

**Barratts Chapel Road Improvements  
S.R. 1 to McGinnis Pond Road  
Kent County, Delaware  
Final Phase II Historic Architectural Resource Survey  
Response to Comments Summary**

**DeIDOT Comments on Phase II Historic Architectural Resource Survey  
For Barratt's Chapel Road Improvements  
October 1, 2008 (Michael Hahn)**

- General: Take the Skelly and Loy Logo off each page: ok on title page and to use in Figure foldouts. The DRAFT watermark and the Skelly and Loy logo have been removed from the report.
- Page 4, reword last sentence: .... Barratt's Chapel was determined. (Note: we never re-evaluated the boundary since one was never developed in the first place) Section 1.3 was removed per other comments. The wording was changed in Section 4.3.1.
- Figures 12 and 13 need a date of the aerial. All others are dated, except for these. We indicate current conditions, but this would mean 2008 which it may not. Just be specific. The source information has been added to figures 12 and 13. The maps were current in 2008.
- Page 31 or the entire write-up for K-2749: Is there a photo of the root cellar? Would this be .003 and not the modern shed. Please fix. When we attempted to take a better photo of the root cellar structure in 2009, we found that it was no longer extant. The root cellar has been removed from the discussion of the resource at 4.3.11 and deleted from the CRS forms.
- On all 2008 DataMIL and 1937 photographs, we need a different color highlight (white with dark photo) or use arrows to better point to the property. Most are centered but with some small properties, its actually hard to pin-point which one. Many maps are difficult to actually see the delineation of the tax or property parcel that was evaluated. Address as needed as some are ok. The tax parcels have been outlined in red for contrast.
- Page 145, K-1689 W.S. Fountain Agricultural Complex. Need a draft NR eligible form. Now would be good, so we might include in this draft. Or we defer and use under second submission. Ultimately, the final NR form version goes with the final report. The K-01689 draft eligibility form was sent to DeIDOT on July 6, 2010 and revised per comments dated July 8, 2010. It is included as Appendix C of this report.
- All in all very comprehensive assessment; provided information based on the best research as deeds and deed tracking is difficult. Explained the unknowns and uncertain which was good.

## Email 11-24-2008 from SHPO (Joan Larrivee)

### General:

- Report fails to indicate where the data (forms, photos) will be filed. A sentence has been added to Section 1 with the filing location.
- Section 4.3 as well as Table 1 and the forms in Section 5 [Appendix A] should be in numeric order. The resources in Section 4.3, Table 1, and Appendix A have been reordered numerically.
- Deconstruction clause is included inconsistently. If it is to be called for in all properties built prior to 1900, then why is it not mentioned for K-2749 or K-2748? The deconstruction clause was used in cases where there were unknowns or uncertainties about the building techniques of pre-1900 structures (especially for vernacular buildings). In these instances, it is possible that the controlled deconstruction of the structure might yield important information that is not documented elsewhere. In the cases of K-02749 and K-02748, the houses (though altered) follow well-documented building traditions and styles and are not likely to yield new information through their possible deconstruction.
- For properties where there are a number of outbuildings (such as K-2746, K-2739, K-1689), it would be helpful to have a site plan showing their location in relationship to the house. Site plans have been added to the text for these three properties.
- If the properties were actually tenanted in 1868 – should this be noted in the name? The name of resource K-02750 has been changed to reflect its use as a tenant house. Other properties with suspected tenant activity have not been converted based on DeIDOT comments from 6-3-2009.
- If it is a Beers name, are we noting it? The historical overview sections discuss the disposition of the properties on the Beers map. It is not generally indicated in the name.

### K-2748:

- The text says that this was the tenant property of Joseph Tracey yet the name is J.B. Tracy which is the way it is listed in Beers – should this difference be clarified in text? They are the same person. A clarification has been added to the text.
- This is noted on the 20<sup>th</sup> century maps as Lexington Mill (it is not named on Beers) but it is made clear in the text that it went by a number of other names – Nichols Mill, Virden Mill, McGinnis Mill – should these names be included in parentheses? The house itself is not really called Lexington Mill – there is a property elsewhere called Lexington Mill Farm. The name has been changed to the J.B. Tracy House/Miller's House to more accurately reflect the current nature of the historic property.
- I am not sure that the house standing today is the same one that was there in 1868 -- or if it is, it has been radically altered. Nothing in its current style reflects this date. Text indicates that it is the same house that was there then. Based on physical inspection of the house, we believe that the radically altered building was built ca. 1865.
- There is a mill site on this property – it indicates that it is not eligible but it could be eligible archaeologically – shouldn't this be acknowledged? The text has been revised to reflect that the site could be eligible archaeologically.

### K-2750:

- This is another property noted as being owned by J.B. Tracy in 1868 but he did not live there; it was a tenant property. Ellen Jerome purchased in 1874. For her it was also a tenant property. Should tenant house be included as part of the name? This property has been renamed the Jerome Tenant House (J.B. Tracy Tenant House)

K-2747:

- A street address should be able to be obtained for this property. The address has been added.
- Why is this property called the Godwin Farm? I understand that Isaac Godwin owned it in 1859 and he was a wealthy farmer. But the Beers owner, Virgil Grinnell, is not mentioned (even in parentheses) and why is it not an Agricultural complex? The property is now called the Godwin Farm/Jones Agricultural Complex. The Godwin Farm name has been retained from the original survey form. Since the extant structures postdate both Godwin's and Grinnell's ownership, it did not seem appropriate to add Grinnell's name. Jones is believed to be the owner at the time of the construction of the farmhouse.
- The description of this property is pretty abbreviated and could use a little more detail. The description has been expanded.
- I do not see any outward expression of a mid-19<sup>th</sup> century house – it is well concealed if there. We agree that this is most likely a ca. 1905 house. Because of its vernacular traditions and awkward proportions, it is difficult to date securely. This date fits both the physical and historical evidence.

K-7603:

- Should this be labeled as a mobile home rather than a dwelling? (only the garage is pre-1962). The resource name has been changed to Mobile Home.

K-2746:

- This property needs a street address. The address has been added.
- Why not called agricultural complex? Agricultural Complex has been added to the name.

K-2739:

- A useful addition to the supporting documentation would be the DeIDOT 1938 road plan. This figure has been added.

**Email 6-6-2009 from DeIDOT (Michael Hahn)**

- ...verifying tenancy may be a more difficult & an added hourly task that would not make a direct difference in the overall integrity and significance of the propert...As discussed with SHPO, please don't get held up on discussing project development alternatives proposals, timings of construction, the APE, and other variables that do not factor into an architectural survey. They are always outdated and somewhat incorrect anyway...No additional research was conducted to verify tenancy. Section 1.0 has been revised. The sections on project purpose and need, project description, and area of potential effects have been replaced by a general introduction.

**Email 3-17-2010 from DeIDOT (Michael Hahn)**

- Three hard copies would consist of two bounded and one unbounded with all CRS forms as well. We are submitting two bound and one unbound copy of the report. All copies include the appendixes with the CRS forms. We are also submitting three compact discs (cdfs) with the report in .pdf format: one for the prime, one for DeIDOT, and one for SHPO.

- The first task is the NR draft nomination from for W.C. Fountain property. Upon comments and circulation with DE SHPO and DeIDOT, this nomination (along with addressing any comments) would be revised and then included with the revised overall CRS revised/final report. This way it's all one package. The eligibility form was submitted for comment on July 6, 2010 and has been revised in response to DeIDOT comments dated July 8, 2010 (see below). It is included as Appendix C of the report.
- PDF cd is the final product. Please make sure, per SHPO requirements, this is a CD Read only. This would also include CRS forms. The photos are probably going to be in a different format – see below. The three cds will be CD Read only. They will include the CRS forms. Because the fieldwork for this project was undertaken before digital photographs were accepted by the SHPO, there are no digital photographs to submit.
- On the CRS forms, photographs are suppose to be tiff or raw format, not jpg . I have included some excerpts from the SHPO's policy since we went digital on the photos. The photographs for this report were all taken with 35mm black and white film and will be submitted under the standards that apply to 35 mm photographs.

**Email about K-01689 Eligibility Form from 7-8-2010 from DeIDOT (Michael Hahn)**

- Page 5, second to last line from the bottom: "The historical". There is a character space on his torical. The space does not appear on our versions. We will double check the text before resubmitting.
- Figure 2: Source is Microsoft 2010? Can this reference be clearer? Was it Microsoft Maps, 2010. It sounds too generic. The full reference is included in the reference list. Because this was the recommended citation format given at the source, we have not changed it.
- If so, I would word the last under Section number 2 Page 2 as:

The W.C. Fountain is recommended eligible under Criterion D. Because the surviving dwelling from the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries are commonly rare, the house will likely yield information on historic building techniques not readily available or documented from other sources. Deconstruction and demolition may further reveal that the resource contained information important to the understanding of vernacular architecture traditions. If the building is to be demolished, moved, or renovated as part of a project, it should be evaluated by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect. Selective demolition should be used to fully determine and conclude that the property is eligible under NRHP Criteria D and it has important information to yield. Should the property be reaffirmed as significant by the qualified architectural historian or historic architect, it should be fully documented prior to demolition (check demolition). We have reworded the paragraph to include this language.