

## Chapter 3

# Historical and Cultural Resources Inventory

---

New Garden has a rich and diverse heritage that is reflected in the historic and cultural resources. The preservation of these historic resources is essential to establish a community bond from past generations to future generations. Since these resources are not renewable, it is essential to recognize their value and promote a plan that is based upon fundamental principles in an effort to preserve, protect, and enhance their presence within the community.

New Garden's character is intrinsically linked to its past. The Township's history and cultural development are integrated in its landscapes, and can be seen in the village areas and neighborhoods. Many of the historic buildings remain in their original settings and contribute to the interesting historical nature of the Township. The preservation of New Garden's historic resources lends to its sense of place and unique character.

The purpose of this chapter is to evaluate the status of historic preservation in the Township. In order to develop strategies that are realistic to implement, it is necessary to first recognize the existing state of historic preservation in the community. This begins with an overview of the Township's history, a review of historic resources, the legal basis for historic preservation, and the implications of this background information. These implications are essentially the major preservation issues facing New Garden. The historic preservation plan for the township is derived from the analysis and the implications.

## HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Understanding the history of New Garden is vitally important to community planning for two major reasons. First, historic resources such as buildings, structures, hedgerows, and stone walls possess a quality of historical and architectural significance and character which makes them worthy of protection and preservation. Second, the events and personalities that helped form the character of the municipality are important to obtain a complete understanding of the true heritage of the Township. This section, while by no means a complete history, focuses on aspects of the historical background of New Garden that bear a direct influence on planning for the future.

The following historical information was derived from several sources: Ann Hagerty, Once Upon a Time in New Garden Township, May 1977; Futhey and Cope, History of Chester County; Open Space, Recreation, and Environmental Resources Plan, New Garden Township, 1993; and New Garden Comprehensive Plans, 1981 and 1993. Other information may be obtained at the Chester County Historical Society, the Chester County Historic Preservation Office, or the Chester County Archives.

The first human inhabitants of the New Garden area were the Lenni-Lenape Indians. The Lenni-Lenape, whose name means "Original People", were also known as the Delawares, but only accepted this name when they learned it was that of a great white chief, Lord de la Warr. One major settlement, Minguannan, was located near London Tract Church in London Britain Township. Another lesser settlement was situated east of Toughkenamon on the hill overlooking the Toughkenamon Valley. A burial ground of this settlement is said to exist near Sharp Road, but the site has never been excavated. These settlements were well established for the time, consisting of about a half a dozen long houses, sometimes clustered and sometimes scattered, to form their central village. The Lenni Lenape migrated to hunting lands in the autumn and returned in the spring to plant crops in the small fields that adjoined their villages.

The Quakers were the first European inhabitants to the area. A good relationship existed between the Indians and the Quakers. Without the knowledge and assistance of the Indians, the Quakers might not have survived the hardships of the new land. It is also believed that Lenni Lenape are buried in the New Garden Meeting Cemetery. Therefore, below ground historic resources exist throughout the Township.

### **Township Formation**

The lands within the Township were part of a survey of 30,000 acres conducted by Henry Hollingsworth for William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania, in 1699. The surveyed land, about 30,000 acres was to be distributed to the children of Penn, William Jr. and Letitia. William Jr. received a patent on May 24, 1706 for 14,500 acres and Letitia received the remaining 15,500 acres. William Jr.'s land included 8,913 acres in what is today New Garden Township and 5,587 acres in Mill Creek Hundred, New Castle County, Delaware. The lands of Letitia included the area now known as Kennett Square and its surroundings. The entire holdings of William Jr. and Letitia were known as "Manor of Stenning", named after Steyning Hundred in Sussex, England. New Garden Township, before losing a corner to London Britain Township, consisted of the lands north of the "Circular Line" included in William Jr.'s land manor.

Before William Penn Jr. obtained the patent to his land, he appointed Griffith Owen, James Logan, and Robert Ashton as his attorneys. Penn was returning to England and wished that his appointed representatives sell his land. The land was not immediately taken by settlers, but after a few years several families of Friends arrived from Ireland, and upon settling there, gave the name of New Garden to the area. This became the first permanent settlement in New Garden Township and was founded in 1712. The name was most likely suggested by John Lowden, a noted minister in the Society of Friends. Lowden suggested the name in remembrance of the New Garden Meeting in County Carlow, Ireland, from which he had come.

### **Early Settlement Patterns**

The first sale of land occurred in 1708, involving a parcel of 700 acres lying just below Toughkenamon, which was purchased by Mary Rowland. In 1712, Gayen Miller purchased 700 acres, while in 1713 conveyances of land were granted to John Miller, James Lindley, John Lowden, James Starr, Michael Lightfoot, William Halliday, Joseph Hutton, Abraham Marshall, and Thomas Jackson, and in 1714 to Thomas Garnett and Joseph Sharp. However, many of these landowners had settled on the land one or two years before receiving their titles. Of the approximately thirty (30) families who first settled in New Garden Township, twenty (20) were Irish Friends.

In 1714, John Rentfro was appointed constable for New Garden, although he probably lived in what is now London Grove Township, which was assessed with New Garden until 1723. Some of the settlers in what is now London Britain were taxed as "inhabitants adjacent to New Garden" for some years prior to 1723. By 1722, the assessment included 92 landowners and 20 "adjacent" taxpayers. In 1724, the number of taxable properties was reduced to 25, due to the tax structure being revised to include only the Township proper. By 1753, the number of taxables had grown to 57 with the first mention of freemen occurring, having 4 listed in that year. A "freeman" at that time was an unmarried male over the age of 21 that did not own property.

Fifty percent of the White immigrants and a very small number of Negroes entered the United States between 1720 and 1776 as indentured laborers, with the largest percentage found in Pennsylvania. Those few slaves who were owned by Quakers in Pennsylvania were freed by 1776. They entered through the Port of Philadelphia, and were the main source of farm help until long after the Revolution. The demand for them increased yearly and more and more people, especially Quaker farmers, steadily opposed slavery. Undoubtedly, many citizens entered the Township as indentured laborers or apprentices.

Early parcel ownership has greatly dictated the shape of the Township's current land use patterns. The Breous Farm Atlas shows property line designations, location of early farm buildings, and other important structures in 1883. Many property lines from this period still exist or are still apparent through remaining hedgerows. This is a setting that is unique to very few communities and an integral part of the heritage of the Township.

### **Roadways**

Most roads in the Township started as trails used by the Indians, and later by settlers moving into or through New Garden. A sparse network of roads was then created along property lines to connect the early farms to one another and to more commercialized areas. This set of early roads was designed to serve farm-related traffic, and thus are comprised of winding, narrow lanes. By 1883, the current Township road network was in place.

There are several roads in the Township that are significant to past as well as current development. Gap and Newport Pike, Route-41, remains a major connecting road between Harrisburg, Pennsylvania and Wilmington, Delaware. Baltimore Pike, which brings travelers through Toughkenamon and the boroughs of southern Chester County, was the most widely used road in the Township until the new US Route-1 was completed in the mid 1960's. Before it was known as Baltimore Pike it was known as State Road and Philadelphia and Baltimore Road. The length of State Road (Baltimore Pike) between Avondale and West Grove was constructed out of stone some time before 1905 while the length in New Garden remained dirt. Newark Road, from the Mill at Doe Run to the Meeting House at New Garden was blazed in 1710, is also of historic importance. The name has changed over the years from New Ark Road. Newark Road helped to create the main intersection in Toughkenamon. It also helped to provide access to the area of the Township where Lowden and the other Friends, established the first settlement. The majority of the remaining roads were developed along early property lines and to connect areas without access to the major roads. Many of these roads bear the names of the early settlers.

### **Rail Lines**

Mass transportation is not new to New Garden. Three rail lines and a trolley line serviced the Township during the nineteenth century. These lines helped to shape the early industrial and cultural features of the Township, and influenced the concentration of development along Baltimore Pike. The first rail service started after a public meeting in 1853 regarding the construction of railroad from Baltimore to Philadelphia by way of West Chester. The first train to Toughkenamon came through in 1860, and this line continues to function today.

The Wilmington and Western Railroad followed the White Clay Creek to Landenberg and in the beginning it was planned to connect with the Philadelphia and Baltimore Central Railroad. The railroad served the various mills along the White Clay. The Wilmington and Western Railroad was completed in 1872 and was met with much public support. The rail line did well for a few years until it fell under financial stress. It was then purchased and reorganized under the name of the Delaware Western Railroad. The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Corporation acquired it on February 1, 1883. It was used for both passenger and freight use for many decades until it was closed for good in 1942.

The trolley line from Kennett Square to Oxford was completed in 1906, and was known as the Wilmington, Kennett, and Oxford Trolley. This line ran on the north side of Baltimore Pike and caused much anguish. In December of 1907, after a train had blocked the roadway, the Township Supervisors decided to eliminate the problem by tearing up the line. Rail workers replaced the line and the supervisors removed it the same evening again. The rail workers went to replace the lines the next day and held their position firm. The Township Supervisors rallied support from the public and took over the position.

### Historic Villages

Toughkenamon: Toughkenamon sprang from modest beginnings. The Hammer and Trowel Inn that operated under several different names, was built sometime prior to 1745. The building was located along the Philadelphia and Baltimore Road that was built in 1737, known as Baltimore Pike. A store was built in 1836, and then a house, for years these were the only buildings at the crossroads of Newark Road and the Baltimore Pike. Toughkenamon's hey day was from about 1835 to 1880 and the boom was owed to the Philadelphia & Baltimore Central Railroad.

Isaac Slack, the "father of Toughkenamon" knew that the proposed route for the railroad lay through the Toughkenamon Valley, although no stop was planned. Nevertheless he began to buy land and even before the railroad came, built two factories, a spoke mill and a lumber mill. Because his business depended on a railroad stop, he built a station and donated the surrounding land to the Railroad. His persuasion finally prevailed; and the railroad which began to operate in 1855, adding Toughkenamon as a regular stop in 1863. By 1870, the population was close to 300. In addition to Slack's factories, a boys and girls boarding school was established, industries included a casket-maker's shop, a wheelwright's, a feldspar mill and in 1882, a creamery. Isaac Slack invested in the Village, shepherded fledgling business, and promoted Toughkenamon for over 25 years; all this despite his own financial reverses.

After its initial manufacturing phase, Toughkenamon became a center for dairy products, and greenhouse culture of tomatoes and carnations. After 1920 and to the present time, however, a majority of businesses became related to the mushroom industry.

Chandlerville: This village originated in approximately 1820 by Enoch Chandler who was a forefather of the milling operations in Chandlerville (now Landenberg). Enoch Chandler owned and probably operated a grist and sawmill within the village of Chandlerville. Chandler owned a series of mills and after his death ownership changed many times. Chandlerville Post Office was established in 1848. The earliest mill was located in nearby Laurel in 1811.

Landenberg: The village came about when Martin Landenberger bought three woolen mills; the Chandlerville mill from Joseph Ripka, the Laurel mill from Joseph Fisher, and the Nobleville mill. All of these mills were located along the White Clay Creek in the southwestern corner of the Township. Under the direction of Landenberger, the mills flourished and Chandlerville experienced growth like it had never seen before. Landenberger built many houses for his employees in Chandlerville. In 1869, it had a population of 1000 people and was one of the largest places in the county. It was at that time considered a major industrial center of Chester County. In 1904 the name was changed to Landenberg. The 1880's were difficult times for Landenberger. The year started fine, but soon because of an economic slowdown, it was necessary to slow mill operations down and in September the main mill burnt to the ground. Following that, Martin Landenberger went and sold his properties to James Lund in November of 1880. Lund's operation ran sporadically in the mid 1880s and closed for good in 1912 and burnt down in 1917. This forced many people out of the community to look for work elsewhere.

New Garden Village: Although the New Garden Friends Meeting was established in 1715, the village of New Garden did not develop for some years later. The establishment of the New Garden Road by 1847 contributed to the development of the village. The first reference to a store in the village was in 1845. Additional business started, such as blacksmiths, brickyards, general stores, and a post office. New homes sprung up around these businesses, establishing New Garden as one of the more picturesque communities in the Toughkenamon Valley.

Kaolin: Kaolin derived its name from the Clay Works located in the area in the 1800s. The clay works, including 2 brickyards, 2 blacksmiths, 2 stores, a school, and meeting grounds, had become a thriving business by the late 1850s, and it was around this operation that the little community developed. The

earliest inn at Kaolin, the Allen Tavern at Sharp Road and Route 41, was constructed in the early 1700s and was operated as a successful business through most of the centuries that followed.

### **Education**

The first school building erected within the Township was of log construction built by New Garden Friends near their Meeting House in 1777. The Society of Friends were pioneers in education in Chester County. The Yearly Meeting from time to time gave earnest and practical advice relative to establishing schools, and in 1778, a year after the New Garden School was established, advised that land should be provided within the scope of each Monthly Meeting with sufficient space for a garden, orchard, grass for a cow, etc., plus a suitable house and stable be provided for a teacher of staid character and proper qualifications. It also recommended that funds be collected for establishing and supporting schools. Within the buildings, desks were provided for older children; benches without backs for the younger. A desk for the teacher, a bucket, and what was called a "pass" comprised most of the furnishings. The latter was a small paddle with the words "in" and "out" written on its opposite sides. The New Garden building had, in lieu of the large stove usually provided in the buildings, a large fireplace to furnish heat. Schools were conducted upon a subscription plan whereby parents and guardians of those who attended paid the teachers' salaries. Public schools were established in 1837 and the original subscription school continued to function until 1856.

### **Historic Industry of Prominence**

As described earlier, milling was an important industry in the early history of New Garden, particularly along the White Clay Creek. Along with the milling industry, agricultural activities were a major aspect of the Township economy. Greenhouses and dairy farming were the most important agricultural activities, and continued to be until the 1940s. Since then, the number of dairy farms has dwindled until only two currently exist in the Township, Wilkinson Farms, Inc. and Highpoint Acres owned and operated by C. Barclay Hoopes, Jr. and family.

Many businesses opened in Toughkenamon, only to close shortly thereafter, and one that lasted only a few years was the rubber mill which opened in part of a sash and frame factory. This latter factory was operated then by Harvey Lang who purchased the large steam mill on February 2, 1870. He operated the sawmill section of the mill, while George M. Thompson of Oxford operated the grist mill part. Four years earlier, the "Village Record" had reported the saw mill, operated by McQuillen, Hoopes, and Company, was doing extensive business in sawing ships' timbers. Thousands of handles for axes, picks, hatchets, etc. were made and shipped to Philadelphia, New York, Boston and other markets. Lang altered part of the mill for a hard rubber factory about 1874, and it may have been the operation of Elverson and Company, of Franklin Township, that he and T. T. Worrall set up in Toughkenamon, for it had been reported that Elverson and Company had planned to move Lang's mill, and would employ a hundred hands. By October 31st, the firm known as the "Pennsylvania Hard Rubber Company," was operating under the management of Messrs. Lang, Worrall, and William Mullee.

### **Mushroom Industry**

In the early part of the 20th century, greenhouse activities began to provide a new industrial base for the Township. This industry was spurred in large part by the number of immigrants who began to establish homes in New Garden after World War I. Charles Starr was the most well known greenhouse operator in the Township. Starr was the owner of "Pleasantville Green-houses" which were located at Starr and Penn Green Roads. He had gained state-wide recognition as a grower of tuberose and carnations.

Southeastern Pennsylvania is said to be similar to those areas where mushrooms are cultivated in Europe. The similar climate, water supply, and ample composting materials helped development of the industry. Major trade routes through the area made spawn easily acquired in the late 1800's. The scientific contributions of J.B. Swayne, the closeness of markets, and the conservative nature of the Quakers encouraged the spread of knowledge of mushroom cultivation, all aided the growth of the industry. It soon became apparent that mushrooms needed special houses in which to grow. Since fungi do not require light, the frame buildings were windowless, but an adequate ventilating system was necessary for air circulation and to provide as constant a temperature as possible. Many endeavored to make a science of mushroom culture, and a full-fledged American industry was born.

The first mushroom farms to the area were in Kennett Square. In 1890, William Sharpless and a group of others were probably the first in New Garden Township to enter the mushroom industry. They started as carnation growers and decided to try mushrooms also. They grew the mushrooms underneath the carnation beds. At first they received their spawn from England. Soon an improved brick spawn was produced in the United States. William Sharpless then entered into spawn producing in 1924. Until 1926 all mushrooms grown commercially in the United States were the brown "cream" variety in color, not the white ones to which we are accustomed today. A great event occurred in that year when a clump of white mushrooms was discovered growing in a bed of "creams". Growers immediately anticipated the commercial possibilities, for the white mushroom had more eye-appeal than previous varieties. All white mushrooms today have been propagated from this chance cluster. Mushroom farming grew into a major industry for the area in the early 1900s led by the Mushroom Supply Company in Toughkenamon. The Mushroom Supply Company was established in 1924 by Charles H. Thompson and L.F. Lambert. Another big factor that helped the growth of the industry was a new and expanded market created in 1928 by mushroom canning, particularly canning of mushroom products such as soup. About 80 percent of all mushrooms produced in the United States in the 1920s were produced in this area. The canning market, plus the increased scientific aid, helped the industry weather the Great Depression. Modern Mushroom is now the largest mushroom producer in New Garden. Originating in the early 1970s, Modern Mushroom was a fully mechanically operated facility and acted as a grower as well as a broker of mushrooms. Today, the canning market is now gone and the market is comprised of fresh mushrooms of the white and "exotic" varieties. New Garden Township produces more mushrooms than any other municipality in the United States and this has been true for many years.

### **Historic Resources**

New Garden's historical development is reflected in both its land and its buildings. Historic resources are not only architecturally significant buildings, but include all types of resources. They are categorized at the federal level as buildings, sites, structures, objects, and districts. The National Park Service (NPS), the federal agency responsible for several historic preservation programs, categorizes resources in this manner in the administration of programs such as the National Register of Historic Places. The categories are defined by the NPS as follows:

**Building:** A house, barn, church, hotel, or similar construction created principally to shelter any form of human activity.

**Site:** The location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined or vanished, where the location itself possess historic, cultural, or archaeological value.

**Structure:** A building used for purposes other than sheltering human activity.

**Object:** A form of simple construction that is primarily artistic in nature and relatively small in scale. It may be movable, but is generally associated with a specific setting or environment.

**District:** A significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of site, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

Historical surveys of locations, places of historical interest and/or architectural features need to be completed. This future planning effort will need to be a high priority since an effective historical and cultural resource plan will promote community pride, economic vitality, and tourism.

### **Historic Resource Surveys**

The National Park Service defines a survey as the “*process of gathering data on historical and physical character of the community.*” Surveys are critical to preservation because they provide for the systematic collection and organization of available data on historic resources. The purpose of the survey and future use of the data should be defined, however, before the format is finalized to ensure that it can be used as anticipated and that the maximum value is achieved.

Most surveys are undertaken to identify properties that are historically important and have contributed to cultural development of the Township or are architecturally important and retain a certain level of architectural integrity. Surveys generally target properties that are at least fifty years of age or older. The survey data are evaluated and the resulting inventory of historic resources can then be the subject of various forms of preservation efforts. Such efforts can include nomination to the National Register of Historic Places, protection through regulatory provisions of a historic preservation ordinance, or public or private restoration or rehabilitation efforts. There are two general types of surveys, preliminary and comprehensive:

#### Preliminary Survey

Municipalities throughout Chester County were surveyed between 1979 and 1981. These were considered “preliminary” or “reconnaissance” surveys as they gathered general information on the location, type, and condition of historic resources within each community. Many of these initial surveys were funded with federal dollars and have largely served as the basis for the preservation activities that have been undertaken to date.

A historic site survey in New Garden was begun, but never completed, between 1979 and 1981. Volunteers were trained in identifying and recording buildings over fifty years in age. They photographed many of the buildings, described basic architectural features, and noted general building forms. The New Garden Historic Sites Survey is on file at the Chester County Historical Society and includes mainly buildings and structures. Of the 78 resources surveyed, 7 were "Eligible" for the National Register, 2 are "Listed", and the remainder are either "Ineligible" or "Undetermined".

The identification and evaluation of historic resources is a key element of a comprehensive historic preservation program. An additional effort to identify historic resources was begun in 2003. Some 396 identified historic resources in New Garden constructed more than 50 years ago were inventoried, many of which are related to its heritage. Several periods of history are represented and are reflected in these resources dating back to the early 19<sup>th</sup> century and exhibit characteristics of that time. Changes to these resources, depending on the type and degree, should be respected as part of the evolution of the resource, unless their integrity has been severely compromised. These resources will be prioritized as to their importance to the Township and for potential for state and federal recognition.

### Comprehensive Survey

A comprehensive survey often takes place as part of a National Register nomination process. Along with a physical description, information on the historical and cultural associations is required as well. Comprehensive surveys are usually contracted to historic preservation professionals. The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC), the state agency responsible for preservation efforts, provides assistance in the preparation of comprehensive surveys. Procedures, forms, and a recommended survey format are found in the publication *Guidelines for Historic Resource Surveys in Pennsylvania*.

The PHMC format requires basic information along with current and historic names, construction dates, past and present uses, and a complete physical description of the property. A site plan of each property is also requested. A critical element of the comprehensive survey is the discussion of the historical or cultural relevance of the resource. This part of the survey links the individual building to the overall historical or cultural development of New Garden. A property's association with prominent persons that lived in the Township or played a role in its history is also documented in this survey.

During the winter of 2003-04 a graduate student from the Center for Architectural History and Design at the University of Delaware conducted an architectural documentation of the history of 15 houses in the Township. This project continues into the academic year 2004-2005 with 15 more houses to be studied. With the historical Commission researching the families who built and lived in these houses, eventually a comprehensive study of the domestic architecture in New Garden Township during the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries as well as of the families who peopled the Township will be compiled.

## **LEGAL BASIS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

The legal foundation for historic preservation activities lies in federal and state laws mandating that historic resources be considered in community planning and development. Various historic preservation programs and techniques evolved out of the public mandate and an understanding of the legal foundation is necessary for the Township to identify viable preservation approaches. An understanding of the governmental obligations associated with carrying out preservation activities using federal or state funding is also necessary since protection of historic resources is both state and national policy. The legal foundation for historic preservation is described in the following narrative and includes discussion of the Township's participation in federal and state initiatives.

### **Federal Level**

Historic preservation as federal policy formally occurred with the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966. This legislation responded to public outcry against the widespread loss of historic resources occurring in large and small cities alike in the name of urban renewal. The legislation was designed to create a comprehensive framework for protecting historic resources throughout the nation through a system of reviews, regulations and incentives that focused on preserving historic resources. The NHPA also encouraged cooperation among federal, state, and local governments in addressing the protection of historic resources. State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) were designated and assigned responsibility to coordinate preservation activities on a state-level. In Pennsylvania, this agency is the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC).

The mandates of the NHPA directly impact preservation at the municipal level. For example, it formalized the National Register of Historic Places. Section 106 of the NHPA requires that any project involving federal funds be reviewed for its impact on historic properties. The Certified Local Government program, authorized by the NHPA, provides municipalities like New Garden the opportunity

to participate directly in federal preservation programs and to access (through the state) certain funds earmarked for historic preservation activities. The following is a brief summary of key programs.

**National Register of Historic Places:** The National Register of Historic Places is a comprehensive listing of districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects of historical or cultural significance to the prehistory or history of the locality, the state, or the nation. Properties do not need to have national significance to be listed in the National Register. The listing is mainly honorary and does not affect the rights of property owners to use their property in any way. It does, however, impact the use of federal funds.

Benefits of designation include eligibility for certain types of federal funds designed to encourage preservation. The most important of these is an investment tax credit available to the owners of income-producing properties that rehabilitate their properties in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. These federal standards are intended to guide the treatment and preservation of the historic and architectural character of properties. Historic commercial buildings, as well as residential structures, could benefit from tax credits if used for income producing purposes. Properties determined eligible for the National Register are afforded many of the same benefits as actual listing.

In 2003, there were two resources in New Garden listed in the National Register of Historic Places:

**Landenberg Bridge:** The Landenberg bridge (L.R. 15017) is a 76.5' by 30' steel, lattice truss, with pin-connected members bridge over White Clay Creek in the village of Landenberg. The bridge is owned and maintained by the state and was built by Schuylkill Bridge Works of Phoenixville in 1899 and has a cantilevered sidewalk on the north side separated from the roadway by a lattice railing. The deck is timber covered with macadam. The bridge is significant because it is representative of a Pratt pony truss of moderate open length and is considered to be one of the earliest such bridges in this nomination. This bridge is also unusual in that it is one of only four bridges nominated in southeastern Pennsylvania. Most metal truss bridges, including Pratt trusses were erected in north central or southwestern Pennsylvania. The Township has been awarded a grant to rehabilitate the bridge. Once the rehabilitation is complete, the Township will assume ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the bridge.

**Merestone House:** The Merestone House property contains a five-unit complex, a guest house/garage that incorporates the ruins of an 1806 barn, a milk house, a stone shed, and a machinery shed with several attached sections. All of the buildings, except for the machinery shed built in 1941/1942, contribute to a Colonial Revival style and used for agricultural purposes as part of the larger farm until 1907. Today the buildings are part of a residential development. The house is actually located in both DE and PA and the outbuildings are all located in Delaware.

**Section 106 Review:** An important provision of the NHPA was the implementation of the Section 106 review process. This section of the Act requires that any project using federal funds be reviewed for its impact on historic resources either listed in, or determined eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places. Section 106 does not necessarily protect historic resources from demolition or alteration, but it does require that alternatives be investigated and mitigation measures be considered. All federally funded projects, programs or activities taking place in the Township are subject to this review process. This includes projects or activities funded through Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), as administered by Chester County.

**Certified Local Government Program:** A Certified Local Government (CLG) is one that meets certain criteria including adoption and enforcement of historic preservation regulations, establishment of a historical commission or similar body, and engaging in the survey of historic properties. The program is

intended to strengthen the preservation partnership among various governmental entities. Upon certification, local governments are given the opportunity to play a greater role in protecting historic resources by participating directly in the federal process. One of the most important incentives is increased access to federal preservation funds. Ten percent of each state's allocation of historic preservation funds must be passed through to CLGs.

**Investment Tax Credits for Historic Preservation:** Federal income tax credits for the rehabilitation of historic properties is an effective means of encouraging the voluntary preservation of historic buildings. Investment tax credits have been responsible for billions of dollars in the rehabilitation of historic properties. The Tax Reform Act of 1986 provides for a rehabilitation tax credit of 20 percent for the rehabilitation of certified historic structures or 10 percent for non-historic buildings constructed before 1936. A certified structure is one that is either individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places or is certified as contributing to a National Register District. The property must be used for non-residential or rental residential purposes and rehabbed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The two-step certification process required is administered by the National Park Service with the assistance of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

### **State Level**

The NHPA authorized the appointment of a State Historic Preservation Office to administer provisions of the Act at the state level. In Pennsylvania, the agency assigned this responsibility is the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC). This entity is responsible for maintaining and administering the State's sites and museums, managing the State Archives, and administering a wide variety of historic preservation programs.

**Pennsylvania History Code:** Many of the federal mandates required through NHPA are reiterated in Title 37 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, the Pennsylvania History Code. The Code pertains to the conservation, preservation, protection and management of historical and museum resources and identifies PHMC as the responsible agency. It outlines the legal basis for historic preservation in Pennsylvania and also mandates cooperation among other State entities in the identification and protection of historic and archeological resources. Preservation is also addressed in other state legislation, supplementing the provisions of the History Code.

**Pennsylvania Enabling Legislation:** There are two laws in Pennsylvania that provide the legal foundation for local historic preservation ordinances. *Act 167, the Historic District Act of 1961*, authorizes municipalities to create local historic districts and protect the historic and architectural character through regulation of the erection, reconstruction, alteration, restoration, demolition or razing of buildings within the certified local historic district. Local historic districts established under the auspices of Act 167 must be formally certified through PHMC. Municipalities are also required to appoint an historic architectural review board (HARB) to advise the local governing body on building activity in the district. *Act 247, the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code of 1968, as amended*, authorizes the use of municipal land use controls such as use regulations and area and bulk regulations to protect historic resources. The MPC specifically provides for the regulation of places having unique historical, architectural, or patriotic interest or value through the creation of a specific zoning classification. New Garden has not adopted a historic overlay zoning district to protect resources within the Township.

### **Local Level**

To aid in the identification and the preservation of important historical landmarks, the New Garden Board of Supervisors formed a Historical Commission in 1991. To promote historic preservation, New Garden has established preservation as local policy. This policy provides the "authorization" to pursue preservation

activities. By first establishing preservation as a municipal policy, the Township is able to ensure that preservation goals are broadly shared and that consensus on its importance has been reached.

Municipal policy is most effectively established in local planning documents such as the comprehensive plan. In Chester County, historic preservation is also addressed in Open Space, Recreation and Environmental Resources plans. By identifying preservation as a goal, recognizing how historic preservation relates to other community development objectives, and emphasizing the need for preservation activities, New Garden is stating that protection of historic resources is important in the community and that future municipal actions, and land use decisions in particular, will support preservation.

Implementation of the policy is the undertaking of those actions and activities determined to support preservation goals and objectives. New Garden will continue to implement a preservation policy in a number of ways. The continued efforts of the New Garden Historical Commission and the adoption of a historic overlay district in the Township's zoning ordinance are key implementation actions. Other ways in which the Township can implement its policy is by consistently seeking input from the Historical Commission on subdivision and land development proposals, adopting demolition delay wording within the zoning ordinance for historic resources, seeking National Register designation for key resources, when appropriate, and by providing information and education on the importance of local history and preservation. A preservation program should include a wide variety of actions designed to meet those goals associated with historic preservation and each action or strategy should be tailored to community objectives.

**New Garden Comprehensive Plan (1993):** The topic of historic preservation was addressed in the previous New Garden Comprehensive Plan (1993). The history of New Garden was presented in Section 3 entitled *Township History*. There were five issues identified:

- A need for the Township to inventory potential historic resources.
- Although the hands of progress are always moving forward, it is necessary to hold onto the past. Resource protection is needed as development occurs.
- Currently there are a number of programs that are available to the Township for registering resources that merit preservation. The National Historic Landmark and National Register programs are only two of the many available.
- An organized process should be instituted to assure proper treatment of these cultural resources. Steps for this process should include:
  1. Formal creation of an Historical Commission, Board of Historic Architectural Review (HARB) or both, to establish a stewardship body for the historical and cultural resources that will have input into the overall planning efforts for the Township.
  2. Identification, through field survey and research, of all structures built prior to 1950.
  3. Creation of an overlay map of the Township that shows all the identified cultural resources with their designations as either a Class I (National Register listed or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places) or a Class II (locally important) resource.
- Protection of historical and cultural resources can and should be a dynamic process that does not preclude development per se, but sets sensible design parameters for conscientious treatment of those resources. Adherence to such parameters also can provide economic benefits for developers in some circumstances (via the Federal Historic Preservation Investment Tax Credit Program for certified rehabilitation of historic structures).

## Conclusion

New Garden contains a wealth of historic resources that span over two centuries, among these are various individual historic buildings scattered throughout the Township and the villages of Toughkenamon, Chandlerville, Landenberg, New Garden, and Kaolin. Many of these resources have retained some of their historical integrity, and can contribute to the overall character of the community and region, but are in need of additional protection. The Township can attribute much of its historical development to the role of agriculture and localized industry.. From a historical aspect, the local roads serve as a link to the past. They Local roads represent old property lines, farm lanes, or trails that connected local properties and many bear the names of the early settlers. New Garden recognizes the importance of preservation and has begun to undertake activities to identify and preserve remaining resources. Integrated with that goal should be the formation of partnerships with other municipalities, the Region, both Pennsylvania and Delaware, and the private sector, for the purpose of preserving and interpreting the history and development of New Garden and assisting with financing the dissemination of historic information. By first identifying specific preservation strategies, the Township can create a preservation program aimed at protecting unique historic qualities and showcasing its role in the historic development of the region. Without an effective historic preservation strategy in place, this character will be lost forever.

## PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

The historic resources analysis of this chapter indicates the following planning implications for New Garden:

- **Preservation Strategies** - The preservation of New Garden's historic buildings, villages, and sites lends to its sense of place and unique character. The Township needs to undertake specific protective strategies to retain these historic resources.
- **Protection and Reuse** - Township historic resources are being lost to development. There is a need to prioritize and protect historic resources from development pressure, whenever feasible, while providing a range of appropriate use options to property owners.
- **Integrated Approaches** - New Garden's unique historic character stems from its agricultural, industrial, and transportation heritage. Preservation efforts and activities should not focus on just one aspect of its history, but should address all significant aspects by integrating strategies and related educational and interpretive efforts.
- **Agricultural Preservation** - The Township developed initially as an agricultural community. There is a need for regulatory measures that protect the remaining historic and cultural resources, as these are not only historic preservation objectives, but open space objectives as well.
- **Community Awareness** - The success of historic preservation programs directly relates to the degree to which preservation is supported by the community. Although residents appear to be aware of the community's history and development, more education is needed. There is a need to identify innovative ways of educating residents about local history and the relationship between historic resources and community character.
- **Funding** - As preservation strategies are developed, financial resources will need to be identified in order to better facilitate implementation.

- **Local Coordination** - Community groups, service organizations, cultural associations, and the school district can all be called upon to assist in preserving the Township's history by disseminating information, providing education, and generating a volunteer base for preservation. There is a need to expand efforts to increase coordination between the Township, local organizations, historic preservation agencies, and the school district in order to create a stronger local foundation for preservation efforts.
- **Partnerships** - The historic resources in New Garden are diverse in type, location, and association. Consequently, a coordinated preservation effort is needed to ensure that the overall fabric of the Township is conserved. New Garden will strive to partner with the private sector, especially the development community, at both the local and regional level to protect remaining resources.
- **Heritage Tourism** - The White Clay Creek watershed is the focus of state preservation efforts and along with the Red Clay Creek presents a heritage tourism opportunity. During the mid-1800s several mills were located along the banks of White Clay Creek. Today, many of these buildings lie in ruins and offer a glimpse at the Township's past. The Township will need to recognize the importance of these resources in generating tourism and a sense of community while building upon this concept as it develops local strategies.
- **Open Space** - Several historic resources provide opportunities for open space and recreation preservation, as well as links between resources. The Township needs to identify these opportunities and develop strategies for how these resources can both be preserved, as well as function as additional resources in terms of open spaces, trails, and recreation.

