

after this period] has threatened whole functional categories of buildings, like sweet potato houses, grader sheds, and railroad related structures" (Herman et. al. 1989:59). Developmental pressures are increasing in the area due primarily to modern highway construction along Routes 404/9/18, Route 113, and Route 13, and pressures associated with the steady expansion of the beach resorts. Modern housing construction is occurring around Georgetown, Bridgeville, and along both sides of Route 404 at the eastern end of the corridor. Often this modern development takes place on former farmsteads, with concurrent destruction of the agricultural character of the site and the removal of the original historic farmhouses and support buildings. Architectural integrity should be a consistently high measure of significance for property types within this period (Herman et. al. 1989:59).

There are twelve known extant historic properties dating to this time period in the project region (Catts, Custer and Hoseth 1991). All of these were identified from the BAHP inventories. During the course of the Location Level Historic Resources Study, 148 properties were identified that may date to this period within or adjacent to the project alternatives.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

### Introduction

A research strategy was developed, as part of this Location Level Architectural Survey, in order to further the knowledge and understanding of the historical, economic, social, and architectural development of Sussex County from its initial settlement by Europeans through the late twentieth century. The research strategy consisted of 1) developing the goals of the project, including research questions; 2) developing a methodology to achieve those goals, and answer the research questions; and 3) integrating the goals, methodology, and results into a comprehensive document that answers the research questions, addresses the State Plan, and furthers the knowledge of the history and historical resources of Sussex County.

The purpose of this Location Level Architectural Survey was to locate all extant historic properties within the project alternatives, describe their appearance, and assess their significance based upon an external examination. Thus, all of the historic properties that met the pre-1945 criterion were identified, mapped, photographed, and assessed according to BAHP standards. Research questions were developed in order to ascertain how the historic properties within the project corridor would fit within the framework of the State Plan's temporal and functional contexts. In order to assess the significance of a historic property, it is first necessary to understand how the property fits within the preservation priorities of the region by utilizing the contextual materials in the State Plan as a framework. The *Delaware Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan* (Ames et. al. 1989) and the accompanying *Historic Context Master Reference and Summary* (Herman et. al. 1989) were utilized in order to develop a context within which the historic properties could be assessed.

### Historic Context Priorities

Historic context priorities, as discussed in the State Plan (Ames et. al. 1989), were taken into consideration in developing the research strategy utilized during this study. Priorities for the Lower Peninsula/Cypress Swamp Zone, within which the project corridor is located, included Priority #1, Agriculture; and Priority #3, Settlement Patterns and Demographic Change. It was anticipated that the theme of agriculture would be the most important aspect in interpreting and assessing the development of the built environment of Sussex County, and that the buildings, structures, landscape features, and processes associated with this context would be significant. Priority #3, Settlement Patterns and Demographic Change, suggested that the development of towns and villages within the project corridor would be a significant factor to

be assessed during the course of the study. It was anticipated that this historic context would be an important controlling factor in the development of Sussex County.

Historic contexts were utilized from the State Plan (Herman et. al. 1989) to better understand the development and changes in Sussex County over time. Expected property types were also developed in coordination with the State Plan. The plan divides the region temporally, as well as functionally over time. There are eighteen historic themes, including agriculture; forestry; trapping and hunting; mining and quarrying; fishing and oystering; manufacturing; retailing and wholesaling; finance; professional services; transportation and communication; settlement patterns and demographic change; architecture, engineering, and decorative arts; government; religion; education; community organizations; occupational organizations; and major families, individuals, and events (Herman et. al. 1989:V).

### Anticipated Property Types

It was assumed that property types within the study area would be dominated by the agricultural theme, for agriculture was the primary economic force driving the development of Sussex County from its earliest settled days. Thus, primary residences in association with agricultural outbuildings were expected to be the most common resource found during the survey. Specific building and structure types within the agricultural theme were expected to change with temporal period, as well as with innovations in agricultural practices. Barns, tobacco sheds, impermanent and permanent corncribs, smokehouses, outhouses, and other types of farm related buildings were expected to be found during the project. Dominant agricultural sub-themes expected, consisted of corns, grain and hay; fruits and vegetables; dairy; meat and poultry; and horse farms.

Other historic themes, based upon contexts developed in the State Plan, were anticipated to be represented within the project corridor; however, much more infrequently. It was expected to find non-agricultural residences, stores and offices, quarry related buildings, buildings related to various milling operations, churches, schools, and transportation related properties such as train stations, freight depots, and roadside commercial enterprises.

### Anticipated Temporal Periods

The State Plan divides the history of Delaware into five chronological periods: 1630-1730±, Exploration and Frontier Settlement; 1730-1770±, Intensified and Durable Occupation; 1770-1830±, Early Industrialization; 1830-1880±, Industrialization and Early Urbanization; and 1880-1940±, Urbanization and Early Suburbanization. It was expected that few properties would be located that date to the seventeenth, eighteenth, or early nineteenth centuries due to the impermanent nature of the architecture in Sussex County, and the relatively late date of more intensive settlement and development as compared with other sections of Delaware. Thus it was thought that the vast majority of resources identified would date to the last two chronological periods, 1830-1940±, with a majority dating to the twentieth century.

### Research Questions

Research questions were developed to better understand how the anticipated resource types would fit within the contexts developed in the State Plan (Herman et. al. 1989), and to develop a context within which the significance of the historic properties could be assessed. The role of agriculture in the development of Sussex County would have to be examined in-depth, in order to provide a context for assessing the anticipated large number of farm related properties. A second research question was the role of changes in transportation technology in the development of Sussex County, both economically and socially, and how these effects would be reflected in the built environment. A third research question was how settlement patterns influenced Sussex County, and how this factor influenced and was reflected in the development

and evolution of the built environment within the project corridor. A fourth research question was how the economic and social history of Sussex County was reflected in the historic properties located and assessed during the course of the project. It was anticipated that these research questions could be preliminarily addressed with data gathered during the Historic Resources Location Level Survey for the Sussex East-West Corridor.

### Factors Influencing Historic Preservation Priorities in Sussex County

The development of historic preservation goals and priorities for Delaware first must be evaluated in terms of the threats to the historic resources. Resources that are not under some external pressure may become less of a preservation priority than those that are under, for example, development pressure. Development pressure *is* present in the project corridor, specifically in the coastal eastern section toward the beach resort areas. Other development pressures can be found along U.S. Route 13, north and south of Georgetown, and along U.S. Route 113, north of Bridgeville. In addition, the primary east-west route across the county, Route 404/9/18, is under heavy development pressure as it is a frequently traveled summer route for vacationers accessing beach resorts such as Rehoboth, Lewes, and Cape Henlopen.

### Previous Related Studies

Three previous cultural resource studies on projects located in or adjacent to the Sussex East-West Corridor were utilized to provide additional contextual data. The Cultural Resource Group of Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., conducted an archaeological and architectural assessment of U.S. Route 113 between Milford and Georgetown, Delaware (LeeDecker et. al. 1989). The Reconnaissance Level Architectural Survey inventoried fifty-seven resources within the project area. The goal of that study was to "(1) compile baseline information on structures 50 years of age or more within the vicinity of the project area; and (2) to identify those structures which appeared to warrant further historical and physical investigation leading to evaluation of significance under National Register Criteria" (LeeDecker et. al. 1989:50). The study documented forty-seven residences, six agricultural complexes, three commercial structures, and one governmental structure. The majority of the identified properties were residential dwellings, constructed alongside the Du Pont Highway (completed in 1923), with only a limited number of farmsteads and commercial structures. Seven of these historic properties are situated within the project limits for the Sussex East-West Corridor study. The results of Louis Berger Associates' study are integrated into the architectural assessment within this report.

A second report utilized during this study was the *Cultural Resources Survey of Delaware Route 1, Five Points to Rehoboth, Sussex County, Delaware* (Tidlow et. al. 1990). The purpose of this survey was to identify potentially significant archaeological sites and historical properties. The study located 125 properties within the project corridor, but failed to note or discuss other properties that were "designated as non-contributing resources [and] were not included in the survey due to their recent date of construction or low level of physical integrity" (Tidlow et. al. 1990:63). The buildings surveyed in that study included resort oriented housing (Frances-Anne Motel, Complex A); a nineteenth century black village (Belltown); a church (Mount Pleasant United Methodist Church); individual houses (Janice P. Lewis House); and a variety of agricultural complexes (Knapp Family Farmstead, Marsh Family Farmstead). The results of this study, completed by John Milner Associates, are integrated into the architectural assessment within this report.

A third study *A Cultural Resources Reconnaissance Planning Study of the Proposed Sussex East-West Corridor, Delaware Routes 404/18 and 9, Sussex County, Delaware* (Catts, Custer and Hoseth 1991), presents the results of an overall view of the Sussex East-West Corridor and its known and predicted cultural resources. This report located all previously surveyed historic properties based upon BAHF site files (included as Appendix II). Appendix IV of the report

contained a list of standing structures that "are presently standing on sites of historically documented structures--i.e., these buildings were shown on Beers' Atlas (1868)--but have not been inventoried by the BAHP" (Catts, Custer and Hoseth 1991:58).

## SURVEY METHODOLOGY

### Introduction

The Location Level Architectural Survey of the proposed Sussex East-West Corridor, Delaware Routes 404/18 and 9, in Sussex County, Delaware was conducted between October 1990 and June 1991 by Cultural Heritage Research Services, Inc. (CHRS). The Sussex East-West Corridor extends from the Maryland-Delaware boundary at Adams Crossroads to the vicinity of Five Points on State Route 1. The corridor is approximately thirty miles long and five miles wide, centered on State Roads 404, 18, 40, and 9. The survey documented all extant historic properties within a one thousand foot wide corridor along each of the proposed project alignments.

The Location Level Survey was carried out in accordance with "Guidelines for Architectural and Archaeological Surveys in Delaware," prepared in draft form by the Delaware Bureau of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (BAHP) in August of 1990. The goal of the survey was to locate all of the extant historic properties within the selected alignments, and to document the resources to a level sufficient to evaluate their potential significance according to National Register of Historic Places Criterion C: architecture. In some cases, when preliminary background research information revealed other levels of significance, the eligibility of historic properties was assessed based upon National Register Criterion A: association with an important event or pattern of events (U.S. Department of the Interior 1986:13). The eligibility of the identified resources was then determined according to specifications in the National Register of Historic Places (Ames et. al. 1989:121-123).

All properties appearing to meet the pre-1945 age criterion specified by the BAHP were surveyed, and their potential eligibility assessed. Properties of outstanding significance that may have been constructed after 1945 were also considered, but no such resources were identified during the course of this study. Properties that had lost integrity due to substantial alterations or extremely poor condition were proposed as not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (Ames et. al. 1989:122-123). Properties requiring additional work in order to assess their significance were noted. Properties appearing to meet Criterion A were designated as eligible but require additional historical research to confirm the relationships between the properties and their historical contexts.

All of the surveyed properties were evaluated within the contexts discussed in the *Delaware Historic Context Master Reference and Summary*, and the historic preservation priorities stated in the *Delaware Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan*. A total of 273 historic properties were included in this survey: 152 previously surveyed properties and 121 newly identified historic properties. Thirty-five were proposed to be individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, significant architecturally under Criterion C. Due to lack of integrity and/or lack of architectural significance, 155 properties were proposed to not be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Forty-five were proposed to be eligible as part of a variety of multiple property submissions, which are detailed below. Thirty-eight historic properties were proposed to be eligible as part of a number of historic districts. And, twenty-five historic properties were proposed to need more work in order to ascertain their significance according to National Register of Historic Places criteria. All surveyed historic properties are located on a Historic Property Location Map (Appendix A), and are referenced by plate number and CRS number for ease of identification.