

### 3.0 RESULTS OF ARCHITECTURAL INVESTIGATION

#### 3.1 Historic Context

European contacts with Native peoples began in 1534 when French explorer Jacques Cartier traded with Iroquoians along the Bay of Gaspé in Canada (Trigger, 1978). While European traders, trappers and missionaries traversed the area for the next two and a half centuries, no architectural evidence remains of this period within the APE.

##### Town of Cape Vincent

In 1791, the northern part of Jefferson County was sold as Tract Number 4 to Alexander McComb. The Town of Lyden was created soon afterward, including all lands north of the Black River. Among the investors in McComb's purchase was James LeRay de Chaumont, son of a French financier and military supplier for the American Revolution, and former protégé of Benjamin Franklin and Robert Morris. In 1801, LeRay acquired vast properties from the St. Lawrence River east to the Town of LeRay (now the Town of Wilna), including LeRay's home, the Hermitage, now located at Fort Drum. A year later, in 1802, the village of Chaumont was settled at the Chaumont River outlet (Emerson, 1898:702-703). The Town of Brownville was formed in 1802, including lands later forming the Town of Clayton (organized in 1818), and the Town of Cape Vincent (organized in 1849).

The first settler in the vicinity of Cape Vincent was Abijah Putnam in 1801, who settled at Port Putnam (Casler, 1906:146). Port Putnam is now Millen Bay, east of the current Village of Cape Vincent. In 1803, The Great Black River State Road (now County Road 8) was extended from Brownville to Chaumont and Port Putnam. Putnam established a ferry to Kingston. In 1808 LeRay established a land office in Port Putnam to sell off property in Cape Vincent. By 1809 public buildings and a wharf had been created in Cape Vincent and the first permanent settlers had come to the area (Harwood, 1985a). No aboveground resources remain from this period in the town's development.

James LeRay attracted many French expatriates, especially supporters of Napoleon Bonaparte. Among the leading French settlers was Comte Pierre Francois Real, member of the French Council of State, who conspired to free Napoleon from St. Helena and bring him to Cape Vincent. Fellow Cape Vincent Bonapartists included Field Marshal Grouchy, General Rollard, Camille Arnaud Paul Carboneau, and the Peugnet brothers (Clarke, 1967:141-143). Many French and German émigrés built substantial stone houses that reflect their European origins (Bonney, 1991).

In 1852, the *Cape Vincent & Rome Railroad* was completed to Cape Vincent (Hough, 1854). The railroad carried freight and passengers to and from a ferry to Kingston, Canada. This not only made Cape Vincent the hub of several new trade routes linking the Midwest, Canada, and the east coast but also opened the area up to more sportsmen and tourists (Harwood, 1985a). The combined rail and shipping links provided a strong economic stimulus, spurring development of the community's commercial center along Broadway.



By the end of the nineteenth century the Thousand Islands and shoreline communities along the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario had become flourishing vacation retreats, leading to the construction of hotels and seasonal homes along the waterfront. In agricultural districts, the end of the century brought little change. New farmhouses and barns continued to be built very close to roads and dairying remained a primary agricultural activity, with large fields utilized for pasture or for growing hay, alfalfa and corn.

The Great Depression during the 1930s had serious impacts on the local economy. Passenger service was discontinued in 1936 along the Cape Vincent Line, and freight service ceased in 1952. Car and truck transportation increased during the late twentieth century bringing people and products to local communities. The greatest change in the post World War II landscape was the result of the introduction of trailer homes. This building type now appears in the landscape as seasonal housing in the recreational zone along the waterfront as well as infill housing in both the rural and more densely populated portions of the study area. In a number of cases trailer parks now fill land that was agricultural well into the twentieth century.

Cape Vincent's history can be followed through its buildings within the APE. The period of settlement and agricultural development in the first half of the nineteenth century, along with the commercial expansion and burgeoning vacation trade of the century's second half, are visible in the landscape. Finally, the twentieth century is represented by the buildings erected to meet the needs of more recent vacationers as well as year-round residents of the area.

#### Town of Clayton

Clayton, located to the east of Cape Vincent on the St. Lawrence River, has a similar history. It was laid out and properties offered for sale by James LeRay in 1822. The town's location along the river, enhanced by the natural harbor of French Creek Bay, and the completion of the road to Watertown in 1824, contributed to the rapid early growth of the community. This growth was also fueled by the town's abundant timber supplies, leading it to become a regional center for lumbering, lumber rafting and shipbuilding.

By the middle of the century, summer visitors were arriving in town by steamboat. As with Cape Vincent, the tourist trade was boosted by the arrival of the railroad, in this case Clayton & Theresa Railroad in 1873. By the end of the century frequent trains and boats brought enough tourists and seasonal residents to double the town's year round population. This booming industry helped to offset a decline in the timber supplies and those industries dependent on this resource. The economy was also supported at this time by area farms, cheese factories, and small factories (Harwood, 1985b).

As with Cape Vincent, the Great Depression during the 1930s had serious impacts on the local economy. Passenger service to Clayton ended in 1951 (<http://www.rivergatewheelers.com/>). Car and truck transportation increased during the late twentieth century bringing people and products to local communities. The greatest change in the post World War II landscape was the result of the introduction of trailer homes. This building type now appears in the landscape as seasonal



housing in the recreational zone along the waterfront as well as infill housing in both the rural and more densely populated portions of the study area. In a number of cases trailer parks now fill land that was agricultural well into the twentieth century.

While the Town of Clayton has both a vibrant history and significant architectural resources, only the extreme western edge of the town is within the 1-mile ring. Very few resources are found within this part of the town. A number of buildings along Sawmill Bay are the seasonal dwellings that reflect the recreational use of the area. Further inland, the buildings demonstrate the agricultural use of the land.

### **3.2 Observed Trends Within the 1-Mile Ring APE**

Survey within the 1-mile ring APE revealed three cultural contexts. These cultural contexts include villages, rural/agricultural areas, and seasonal/recreation use areas.

#### **Villages**

The APE includes several areas that are densely settled all year long; these are the cultural contexts described as villages. The largest is the Village of Cape Vincent, where nearly 300 domestic and commercial structures are situated on a grid of streets surrounding the commercial center of Broadway. Two smaller villages, Rosiere and St. Lawrence, repeat the settlement density and mix of residential and commercial (or formerly commercial) buildings of the Village of Cape Vincent without the large numbers of structures or streets. In all three villages, a mix of buildings from different eras provides a heterogeneous architectural picture. In no case, other than the already established Broadway Historic District in the Village of Cape Vincent, did the groupings of structures appear to form a cohesive enough grouping without the intrusion of altered or non-historic structures to suggest a National Register Historic District.

#### **Agricultural Areas**

The majority of the area within the 1-mile ring is now agricultural or rural. In these areas widely scattered buildings, usually agricultural outbuildings or evidence of these buildings, dot the landscape. While buildings have been replaced or abandoned, infill structures added, and some of the land is no longer under cultivation, the area outside the villages and away from the waterfront gives a clear indication of its long history of use for agriculture.

#### **Seasonal/Recreational Use Areas**

The final cultural context is the area of seasonal use located along the St. Lawrence River. Here buildings in a variety of styles and from different eras have been constructed, or in some cases adapted, for seasonal use taking advantage of the recreational opportunities provided by the river. These buildings are located in a variety of settings: within the Village of Cape Vincent, in groupings of seasonal buildings (often as clusters of cottages, cabins, trailers, or a mix of these types) or, least frequently, as individual buildings within the landscape. These buildings reflect the long history of the area as a vacation destination.



Within the 1-mile ring APE, a number of architectural styles were observed, including Federal (ca. 1790-1830), Greek Revival (ca. 1830-1860), Italianate (ca. 1840-1885), Gothic Revival (ca. 1845-1880), Second Empire (ca. 1860-1880), Stick (ca. 1860-1890), Queen Anne (ca. 1880-1910), Colonial Revival (ca. 1880-1955), Tudor Revival (ca. 1890-1940), Craftsman/Bungalow (ca. 1900-1930), as well as vernacular end or side gable buildings (ca. 1820-1920), and Mid-Century Mobile Housing (ca. 1945-present). The area also includes a number of nineteenth century masonry buildings built for the community of French immigrants who settled in the area between 1810 and 1850. The specific descriptions of these architectural styles and building types, including typical character-defining features, have been described in greater detail within standard architectural history guides (including Virginia & Lee McAlister's *Field Guide to American Houses*). Masonry buildings in the area, described in a monograph and related article (Bonney, 1985; Bonney, 1991), represent a regionally distinct building style observed within the 1-mile APE. One additional category of aboveground resources recorded during survey were historic cemeteries.

The APE includes a number of notable surviving examples of the above-noted styles. [References to specific structures are noted in the following discussion by ID number. The ID number appears for each structure within Appendix A on the upper right hand corner of each page. Photos for the buildings discussed may be found on the respective pages labeled with the referenced ID numbers.]

Federal Style (ca. 1790-1830). The Federal style, with its classically derived ornament and attenuated decorative features, is represented by a few buildings within the 1-mile ring APE. One clear example of this style is the Vincent LeRay House (ID 28), executed in local limestone. The blind arcade, flush board siding and modillions of the Otis Starkey House (ID 168) demonstrate the elements typical of the style on a slightly less grand scale.

Greek Revival (ca. 1830-1860). High-style Greek Revival buildings are better represented in the 1-mile ring APE. The most complete example of the style's classically inspired elements is Maple Grove (ID 24). This temple front building with portico typifies the style as it was practiced at the highest level in the area.

Italianate (ca. 1840-1885). The Italianate style is represented in the area by both commercial and domestic buildings. The Aubertine Building (ID 223) and the Glen Building (ID 213) reflect this style as it was expressed in commercial buildings of slightly different scales. The Erastus K. Burnham House (ID 215) is an exuberant expression of this period's domestic architecture.

Gothic Revival (ca. 1845-1880). The 1-mile ring APE contains only a few buildings which reflect the Gothic Revival style. The masonry St. Vincent of Paul Catholic Church (ID 39) is a fully realized expression of the style with pointed arch windows, an elaborately detailed entry, and a three-stage tower. The James Buckley House (ID 166) includes the characteristic cross gable roof, board and batten siding, and flattened arch details. A larger but less intact example can be seen at 346 James Street (ID 187).



Second Empire (ca. 1860-1880). Very few examples of Second Empire buildings were found within the 1-mile ring APE. The best preserved example is the General Sackett house (ID 182). The building retains its mansard roof with fish scale slates, round-headed dormers, and molded cornice with brackets.

Stick (ca. 1860-1890). The Stick style was used in very few of the buildings within the 1-mile ring APE. 9440 County Rd. 9 (ID 390) is a good example of the style. It uses decorative trusses at the gable ends of its steeply pitched roofs, deep roof overhangs, decorated rafter ends, and a cross gable roof form.

Queen Anne (ca. 1880-1910). Queen Anne was a relatively popular style within the 1-mile ring APE. Within the APE, this style was used in a restrained manner, employing only a few of the many devices commonly used in designs of this style. For example, 249 James Street (ID 196) uses only a projecting bay, cantilevered wall extension, and decorative shingles to avoid flat wall surfaces.

Colonial Revival (ca. 1880-1955). The APE contains only a few Colonial Revival buildings. The most complete example is the Cornelius Sackett House (ID 220). This gambrel roofed building employs many of the elements of the style, including classically inspired elements, fanlight windows, and groups of double hung windows all in a symmetrical façade.

Tudor Revival (ca. 1890-1940). Three Tudor Revival buildings were found within the 1-mile ring APE (IDs 367-369). This small grouping used half-timbering, steeply pitched roofs, and grouped windows to express the style.

Craftsman/Bungalow (ca. 1900-1930). The Craftsman Style is also represented in the district. The structure at 383 South Market Street (ID 91) includes such character defining decorative elements as triangular knee braces, wide eaves overhangs, and shingles with alternating wide and narrow exposures.

Vernacular Buildings (ca. 1820-1920). The majority of the buildings within the 1-mile ring APE lack the style markers of the structures described above and may simply be characterized as vernacular structures. Most of these were simpler versions of the high style structures described above, employing similar massing or plans but lacking the decorative details that distinguish the more elaborate buildings in the area. For example, a number of buildings employed the Greek Revival building gable front and wing form without using a classical entablature or other decorative elements. There is, however, one vernacular house type that merits specific mention, the buildings within the APE which are related to the French settlement of the area. While at least one of these, the Servants Quarter for the LeRay House (ID 26), recalls the French origins of its builders, the rest are linked more closely to each other (and other buildings in the APE) because of their use of local limestone and their simple gable-roofed form (e.g. McKinley Farm, ID 17). These masonry buildings are a distinctive feature in the landscape.

Mid-Century Mobile Housing (ca. 1945-present). Mobile housing units were also located within the APE. These were located either individually in rural settings (often associated with older agricultural outbuildings) (ID 420) and, less frequently, as in-fill buildings within neighborhoods (ID 407), or as parts of heterogeneous collections in trailer parks and seasonal housing groupings (ID 302 and ID 303). Relatively little academic study or National Register guidance has been produced regarding field dating methods of trailer parks or mobile housing units. However, earlier examples dating generally from the immediate post-World War II era are often distinguished on the basis of narrow width. As little formal professional study has been completed regarding this property type, dating methodologies are still emerging. Nevertheless, field surveyors documented examples within the APE which were more likely to be 50 years of age or older on the basis of design, fenestration, and materials. The process of surveying this building type was further complicated by the frequent location of these structures far from the public right-of-way and down private roads. Examination from the road, combined with the examination of historic USGS maps, suggested that few of the examples in the study area met the criterion of being more than 50 years old.

Cemeteries. Nine cemeteries were located within the APE. These appear on inventory maps labeled as C-1 through C-6, and ID numbers 39, 78, 297, and 421. (C-2 was also given ID number 297.) According to National Register Bulletin 15, a cemetery is not generally eligible for listing in the Register unless “it derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events.” (National Register Bulletin 15, Section VII: 2002 ed). None of the cemeteries within the 1-mile ring APE were associated with important design features, transcendentally important persons or associated with significant historic events.

### 3.3 Summary of Inventoried Properties

As a result of the survey of the 1-mile ring APE, a total of 516 buildings, structures or cemeteries style-dated as 50 years old or older were recorded. Twenty-five of these properties have already been listed in the NRHP (Table 1). An additional property, St. John’s Episcopal Church, was listed in the NRHP in 1985. The structure burned in 1999 and was replaced by a modern structure (<http://www.capevincent.org/history.asp>). As a result of this survey, an additional 66 properties are recommended as potentially eligible for inclusion in the NRHP (Table 2). Nine cemeteries were also recorded within the 1-mile ring APE (Table 3). Two of these are associated with churches listed on the NRHP. The other cemeteries are not recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP.

Appendix A contains the field data collected for all of the inventoried. Map 1 located in Appendix B depicts the map locations of these properties. The data recorded for each property appear on individual data sheets that include one, two, three, or four photographs of the property. The information included in the property data sheets is clustered into three sections: location information, description, and potential significance. The location information includes: Map ID (see Map 1, Appendix B for depiction of property location); street address; town/city; village; date of inventory; Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) northing and easting geographic



coordinates. Description information includes: the original use of the property; current use of the property; type and style of structures observed; exterior materials; other exterior materials; roof materials; roof form; foundation materials; number of stories; structural system; windows; chimney placement; doorway; porch; decorative elements; alterations; other alterations; landscape elements; natural features; outbuildings; condition; type of setting; and notes. Significance information includes observations about the property as within a dense grouping; NRHP listing status; primary period of significance; primary NRHP criterion; integrity criteria (setting, association, materials, design, feeling, workmanship, and location); and eligibility recommendation. Due to a technical malfunction, the map locations of 27 properties were not obtained using the GPS unit in the field. This map location information will be updated during the next phase of fieldwork.

#### 4.0 FUTURE INVESTIGATIONS

Pending review of this document by the SHPO and subsequent revisions to analysis and field methods, TtEC will complete a similar inventory of aboveground resources located within the remaining 5-mile ring APE. Discussions with SHPO may lead to modifications in survey methods. It is anticipated that the remaining portion of the survey and the subsequent report may focus only on resources recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP and will not involve recording and reporting on all structures within the remaining 5-mile ring APE that may be style-dated as 50 years old or older.

Upon completion of the five-mile APE survey, St. Lawrence will consult with the SHPO, the Town of Cape Vincent, and any other appropriate parties, to determine if any further studies, analyses or related activities may be required. St. Lawrence will entertain possible Project modifications or other responses in order to possibly avoid or minimize affects to significant resources.

#### 5.0 SOURCES CITED

Bonney, Clair., 1985 *French Emigré Houses in Jefferson County*. Basel, Switzerland: Glasser and Weiskopf.

Bonney, Claire, 1991. Comparing Pre- and Post-Emigration French Homes in Jefferson County, New York and Haute-Saone. *New York Folklore* 17(1-2):99-120.

Casler, Nelie Horton, 1906. *Cape Vincent and Its History*. Hungerford-Holbrook Co., Watertown, NY.

Clarke, T. Wood, 1967. *Émigrés in the Wilderness*. Ira J. Friedman, Inc., Port Washington, NY.

Emerson, Edgar C., 1898. *Our County and Its People, A Descriptive Work on Jefferson County, New York*. The Boston History Company, Publishers, Boston, MA.