stopping point along trails and roadways since the seventeenth century in America. Contemporary hospitality development companies such as Kimpton and Remington have the opportunity to work in spaces like the governor Calvert House or Maryland Inn because of the efforts of St. Clair Wright and Paul Pearson.

Williamsburg, Virginia and Annapolis, Maryland would not be destinations for travelers looking to connect to eighteenth-century life ways if not for the rigorous historic preservation and renovations campaigns in each city. The tourism industry that both cities rely upon is largely made possible by the efforts of private foundations and private developers. The historic preservation community must work to partner with philanthropist and developers to push the field further. Adaptive-rehabilitation and renovation projects that harness the historic fabric of vernacular structures must find greater acceptance by the historic preservation community. At the end of the 20th century, historic preservation was offered as a remedy for declining business

---

and visitation to urban cores of many cities and towns across America.\textsuperscript{115} Today, real estate development is awakening to the value in an approach that engages adaptation and the heritage of use.

Preservationists, I hope, want more than to preserve historic buildings. They want to build communities. They want to use heritage for strengthening communities. Economic strength and well-being can serve both communities well. This awakening is particularly evident within the hospitality industry as more projects are taken on within in historic districts. The process in Williamsburg, Virginia and Annapolis, Maryland provide four case studies of progressive practices of preserving and adapting inn and tavern structures. Anne St. Clair’s imperatives for an organically growing Annapolis serve as a foundation for development strategies that harbor the latent economic potential of historic structures.

These practices are admittedly not universally applicable to all existing eighteenth-century tavern and inn structures. Hospitality, housing, and commercial development firms often perform market surveys before investing in a project. An adaptive reuse or renovation project should be subject to the same type of market and feasibility studies before the project is commenced and the surrounding environment of the inn should be scrutinized. The four case studies offered in this thesis are in a National Historic Landmark district. They are a part of cities with a rich seventeenth and eighteenth-century heritage. This environment bolsters the success of heritage tourism. This research does not suggest that every tavern should be restored; however, if there is a reasonable amount of historic value and a local appreciation for historic spaces, a rehabilitation project could be very successful. This research does suggest that historic rehabilitations should be considered for private-public development partnerships. There are

incentives to working with historic structures. Nationally, state, or locally registered projects can qualify for historic preservation tax credits. In the current tax models, developers not looking to use tax credits for themselves may be able to sell the credits offering a financial incentive.

The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Paul Pearson, Historic Annapolis Inc., The Maryland Historical Trust, and Remington Hospitality did not shy away from creating a successful business at the expense of minor losses to the historic fabric. They realized historic materials can and should be reused whenever possible in the buildings alongside the modern conveniences. All four nationally registered historic structures still include material finishes that date back to the eighteenth century. The economic success of these inns within the historic districts of Williamsburg and Annapolis is certainly due to the visionaries involved in the projects, the significance of the materials used, and the careful adaptation processes. The adaption of these four historic inns to their original purpose has contributed to the economic development both Annapolis and Williamsburg. The people and timeless spaces set the inn crowd apart.

“Bricks and mortar can be shifted around, but people make the difference.”116
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## Appendix I

Governor Calvert House (56-58 State Circle) Chain of Title:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>RESIDENT</th>
<th>ARCH CHANGES</th>
<th>TRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Surveyed for Mrs. Philemon Hemsley</td>
<td>“Lot 82-83” in James Stoddart Notebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>William and Mary Hemsley Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Thomas Larkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>William and Mary Hemsley Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Honorable Charles Calvert</td>
<td>Charles and Rebecca Calvert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Elizabeth Calvert Calvert (sole surviving heir of Charles and Rebecca Calvert)</td>
<td>Elizabeth Calvert and husband Benedict Leonard Calvert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Rebecca and</td>
<td>Leased(^{117})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{117}\) Rebecca and Benedict Calvert move to country and rent the house. See *Maryland Gazette* advertisements and Annapolis City Records
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Benedict Calvert</td>
<td>Wallace, Davidson, and Johnson firm&lt;sup&gt;118&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td></td>
<td>State of Maryland (used as a barracks)&lt;sup&gt;119&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Benedict Calvert, husband of Elizabeth Calvert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Edward Henry Calvert, heir of Benedict Leonard and Elizabeth Calvert</td>
<td>Robert Denney (leased)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Robert Denney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>118</sup> Two advertisements in the January 1772 *Maryland Gazette* issue show the firm selling imports on the property.

<sup>119</sup> See Auditor Journal B: 416 (3/6/1784)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Jonas Green purchased Denney property “Lots 82-83” sold for $2110.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Title to Jonas Green is confirmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Lawsuit precipitates the sale of Green property. It is purchased by</td>
<td>Robert Welcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert and Martha Welch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-54</td>
<td>Leased, possibly to Jonas and Mary Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Abram Claude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Abram Claude (deceased) devised to children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Descendants of Abram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\[120\] Chancery Records 103:347
\[121\] Jonas Green is the nephew of Robert Denney
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Claude default on mortgage (Equity Case 21, 801)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Historic Inns of Annapolis Limited Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Remington Hospitality, LLC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix II

### Market Square Tavern Chain of Title:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>RESIDENT</th>
<th>ARCH CHANGES</th>
<th>TRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>John Dixon</td>
<td>“south side of Market Place”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21 yr. lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>John Dixon</td>
<td>“south side of Market Place”</td>
<td></td>
<td>“new store”</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>John Hood</td>
<td>“south side of market place”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>James Johnson</td>
<td>“ss of Market Place”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Robert Lyon</td>
<td>“ss of Market Place”</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barber, Lodgings, Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>Thomas Craig</td>
<td>“south side of market place”</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>houses</td>
<td>Lodgings, Tailor, Tavern (176 Tavern-keeper &amp; Tailor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Thomas Craig</td>
<td>“centre of city”</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tavern, shop, stables, cellars, kitchen, store, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>Gabriel Maupin</td>
<td>“Market Square House &amp; Shop”</td>
<td>1774- Mason rented 1786 –</td>
<td>“considerable additions &amp; improvements”</td>
<td>Tavern-keeper Saddler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Caller</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792-3</td>
<td>Gabriel Maupin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repairs to 13 rooms, stairs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>passages &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Gabriel Maupin</td>
<td>&quot;Main Street&quot;</td>
<td>Addition to the tavern, tailor’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shop &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>Peter R. Deneufville (lease)</td>
<td>&quot;East Court House Square&quot;</td>
<td>Dwelling, new addition, new stables, counting room</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Peter R. Deneufville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Tyler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Peter R. Deneufville</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Coke</td>
<td>Tevern-keeper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Peter R. Deneufville</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;leased land&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Coke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Peter R. Deneufville</td>
<td></td>
<td>James J. Sanford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Peter R. Deneufville Est.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Lucas &amp; others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Peter R. Deneufville Est.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Jones</td>
<td>Merchant &amp; Constable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>P.R. Deneufville Est.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philip J. Barziza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>John A.</td>
<td>A. Lytle &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Deneufville’s Est.</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Marion D. Barlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>James E. Banks (lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Banks’ heirs (lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Williamsburg Holding Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix III**

Maryland Inn (Church Circle at Main Street) Chain of Title:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>LEASEE</th>
<th>ARCH CHANGES</th>
<th>TRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Philemon Lloyd</td>
<td>“Lots 48-49, Stodert Survey”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Philemon Lloyd</td>
<td>“pray’d Renewment of his Lott of Land…heretofore laid out for the Drummer of the Town.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732-38</td>
<td>Henrietta Maria Chew Delany (Philemon Lloyd’s daughter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Edward and Henrietta Dorsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>Henrietta Dorsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lease part of lot 49 for 99 years to Nathan Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Will of Henrietta Dorsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Will of Henrietta Maria Dulany bequeaths to daughters Margaret Bordley and Maria Paca¹²²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Nathan Waters assigns lease to Thomas Hyde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>William Mary Paca v. John Beale Bordley and wife Margaret. Writ of Petition and Judgment Rendered for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹²² Probate June 7, 1766
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>Assignment of rights to inherit lots from John Beale Bordley to son, Matthias Bordley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liber DD 6 Folio 651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>Assignment of rights to inherit lots from John Beale Bordley to son, Matthias Bordley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conveyance from Matthias Bordley to Thomas Hyde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

123 Provincial Court Judgment, Liber DD 18, Folio 527
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Will of Thomas Hyde to Sarah Walls (daughter of his sister Elizabeth Walls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Will of Sarah Wall Clements to her niece, Elizabeth Bowie, wife of Thomas Bowie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Robinson (as a boarding house)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1855</td>
<td>Elizabeth Bowie (deceased), conveyed to Jacob C. Howard and wife, Araminta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Hiram McCollough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupied by Passmore McCollough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Confirmatory Deed of Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Conveyance from Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>N. Stockett (Trustee), to Roberty N. Fowler (Equity Case: Henry M. Owings v. Hiram McCollough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Foreclosure on mortgage of Robert N. Fowler to Henry James (Equity Case 1446)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Hazeltine G. Vickery and Isaac S. George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Luther H. Gadd and George T. Melvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Melvin conveyed his half interest to Luther H. Gadd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>George T. Melvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Frank J. Kadam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>J. Norman Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Delmas C. Stutler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Mortgage default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Bernard J. Wiegard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Bernard J. Wiegard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Maryland Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

124 Subject to mortgage GW 114 Folio 340
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Corporation</th>
<th>Dissolution and Liquidation of the Maryland Hotel Corporation, property to Kent R. Mullikin, Stanley S. Garber, and Winifred C. Mullikin individually as tenants in common.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Drummer’s Lot Inc.</td>
<td>Rehabilitation collaboration with Historic Annapolis, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Donohoe Properties and Paul M. Pearson, Trustees.</td>
<td>Rehabilitation collaboration with Historic Annapolis, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Remington Hospitality, LLC.</td>
<td>Rehabilitation collaboration with Historic Annapolis, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV

Middleton Tavern Chain of Title:\textsuperscript{125}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>LEASEE</th>
<th>ARCH CHANGES</th>
<th>TRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Governor Francis Nicholson sets aside property for “thus use of such Ship Carpenters as would inhabit thereon and follow their trades within this province”</td>
<td>“Ship Carpenters Lot” on the North edge of Nicholson Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Frances Nicholson, Royal Governor of Maryland Colony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Ship Carpenters Lot granted to Robert Johnson</td>
<td>“Ship Carpenters Lot”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>lot granted to Robert Gordon</td>
<td>“Ship Carpenters Lot”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Elizabeth Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Elizabeth Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Horatio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{125} 1739-1770 title records source: Provincial Court Records  
1793-2004 title records source: Land Records of Anne Arundel County
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Middleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Horatio</td>
<td>The original tavern is constructed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Horatio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>devised to wife, Ann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middleton, then children, and grandchildren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Chancellors</td>
<td>Part of Ship Carpenters Lot (#1, #2, and #3) and Lot F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conveys to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>John Randall</td>
<td>Part of Ship Carpenters Lot (#1, #2, and #3) and Lot F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>John Randall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>devised to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wife, Deborah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randall, then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>daughters,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliza,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frances,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1854</td>
<td>Henrietta Randall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip F. and Anne Randall Voorhees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1854</td>
<td>Eliza H. and Anne Randall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Frederick and Magdalene Marx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>George and Sophia Rost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2, 1867</td>
<td>William P. Meyers, Thomas and Annie H. Hedian, and Buckler and P. Agnes Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 4, 1867</td>
<td>William P. Meyers, Thomas and Annie H. Hedian, and Buckler and P. Agnes Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 12, 1875</td>
<td>Sophia Rost, widow of George Rost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 14, 1875</td>
<td>Sophia Rost</td>
<td>John Rost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1875</td>
<td>Thomas Tydings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Thomas Tydings, deceased, to George R. Tydings (Lot 1) and Charles C. Tydings (Lot 2) Equity Case 915</td>
<td>(Lot 1: “east end” of 2-6 Market Space/50 Randall Street) and (Lot 2: “west end and passage way” of 2-6 Market Space)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Clara C. Tydings Russell, Thomas Tydings, Jr., and George R. Tydings</td>
<td>Lot 2 “west passage way’ of 2-6 Market Space”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>George R. Tydings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>George R. Tydings</td>
<td>“One third Interest in Lot 2 (‘west passage way’ of 2-6 Market Space)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>George R. Tydings</td>
<td>“Lots 1 and 2”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Deed Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>W. Thomas Williams and William O. Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Annapolis Mortgage Company Equity Case 6880: mortgage default “2-6 Market Space/50 Randall Street”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Nicholas J. and Helen Mandris and Cleo John and Mary Apostol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Cleo John and Mary Apostol Joseph Jerome Hardesty, Sharon S. Hardesty, and Bernard O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Cleo John and Mary Apostol</td>
<td>Hardesty, Jr. (10-year renewable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Cleo John and Mary Apostol to the State of Maryland for Maryland Historical Trust Deed of Easement and Architectural Covenant</td>
<td>post-fire restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Apostol Associated, LLC., Nicolas Apostol, John Apostol, and Georgia Yeatros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>