

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This report has presented the results of a Location Level Historic Resources Survey of the proposed Sussex East-West Corridor, Delaware Routes 404/18 and 9, in Sussex County, Delaware. The Sussex East-West Corridor Study involves the planning of approximately thirty miles of transportation improvements that would provide for existing and future traffic demands to Delaware Route 404 in Sussex County. Early in the transportation alternatives study, general corridors for transportation improvements were identified. The locations of corridors were chosen to minimize impacts on areas sensitive to the effects of highway development. The corridors were wide bands within which more specific roadway alignments were later developed. These original corridors consisted of five bypasses of Bridgeville, five bypasses of Georgetown, Route 404 from the Maryland State line to Delaware Route 1, two additional connecting corridors between Bridgeville and Georgetown (Road 40 and Road 565/Road 527 corridor), and a number of connections with Routes 1 and 5. After reviewing the corridors, the least desirable segments were eliminated from further consideration (McCormick, Taylor and Associates 1991). Three alternate routes were then assembled: **Road 40, Road 527, and Route 404**. Later, the **Wishbone Alternative** was introduced. The Location Level Historic Resources Survey documented all extant historic properties within a one thousand foot wide corridor along each of the three proposed alternate routes and the Wishbone Alternative.

The Location Level Architectural Survey studied a total of 273 historic properties within the study corridors. One hundred and eighteen (118) of the properties appear to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, based upon either Criterion C: architecture, or Criterion A: association with a significant historic pattern (Table 1). All of the resources were evaluated according to the preservation priorities and within the historic contexts developed in the State Plan (Herman et. al. 1989; Ames et. al. 1989). One hundred and fifty-five (155) historic properties were determined not to be eligible for the National Register. The primary factors in determining historic properties as not eligible were the lack of integrity and/or the lack of architectural significance. Twenty-five (25) historic properties were determined to need more work in order to assess their significance.

It should be noted that due to the limitations inherent in the scope of a Location Level Architectural Survey, historic properties were evaluated primarily on the external architectural appearance of the resource. Additional areas of significance may be revealed through an Evaluation Level Survey, where substantial amounts of background research are required to assess eligibility based upon all National Register Criteria. In addition, no boundaries were suggested for the eligible properties detailed in this study. Additional research would be necessary to provide this data, and is outside of the scope of this study.

The breakdown of the eligible historic properties can be seen on the accompanying table (Table 2). This table shows the individually eligible properties, multiple property submissions, and historic districts. Thirty-five properties were proposed to be individually eligible for the National Register. A variety of multiple property submissions were utilized to group significant historic properties according to a number of themes. Twenty-two properties were included in the Three Bay, I-House, Multiple Property Submission. Two properties were contained in the Four Bay, I-House, Multiple Property Submission. Nine properties were included in the Five Bay, I-House, Multiple Property Submission. The Classical Box Multiple Property Submission consists of five properties. Seven properties were included in the Commercial Roadside Multiple Property Submission.

TABLE 1

Summary: Historic Properties
Sussex East-West Corridor
Sussex County, Delaware

CRS No.	Eligible * NR listed	More Work Needed	CRS No.	Eligible	More Work Needed
346	NO	NO	1759	YES	NO
409	?	YES	1779	YES	NO
739	YES	NO	1788	NO	NO
823	YES*	NO	1795	NO	NO
827	YES*	NO	1797	YES	NO
855	NO	NO	1890	NO	NO
856	NO	NO	1992	NO	NO
857	NO	NO	2912	YES	NO
858	?	YES	3022	NO	NO
859	NO	NO	3024	YES	NO
860	NO	NO	3025	YES	NO
863	YES	NO	3158	YES	NO
864	?	YES	3159	YES	NO
865	NO	NO	3160	NO	NO
866	NO	NO	3163	YES	NO
867	YES	NO	3189	YES	NO
899	NO	NO	3191	?	YES
900	YES	NO	3192	NO	NO
956	NO	NO	3193	YES	NO
957	NO	NO	3194	NO	NO
1042	NO	NO	3213	NO	NO
1664	YES	NO	3214	YES	NO
1668	YES	NO	3215	NO	NO
1669	NO	NO	3216	YES	NO
1687	YES	NO	3217	YES	NO
1688	YES	NO	3218	YES	NO
1703	YES	NO	3233	YES	NO
1707	YES	NO	3235	?	YES
1708	NO	NO	3236	NO	NO
1710	NO	NO	3531	YES	NO
1711	YES	NO	3532	YES	NO
1712	YES	NO	3553	NO	NO
1713	NO	NO	3566	YES	NO
1714	YES	NO	3567	YES	NO
1715	YES	NO	3568	YES	NO
1725	NO	NO	3569	YES	NO
1728	YES	NO	3571	YES	NO
1729	YES	NO	3573	YES	NO
1730	YES	NO	3574	NO	NO
1731	YES	NO	3617	YES	NO
1733	NO	NO	3618	YES	NO
1734	YES	NO	3619	YES	NO
1755	YES	NO	3644	YES	NO
1757	NO	NO	3645	YES	NO
1758	NO	NO	3992	NO	NO

TABLE 1

Summary: Historic Properties
Sussex East-West Corridor
Sussex County, Delaware

CRS No.	Eligible	More Work Needed	CRS No.	Eligible	More Work Needed
4022	NO	NO	5156	NO	NO
5058	?	YES	5213	YES	NO
5061	YES	NO	5214	?	YES
5062	NO	NO	5215	YES	NO
5063	NO	NO	5216	YES	NO
5064	NO	NO	5217	NO	NO
5066	YES	NO	5218	YES	NO
5067	YES	NO	5220	NO	NO
5068	?	YES	6052	YES	NO
5070	NO	NO	6053	YES	NO
5071	YES	NO	6054	YES	NO
5072	YES	NO	6066	YES	NO
5073	YES	NO	7958	NO	NO
5074	NO	NO	8059	NO	NO
5075	NO	NO	8344	NO	NO
5077	YES	NO	8348	NO	NO
5078	YES	NO	8397	NO	NO
5079	YES	NO	8398	NO	NO
5080	YES	NO	8399	NO	NO
5081	NO	NO	8400	NO	NO
5082	YES	NO	8401	YES	NO
5083	YES	NO	8402	?	YES
5084	YES	NO	8403	NO	NO
5085	YES	NO	8404	NO	NO
5086	YES	NO	8405	NO	NO
5087	YES	NO	8406	NO	NO
5088	NO	NO	8407	NO	NO
5089	NO	NO	8408	YES	NO
5090	NO	NO	8409	NO	NO
5091	NO	NO	8410	NO	NO
5109	YES	NO	8411	YES	NO
5127	NO	NO	8412	NO	NO
5128	YES	NO	8413	NO	NO
5131	YES	NO	8414	NO	NO
5139	NO	NO	8415	?	YES
5140	NO	NO	8416	NO	NO
5141	NO	NO	8417	NO	NO
5143	YES	NO	8418	YES	NO
5146	YES	NO	8419	YES	NO
5147	YES	NO	8420	?	YES
5148	NO	NO	8421	?	YES
5149	NO	NO	8422	YES	NO
5151	NO	NO	8423	NO	NO
5152	NO	NO	8424	NO	NO
5153	NO	NO	8425	YES	NO
5154	YES	NO	8426	?	YES

TABLE 1

Summary: Historic Properties
Sussex East-West Corridor
Sussex County, Delaware

CRS No.	Eligible	More Work Needed	CRS No.	Eligible	More Work Needed
8427	NO	NO	8473	YES	NO
8428	NO	NO	8474	NO	NO
8429	NO	NO	8475	NO	NO
8430	NO	NO	8476	?	YES
8431	?	YES	8477	YES	NO
8432	NO	NO	8478	YES	NO
8433	NO	NO	8479	NO	NO
8434	NO	NO	8480	?	YES
8435	NO	NO	8481	YES	NO
8436	?	YES	8482	NO	NO
8437	?	YES	8483	NO	NO
8438	NO	NO	8484	NO	NO
8439	NO	NO	8485	YES	NO
8440	NO	NO	8486	NO	NO
8441	?	YES	8487	YES	NO
8442	YES	NO	8488	NO	NO
8443	?	YES	8489	YES	NO
8444	NO	NO	8490	NO	NO
8445	NO	NO	8491	YES	NO
8446	YES	NO	8492	NO	NO
8447	NO	NO	8493	YES	NO
8448	NO	NO	8494	NO	NO
8449	YES	NO	8495	NO	NO
8450	NO	NO	8496	NO	NO
8451	NO	NO	8497	NO	NO
8452	NO	NO	8498	NO	NO
8453	YES	NO	8499	YES	NO
8454	NO	NO	8500	NO	NO
8455	NO	NO	8501	YES	NO
8456	NO	NO	8502	NO	NO
8457	YES	NO	8503	NO	NO
8458	NO	NO	8504	NO	NO
8459	NO	NO	8505	YES	NO
8460	?	YES	8506	YES	NO
8461	YES	NO	8507	YES	NO
8462	NO	NO	8508	YES	NO
8463	?	YES	8509	?	YES
8464	NO	NO	8510	NO	NO
8465	YES	NO	8511	?	YES
8466	YES	NO	8512	NO	NO
8467	YES	NO	8513	?	YES
8468	YES	NO	8514	NO	NO
8469	YES	NO	8515	YES	NO
8470	YES	NO	8516	NO	NO
8471	YES	NO	8517	NO	NO
8472	NO	NO			

A variety of historic districts were developed in order to group significant properties that were geographically linked. The Governor Collins Historic District includes five properties. The H.N. Pepper Historic District contains three properties. The Peach Mansion Historic District consists of four properties. The H.E. Williams Historic District includes three properties. The Harbeson Historic District is made up of nine properties. The Mill Worker Housing Historic District contains three properties. The Nineteenth Century Tenant Historic District consists of five properties. And the Twentieth Century Tenant Historic District includes six properties.

TABLE 2	
Eligible Historic Properties Sussex East-West Corridor Sussex County, Delaware	
Individually Eligible Properties (including NR listed)	35
Three Bay I-House Multiple Property Submission Properties	22
Four Bay I-House Multiple Property Submission Properties	2
Five Bay I-House Multiple Property Submission Properties	9
Classical Box Multiple Property Submission Properties	5
Commercial/Roadside Multiple Property Submission	7
Governor Collins Historic District Properties	5
H.N. Pepper Historic District Properties	3
Peach Mansion Historic District Properties (including 1 NR listed)	4
H.E. Williams Historic District Properties	3
Harbeson Historic District Properties	9
Mill Worker Housing Historic District Properties	3
Nineteenth Century Tenant Historic District Properties	5
Twentieth Century Tenant Historic District Properties	6
Total Eligible or Listed Historic Properties	118

Table 3 provides a breakdown of historic properties by study corridor. There is considerable overlap in the alignment of each of the corridors (see Historic Property Location Map in Appendix A). The Wishbone Alternative, the last alignment corridor to be developed, contains 243 historic properties. One Hundred and eight (108) of the historic properties in or adjacent to this preliminary alignment corridor are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Route 404 alignment corridor contains the second highest number of historic properties. One Hundred and eighty-one (181) properties are located in or adjacent to this proposed alignment, eighty-three (83) of which appear to meet the criteria of eligibility for listing on the National Register. The Road 40 alignment corridor contains one hundred and seventy-three (173) historic properties. Seventy of the properties surveyed within the Route 40 preliminary alignment corridor are eligible for listing on the National Register. The alignment corridor that seems to have the fewest historic properties is Road 527. Sixty-two (62) eligible properties are located in or adjacent to the Road 527 alignment corridor out of a total of one hundred and fifty three (153) historic resources.

TABLE 3

**Historic Properties by Study Corridor
Sussex East-West Corridor
Sussex County, Delaware**

Road 40 CRS Nos.	Route 404 CRS Nos.	Road 527 CRS No.	Wishbone CRS Nos.
346 3235 8406 8481	346 3024 5089 8474	346 3192 8414 8503	346 1779 5073 8402 8459 8505
739 3236 8407 8482	409 3025 5090 8475	739 3553 8415 8504	409 1788 5075 8403 8460 8506
823 3553 8408 8483	739 3158 5091 8476	823 3566 8416 8505	739 1795 5077 8404 8461 8507
827 3566 8409 8484	823 3159 6052 8477	827 3567 8417 8506	823 1797 5078 8405 8462 8508
855 3567 8410 8485	855 3160 6053 8478	855 3568 8418 8507	827 1890 5079 8406 8463 8509
856 3568 8411 8486	856 3163 6054 8479	856 3569 8419 8508	855 1992 5080 8407 8464 8510
858 3569 8412 8487	857 3193 6066 8480	857 3571 8420 8509	856 2912 5081 8408 8465 8511
859 3571 8413 8488	858 3194 8059 8481	858 3573 8421 8510	857 3022 5082 8409 8466 8512
860 3573 8414 8489	859 3553 8348 8482	859 3574 8422 8511	858 3024 5083 8410 8467 8513
863 3574 8415 8490	860 3566 8397 8483	860 3617 8423 8512	859 3025 5084 8411 8468 8514
864 3617 8416 8491	863 3567 8398 8484	863 3618 8424 8513	860 3158 5085 8412 8469 8515
865 3618 8417 8492	864 3568 8399 8485	864 3619 8425 8514	863 3159 5086 8413 8470 8516
866 3619 8418 8493	865 3569 8400 8486	865 3644 8426	864 3160 5087 8414 8471 8517
867 3644 8419 8494	866 3571 8401 8487	866 3645 8427	865 3163 5088 8415 8472
899 3645 8420 8495	867 3573 8402 8488	867 3992 8428	866 3189 5089 8416 8473
900 3992 8421 8496	899 3574 8403 8489	899 5109 8429	867 3193 5090 8417 8474
956 4022 8422 8497	900 3617 8404 8490	900 5127 8473	899 3194 5091 8418 8475
957 5143 8424 8498	956 3618 8405 8491	956 5128 8474	900 3233 5143 8419 8476
1042 5146 8430 8499	957 3619 8406 8492	957 5131 8475	956 3235 5146 8420 8477
1703 5147 8431 8500	1042 3644 8407 8493	1042 5139 8476	957 3236 5147 8421 8478
1707 5148 8432 8501	1664 3645 8408 8494	1703 5140 8477	1042 3553 5148 8422 8479
1725 5149 8433 8502	1668 5058 8409 8495	1707 5141 8478	1664 3566 5149 8424 8480
1728 5151 8435 8503	1669 5061 8410 8496	1725 5143 8479	1668 3567 5152 8430 8481
1729 5152 8436 8504	1687 5062 8411 8497	1728 5146 8480	1669 3568 5153 8431 8482
1730 5153 8441 8505	1688 5063 8412 8498	1729 5147 8481	1687 3569 5154 8432 8483
1731 5154 8442 8506	1708 5064 8413 8499	1730 5148 8482	1688 3571 5156 8433 8484
1733 5156 8443 8507	1710 5066 8414 8500	1731 5149 8483	1703 3573 5213 8435 8485
1734 5213 8444 8508	1711 5067 8455 8501	1733 5151 8484	1707 3574 5214 8436 8486
1755 5214 8445 8509	1712 5068 8456 8502	1734 8059 8485	1708 3617 5215 8441 8487
1757 5215 8446 8510	1713 5070 8457 8503	1755 8397 8486	1710 3618 5216 8442 8488
1758 5216 8447 8511	1714 5071 8458 8504	1757 8398 8487	1711 3619 5217 8443 8489
1759 5217 8448 8512	1715 5072 8459 8505	1758 8399 8488	1712 3644 5218 8444 8490
1779 5218 8449 8513	1733 5073 8460 8506	1759 8400 8489	1713 3645 5220 8445 8491
1788 5220 8450 8514	1734 5075 8461 8507	1779 8401 8490	1714 3992 6052 8446 8492
1795 7958 8451 8515	1755 5077 8462 8508	1788 8402 8491	1715 4022 6053 8447 8493
1797 8059 8452	1757 5078 8463 8509	1795 8403 8492	1725 5058 6054 8448 8494
2912 8344 8453	1758 5079 8464 8510	1797 8404 8493	1728 5061 6066 8449 8495
3022 8397 8454	1759 5080 8465 8511	2912 8405 8494	1729 5062 7958 8450 8496
3024 8398 8473	1779 5081 8466 8512	3022 8406 8495	1730 5063 8059 8451 8497
3025 8399 8474	1788 5082 8467 8513	3024 8407 8496	1731 5064 8344 8452 8498
3158 8400 8475	1795 5083 8468 8514	3025 8408 8497	1733 5066 8348 8453 8499
3159 8401 8476	1797 5084 8469 8516	3158 8409 8498	1734 5067 8397 8454 8500
3160 8402 8477	1890 5085 8470 8517	3159 8410 8499	1755 5068 8398 8455 8501
3163 8403 8478	1992 5086 8471	3160 8411 8500	1757 5070 8399 8456 8502
3189 8404 8479	2912 5087 8472	3163 8412 8501	1758 5071 8400 8457 8503
3233 8405 8480	3022 5088 8473	3191 8413 8502	1759 5072 8401 8458 8504

Conclusions

All of the information collected during the survey was placed into a computer data base for ease of analysis. Each historic property was categorized according to style, function, temporal period, and significance. The results indicate that, of the total number of properties, 114, or 41 percent, fell into the I-house category. The second largest group, according to architectural style, was Unadorned Vernacular (58 examples, or 20.8 percent). This group was composed mainly of Cottages dating to the second quarter of the twentieth century. A variety of other architectural styles were represented throughout the corridor, although less frequently, including "Post 1945," "Commercial," "Classical Box," "Twentieth Century Colonial Revival," and "Chesapeake Bay Vernacular." A wide variety of other styles were also found within or adjacent to the study corridors during this study (Table 4).

The eligible historic properties as compared to the total number of properties surveyed provided some insights into the integrity of different styles present within the corridors studied (Table 4). Fifty-eight (58) I-houses were proposed as eligible. This represents 47.2 percent of the total number of eligible properties. This is a slightly higher percentage than the total percentage of I-houses within the corridor (41 percent). Eighty-two of the surveyed I-houses are three bay, eight are four bay, seventeen are five bay, and seven are "type 4" I-houses. A little more than half of the eligible I-house properties (thirty-three) are contained within the I-house multiple property submissions. The remaining eligible I-house properties are contained within the proposed historic districts or are considered as individually eligible.

Chesapeake Bay Vernacular and Commercial buildings also constitute a higher percentage of the eligible structures than the surveyed properties as a whole. Chesapeake Bay Vernacular buildings represent 4 percent of the total buildings surveyed but 6.5 percent of the eligible buildings. This building style represents a predecessor of the I-house type that is the most prominent type throughout the study. The age of this type or resource is the primary reason for the high percentage of properties that are eligible (seventy-two percent of the surveyed properties are eligible). Commercial buildings consist of 5.8 percent of the styles surveyed. Sixty percent of these properties appear to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (8.1 percent of the total styles eligible). The high percentage of eligible properties reflects the rapid rate at which these styles of structures are diminishing within the study area.

While the percentage of eligible I-houses, Chesapeake Bay Vernacular, and Commercial buildings/structures is higher than the percentage surveyed, the percentage of eligible Unadorned Vernacular and Post 1945 buildings is correspondingly lower. The Unadorned Vernacular category contains a variety of building types that could not be assigned to other styles. Only thirty-one percent of this building type possessed sufficient integrity to be considered eligible. A similar relationship can be seen in Post 1945 style buildings. Only four percent of this building type was considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. This style consisted of 8.6 percent of the total styles identified during the survey, but only 0.8 percent of the total eligible property styles (Table 4). Unlike the Unadorned Vernacular style, the Post 1945 style properties may not only reflect a lack of integrity, but also a temporal bias as well.

TABLE 4				
Architectural Styles Present*				
Sussex East-West Corridor				
Sussex County, Delaware				
Style	All Properties		Eligible Properties	
Unadorned Vernacular	58	20.8%	18	14.6%
Chesapeake Bay Vernacular	11	4.0%	8	6.5%
Federal	2	0.7%	1	0.8%
Vernacular w/ Federal	2	0.7%	1	0.8%
Vernacular w/ Gothic Revival	1	0.4%	1	0.8%
Peach Mansion Vernacular	1	0.4%	1	0.8%
Vernacular w/ Italianate	3	1.1%	3	2.4%
Vernacular Eclectic	1	0.4%	0	0.0%
Vernacular w/ Vict Gothic	2	0.7%	2	1.6%
Colonial Revival, 19th	8	2.9%	2	1.6%
Arts and Crafts	1	0.4%	0	0.0%
Commercial	16	5.8%	10	8.1%
Bungalow	2	0.7%	1	0.8%
Classical Box	12	4.3%	7	5.7%
Colonial Revival 20	12	4.3%	4	3.3%
Unique	2	0.7%	2	1.6%
30s Picturesque	4	1.4%	1	0.8%
Art Deco	1	0.4%	1	0.8%
Post 1945	24	8.6%	1	0.8%
I-House	141	41.0%	58	47.2%
Shotgun	1	0.4%	1	0.8%

*many properties reflect more than one style. Table reflects number of styles present not properties

Historic properties surveyed within this study fell into all temporal periods as identified in the State Plan (Ames et. al. 1989). The majority of properties surveyed (54.2 percent) fell into the 1880-1940 period (148 examples). The second largest temporal group was 1830-1880 (83 examples, 30.4 percent). Thirty-five properties fell into the period of 1940+ (12.8 percent). A few historic properties were identified as falling within the earlier temporal periods 1630-1830, but these amounted to only 7 examples, 2.6 percent (Table 5). A comparison of the temporal periods of surveyed versus eligible properties indicates a bias in favor of older structures within the corridor which is in keeping with their diminishing numbers.

TABLE 5				
Historic Properties by Temporal Period				
Sussex East-West Corridor				
Sussex County, Delaware				
	All Properties		Eligible Properties	
1630-1730	1	0.4%	1	0.8%
1730-1770	1	0.4%	1	0.8%
1770-1830	5	1.8%	4	3.4%
1830-1880	83	30.4%	53	44.9%
1880-1940	148	54.2%	51	43.2%
1940+	35	12.8%	8	6.8%

A variety of functional categories are also well represented within the project corridor. The most abundant type of building is domestic in origin. Nearly sixty percent of the buildings surveyed fall into the "dwelling" or "dwelling complex" category. Many of the properties designated as dwelling/dwelling complex may have at one time been part of agricultural complexes. Properties in this category include houses that, at the time of the survey, had no extant outbuildings associated with agricultural pursuits. These features of the landscape may account for the surprisingly low percentage of "Agricultural Complexes." Only seventeen percent of the properties surveyed were classified as "Agricultural Complexes." Other functional categories included "Tenant/Worker Dwellings," 4.4 percent; "Schools," 2 percent; "Churches," 2 percent; "Cemeteries," 2 percent; "Agricultural Outbuildings," 2 percent; and "Bridges," 1.7 percent. A variety of other functional types were found but in limited numbers (Table 6).

TABLE 6

Functions Present*
Sussex East-West Corridor
Sussex County, Delaware

Function	All Properties		Eligible Properties	
Multiple	1	0.3%	0	0.0%
Community	1	0.3%	1	0.8%
Dwelling	47	16.0%	14	11.0%
Dwelling Complex	126	42.9%	42	33.1%
Tenant/worker Dwell	13	4.4%	11	8.7%
Domestic Outbuilding	1	0.3%	1	0.8%
Agricultural Complex	50	17.0%	32	25.2%
Agri. Outbuilding	6	2.0%	2	1.6%
Mill Complex	1	0.3%	0	0.0%
Warehouse	3	1.0%	1	0.8%
Service Business	1	0.3%	0	0.0%
Retail Store	12	4.1%	6	4.7%
Community Center	1	0.3%	0	0.0%
Service Station	3	1.0%	3	2.4%
Restaurant/Diner	2	0.7%	2	1.6%
Judicial/Govt Building	1	0.3%	1	0.8%
School	6	2.0%	2	1.6%
Church/Meetinghouse	6	2.0%	3	2.4%
Cemetery	6	2.0%	4	3.1%
Bridge	5	1.7%	0	0.0%
Public Works	1	0.3%	1	0.8%
Park	1	0.3%	1	0.8%

*many properties reflect more than one function. Table reflects number of functions present not properties

A comparison of eligible functional types to those surveyed provides a measure of the types of properties that continue to reflect the development of Sussex County's cultural landscape. The majority of functional type percentages are fairly similar between surveyed and eligible categories. Only four categories reflect significant differences. Dwelling and Dwelling Complexes constitute nearly sixty percent of the functional types surveyed, but represent only forty-four percent of the eligible types. Only one third of the properties surveyed are eligible. In contrast, Agricultural Complexes constitute 17 percent of the functional types surveyed, but represent 25.2 percent of the eligible types. Sixty-four percent of these properties are eligible. Similarly, Tenant/Worker Dwellings constitute 4.4 percent of the surveyed properties and 8.7 percent of the eligible types. Eighty-five percent of these properties are eligible. These numbers reflect the lack of integrity of many of the dwelling/dwelling complexes, as well as the low number of intact agricultural complexes and tenant dwellings remaining within the study corridor.

Anticipated vs. Actual Results. Table 6 provides a basis for comparison of the resources not only within the study corridors, but also allows for a comparison between the types of resources that were anticipated based on the background research and State Plan, and those which were found. The results of the Location Level Architectural Survey did vary somewhat from what was anticipated based upon the background materials presented in the State Plan (Herman et. al. 1989; Ames et. al. 1989). Agriculture is the dominant theme in the history and development of Sussex County, from the seventeenth century through the present. The built environment revolves around that central theme. Domestic architecture is almost unilaterally tied to the agricultural landscape. Houses are characterized by wealth and class: large land-owner dwellings, farm manager dwellings, and a series of smaller tenant houses. It is possible that some of the smallest tenant houses found during the survey were slave dwellings that were converted to tenant use after emancipation. The architectural type chosen by all classes for use in domestic construction was first the Chesapeake Bay Vernacular model, commonly found across the region during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (eleven examples of this type of dwelling were found during the survey). This style evolved into the I-house during the eighteenth century, and became the dominant dwelling style throughout Sussex County into the twentieth century (141 examples of this type of dwelling were identified during the survey).

The I-house is not a recognized architectural type in the State Plan. It is not described as either a plan or style in Appendix C, Catalogue of Property Types (Ames et. al. 1989:147). However, the building form is a pervasive element on the landscape and is commonly accepted by numerous architectural historians as a dominant dwelling form spreading from the Chesapeake Bay settlement hearth (Kniffen 1986; Glassie 1968; Noble 1984; McAlester and McAlester 1984). Although finishes and plans may vary across the type, the basic form as defined by Kniffen remains constant.

According to the Bureau of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's *Defined Function, Style and Material Computer Codes*, draft 1990, the only architectural type that could have been utilized when describing I-houses was "vernacular" with a variety of applied details depending upon the period. It was felt that utilizing the term "vernacular" served little purpose and did not convey a sense of the appearance of the building being described. The priority in utilizing a descriptive term for the architectural style of a historic property should be the ability of the reader to ascertain the general appearance of the building from that term. "Vernacular" is a fairly subjective category, and to one reader may suggest a building totally different from the one actually being surveyed. I-house, for the most part, refers to a known and generally accepted architectural style, that is not easily confused with other styles.

It was not expected, based upon the preliminary background materials, that the I-house would have been such a pervasive dwelling form for such an extended period of time. The I-house represents forty-one percent of the total number of historic properties found during the course of the study. The lack of other domestic architectural styles could be due to a number of factors. First, the project corridor was fairly isolated during a large period of time, with settlement during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries limited in scope to the eastern and western edges. Waves of immigration and rapid growth were not the scheme in Sussex County during that period, and thus access to a varied architectural repertoire would have been limited. Second, the maintenance of a conservative tiered system of agriculture (major landowner, farm manager, tenant farmers, slaves) through the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries did not support changes in domestic architecture. As these patterns continued from generation to generation, houses would be built similar to those with which the people were familiar. Although crops changed over time, the traditional relationships and practices were retained, as was the limited domestic architectural vocabulary.

It should be noted, however, that a detailed study of individual dwellings may reveal stylistic elements from the Georgian and Federal periods, primarily around entryways. Interior finishes and decorative elements may also be a means of evaluating the influence of "current" fashionable architectural trends on the traditional housing types utilized during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries within the project corridor. The basic domestic architectural form during this period, however, rarely varied from the steady progression of Chesapeake Bay Vernacular to I-house design.

One of the primary anticipated property types was agricultural outbuildings. It was felt at the outset of the project that the presence or absence of support structures would be a key factor in the significance of historic agricultural properties. This was the case, but the majority of the buildings in the corridor were, at one time, associated with agriculture, and had a number of outbuildings. Thus, significance could not be clearly supported or dismissed based upon this factor. However, the presence of outbuildings was a contributing factor in determining significance.

It was difficult, during the course of the study, to categorize the development of agricultural outbuildings within Sussex County. Few buildings appear to remain from the earliest periods of settlement, and only a small number may date to the first half of the nineteenth century. It appears that agricultural outbuildings were, as discussed in the State Plan (Herman et. al. 1989; Ames et. al. 1989), of an impermanent nature for a substantial period of time. However, due to the large amount of alterations to many of the outbuildings associated with agricultural properties, it was difficult during the study to ascertain the original appearance, function, and age of the majority of these important resources. Further work is necessary to develop a more accurate picture of the development of these buildings and structures within Sussex County, for they are integral in understanding its rich agricultural history.

It was also impossible, due to limitations inherent in a Location Level Study, to determine the different types of agricultural buildings and their functions. Changes in the patterns of agriculture in Sussex County were probably reflected in adaptations of the outbuildings and support structures. Farms evolved over time, and could have produced tobacco, grains, corn, dairy products, vegetables, fruits, and poultry. These changes would have been reflected in the outbuildings associated with the farms. For the purposes of this study, only the presence or absence of these structures was noted, with brief descriptions of their apparent current uses. Additional study would be necessary to detail the evolutionary nature of the outbuildings, and associated structural and design changes necessitated by shifts in agricultural practices.

It was expected that a variety of other types of historic properties would be represented during the study. These properties would fall into the other historic themes and contexts discussed in the State Plan. A number of churches, schools, commercial establishments, and

community buildings were identified during the study. However, the vast majority of historic properties within the corridor were intimately linked with agriculture: farm dwellings and agricultural outbuildings. Some dwellings were associated with the theme of suburbanization. This context deserves additional study for its relationship to rural areas like Sussex County, and how suburbanization patterns outside of smaller towns compares to that for urbanized areas like Wilmington and Newark.

It was anticipated that few properties would be found that dated to the seventeenth, eighteenth, or early nineteenth centuries due to the impermanent nature of the architecture and the relatively late date of more intensive settlement of Sussex County. Less than four percent of the properties in the county were expected to date to a pre-1830s period (Catts, Custer, Hoseth 1991). The data from the present study indicates that 2.6 percent of the historic properties date from the pre-1830s. A slightly lower percentage than anticipated. Catts, Custer and Hoseth (1991) indicate that sixty-six percent of the structures recorded in BAHF files date to the 1880-1940 period. According to our analysis, fifty-four percent of the properties appear to date to the 1880-1945 period. If post 1945 properties are included with those from the 1880-1940 period, the percentage from the survey (sixty-seven percent) matches that suggested by Catts, Custer, and Hoseth. The lack of specific stylistic detailing on these buildings makes accurate dating difficult. Additional study is necessary to develop a methodology for dating I-houses that lack external decoration. It may be necessary to do a complete deed search on each eligible property in order to ascertain a possible period of construction. This amount of research is outside of the scope of this Location Level Architectural Study. However, based upon comparative materials (McAlester and McAlester 1984; Glassie 1968; Kniffen 1986; Noble 1984), the majority of the I-houses located within the corridor date to the nineteenth century, with a few possibly dating to the eighteenth century. The results of the study, in this respect, differ substantially from what was anticipated as it would appear that the majority of the built environment within the project corridor dates to the nineteenth century.

Research Questions. Four research questions were postulated during the initial research design phase of the project. CHRS attempted to address each of the questions through the results of this study. The role of agriculture was studied, and was determined to be a defining factor in the development of the built environment within the project corridor. The majority of the historic properties located have some tie to agriculture, either currently or through past uses of the property. Seventeen percent of the historic properties within the corridor were identified as agriculture complexes. Also, many of the dwellings in the study area were probably agriculturally related as well. Additional research is necessary to more accurately detail how changes in agricultural practices in Sussex County are reflected in its buildings and structures.

A second research question that was developed was the role of the transportation network and its influence on development within the corridor. Research has revealed that changes in the transportation network had a tremendous effect on the economic and social development within the corridor, and was a guiding factor in settlement patterns. Settlement was guided by the transportation network: first by rivers and creeks, later by early roads, railroads, and finally, modern (1929+) highway construction. Industrial development was constrained by the limits of the transportation facilities, with only a few mills and forges constructed, and only on the waterways. Agriculture was also subject to the limitations of transportation, and was revolutionized after the coming of the railroads in the 1850s. Finally, modern highway development, occurring after the invention of the automobile, transformed the landscape. Highway development brought commercial roadside development, spurring suburban development, and supporting the growing truck farming practices that began with the railroads. Thus, transportation changes had a major impact on all aspects of development within the project corridor.

A third research question was the effect of settlement patterns on the built environment within the corridor. It is clear that settlement of this section of Sussex County took place from

the east and west concurrently. Early European groups were developing the eastern coast around Lewes and slowly moving westward, while a second focus of development spread from the Nanticoke River and its tributaries into the western section of the corridor. This pattern of movement continued through the eighteenth century. The selection of Georgetown as the county seat in 1791 marked the joining of the two settlement patterns. However, the strong influence of the Chesapeake Bay region permeated the central and western portions of the corridor, for travel and trade were intimately linked by drainages and roads leading into Maryland. Domestic architecture through the corridor into the early twentieth century was primarily defined by the early English settlers who brought the traditional Chesapeake Bay vernacular dwelling style into the region. This style formed the foundation for the eighteenth and nineteenth century I-house. Thus, the dominant architectural theme found in the project corridor was directly related to the settlement pattern. Additional research is necessary to detail the effects of later settlement influences on the architecture in the corridor. For example, did migrant workers bring an architectural vocabulary with them, or did they absorb and utilize the local patterns?

The fourth research question raised during the research design was how the economic and social history of Sussex County was reflected in the historic properties within the corridor. The limited research carried out during the Location Level Study revealed the dominant role of agriculture in the development of the region. For the most part, economic prosperity of individual landowners and farm managers was tied to the land. Wealthier landowners appear to have built larger houses. However, detailed research has not been carried out to assess if this is actually true. Tax assessments, censuses, and will and probate records would have to be studied to develop an accurate context to evaluate the relative wealth of property owners. This material would then have to be compared with records available for tenant farmers and laborers to confirm the theory. Based upon the information gathered during this study, it seems likely that economic standing was reflected in the dwellings constructed, and that economic position and social position were almost synonymous. In addition, the wealthier and more prosperous the farm, the larger the number of outbuildings that would be found on or adjacent to the farm. Again, the lack of detailed information on the outbuildings within the corridor makes it difficult to support this statement.

Recommendations. It is hoped that the background historical materials gathered during this project, as well as the architectural historical materials can be integrated into the *Delaware Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan* (Ames et. al. 1989) and its companion volume *Historic Context Master Reference and Summary* (Herman et. al. 1989). The documents are useful in providing a general overview, although, their wide scope limited their specific applicability. Integrating the preservation priorities discussed in both volumes into this study proved challenging. It does seem that there is an inherent bias in the State Plan toward the northern section of the state. Although urban areas of Delaware, and coastal resort areas, are under heavy developmental pressure and are losing historic resources, so is the interior of Sussex County and the Lower Peninsula/Cypress Swamp Zone. The architecture of Sussex County is notably different from Kent and New Castle counties, with an extremely strong tie to the Chesapeake Bay and southern influences. This tie dates from the seventeenth century and is reflected in the built environment still present. It is hoped that the rich cultural heritage detailed during this study can be incorporated into the fabric of Delaware's history.

The use of multiple property submissions and historic districts are effective means to group significant related historic properties. The analysis of the distribution of the contributing properties within each submission across the study corridor proved of varied usefulness. Further comparative analysis of the data is necessary to evaluate the distributions of the contributing properties within each submission in comparison with the total number of similar resources across the corridor.

It is recommended that multiple property submissions be more frequently utilized as a tool in historic structure surveys, based upon its useful application during this study. It is an excellent method for combining similar resources with their significant historic context, thus presenting a comprehensive nomination of important properties, all linked thematically.

It was determined, during the course of this study, that a number of areas deserve additional research. Almost all of the proposed historic districts require substantial amounts of background research to confirm their eligibility. During this study, only enough information to suggest possibly significant areas was gathered. Additional research would include accessing deeds, wills, tax assessments, and other primary materials to more accurately detail the histories and significances of these historic districts. Additional research is necessary to develop a more complete background history of all of the significant historic properties. The assessment of eligibility utilized within this study is based, primarily, upon external appearance. Thus, architectural significance is the principal category of importance. The individual historic properties were not, for the most part, evaluated according to National Register Criteria A, B, or D. To assess eligibility against these categories, substantial background research would be necessary. Additional research would also lead to the ability to determine boundaries for the eligible historic properties. Within the scope of a Location Level Study, it is impossible to determine any boundaries for significant properties. To establish boundaries, complete property mapping would also be necessary for all of the eligible properties.

It is recommended that the additional research necessary to clarify the historic context of districts and individual properties and the determination of property boundaries be undertaken after the preferred alternative is selected. An Evaluation Level Historic Resources Survey should be performed within the areas of impact for the preferred alternative in order to document the elements that are not present in the Location Level Study. Design plans for the preferred alternative should attempt to avoid, when possible, the eligible historic properties. If any properties can not be avoided, steps should be taken to minimize and/or mitigate the impacts whenever possible.