

Southampton Historic Resources Survey



Prepared for
Town of Southampton

Prepared by



with
Jacqueline Peu-Duvallon
Historic Preservation Consulting, LLC



Historic Resources Survey

Town of Southampton Suffolk County, New York



Prepared for:

Town of Southampton

Prepared by:

AKRF, Inc.

440 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10016
& Jaqueline Peu-Duvallon

April 2014

1: Introduction and Methodology

- A. Introduction..... 1-1
- B. Survey Methodology..... 1-2
- C. Southampton Landmark Criteria..... 1-6
- D. State/National Register Criteria 1-7
- E. Survey Evaluation Guidelines..... 1-8

2: Summary of Survey Results

- A. Introduction..... 2-1
- B. Town of Southampton Historical Overview 2-1
- C. Previously Designated Historic Resources 2-3
- D. Potential Southampton Landmarks 2-5

3: Eastport Hamlet Results

- A. Eastport Historic Context..... 3-1
- B. Summary of Eastport Results..... 3-2
 - Eastport Figures
 - Eastport Photographs
 - Eastport Tables

4: Remsenburg-Speonk Hamlet Results

- A. Remsenburg-Speonk Historic Context 4-1
- B. Summary of Remsenburg-Speonk Results 4-2
 - Remsenburg-Speonk Figures
 - Remsenburg-Speonk Photographs
 - Remsenburg-Speonk Tables

5: Northampton Hamlet Results

- A. Northampton Historic Context..... 5-1
- B. Summary of Northampton Results..... 5-1
 - Northampton Figures

6: Westhampton Hamlet Results

- A. Westhampton Historic Context..... 6-1
- B. Summary of Westhampton Results..... 6-2
 - Westhampton Figures
 - Westhampton Photographs
 - Westhampton Tables

7: Quiogue Hamlet Results

- A. Quiogue Historic Context 7-1

B. Summary of Quiogue Results.....	7-2
Quiogue Figures	
Quiogue Photographs	
Quiogue Tables	
8: Riverside Hamlet Results	
A. Riverside Historic Context.....	8-1
B. Summary of Riverside Results	8-1
Riverside Figures	
Riverside Photographs	
Riverside Tables	
9: Flanders Hamlet Results	
A. Flanders Historic Context.....	9-1
B. Summary of Riverside Results	9-3
Flanders Figures	
Flanders Photographs	
Flanders Tables	
10: East Quogue Hamlet Results	
A. East Quogue Historic Context.....	10-1
B. Summary of East Quogue Results.....	10-1
East Quogue Figures	
East Quogue Photographs	
East Quogue Tables	
11: Hampton Bays Hamlet Results	
A. Hampton Bays Historic Context.....	11-1
B. Summary of Hampton Bays Results	11-2
Hampton Bays Figures	
Hampton Bays Photographs	
Hampton Bays Tables	
12: Shinnecock Hills Hamlet Results	
A. Shinnecock Hills Historic Context.....	12-1
B. Summary of Shinnecock Hills Results	12-2
Shinnecock Hills Figures	
Shinnecock Hills Photographs	
Shinnecock Hills Tables	
13: Tuckahoe Hamlet Results	
A. Tuckahoe Historic Context.....	13-1
B. Summary of Tuckahoe Results.....	13-1
Tuckahoe Figures	
Tuckahoe Photographs	
Tuckahoe Tables	

14: North Sea Hamlet Results

A. North Sea Historic Context..... 14-1
B. Summary of North Sea Results..... 14-2
 North Sea Figures
 North Sea Photographs
 North Sea Tables

15: Noyac Hamlet Results

A. Noyac Historic Context 15-1
B. Summary of Noyac Results 15-2
 Noyac Figures
 Noyac Photographs
 Noyac Tables

16: Water Mill Hamlet Results

A. Water Mill Historic Context 16-1
B. Summary of Water Mill Results 16-2
 Water Mill Figures
 Water Mill Photographs
 Water Mill Tables

17: Hayground-Mecox Area Results

A. Hayground-Mecox Historic Context..... 17-1
B. Summary of Hayground-Mecox Results 17-2
 Hayground-Mecox Figures
 Hayground-Mecox Photographs
 Hayground-Mecox Table

18: Bridgehampton Hamlet Results

A. Bridgehampton Historic Context 18-1
B. Summary of Bridgehampton Results..... 18-2
 Bridgehampton Figures
 Bridgehampton Photographs
 Bridgehampton Tables

19: Unincorporated Sag Harbor & Sagaponack Results

A. Unincorporated Sag Harbor and Sagaponack Historic Context..... 19-1
B. Summary of Bridgehampton Survey Results..... 19-1

References

List of Figures and Photographs

Figure 3-1:	Eastport Historic Maps
Figure 3-2:	Eastport Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 3-3 through 3-26:	Eastport Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 4-1:	Remsenburg-Speonk Historic Maps
Figure 4-2:	Remsenburg-Speonk Historic District Map
Figure 4-3:	Remsenburg-Speonk Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 4-4 through 4-26:	Remsenburg-Speonk Historic District Photos
Figure 4-27 through 4-44:	Remsenburg-Speonk Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 5-1:	Northampton Historic Maps
Figure 5-2:	Northampton Location Map
Figure 6-1:	Westhampton Historic Maps
Figure 6-2:	Westhampton Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 6-3 through 6-31:	Westhampton Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 7-1:	Quogue Historic Maps
Figure 7-2:	Quogue Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 7-3 through 7-27:	Quogue Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 8-1:	Riverside Historic Maps
Figure 8-2:	Riverside Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 8-3 through 8-9:	Riverside Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 9-1:	Flanders Historic Maps
Figure 9-2:	Flanders Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 9-3 through 9-17:	Flanders Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 10-1:	East Quogue Historic Maps
Figure 10-2:	East Quogue Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 10-3 through 10-33:	East Quogue Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 11-1:	Hampton Bays Historic Maps
Figure 11-2:	Map of Potential Multiple Resource Districts in Hampton Bays: Red Creek, Squiretown, Good Ground, Canoe Place, Springville-Rampasture, and Ponquogue

Figure 11-3 through 11-4:	Hampton Bays Resources: Red Creek Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 11-5 through 11-12:	Hampton Bays Resources: Squiretown Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 11-13 through 11-21:	Hampton Bays Resources: Good Ground Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 11-22 through 11-27:	Hampton Bays Resources: Canoe Place Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 11-28 through 11-38:	Hampton Bays Resources: Springville-Rampasture Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 11-39 through 11-52:	Hampton Bays Resources: Ponquogue Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 12-1:	Shinnecock Hills Historic Maps
Figure 12-2:	Art Village Historic District Map
Figure 12-3:	Shinnecock Hills Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 13-4 through 13-9:	Art Village Historic District Photos
Figure 12-10 through 12-17:	Shinnecock Hills Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 13-1:	Tuckahoe Historic Maps
Figure 13-2:	Tuckahoe Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 13-3 through 13-9:	Tuckahoe Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 14-1:	North Sea Historic Maps
Figure 14-2:	North Sea Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 14-3 through 14-33:	North Sea Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 15-1:	Noyac Historic Maps
Figure 15-2:	Noyac Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 15-3 through 15-20:	Noyac Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 16-1:	Water Mill Historic Maps
Figure 16-2:	Water Mill Historic District Map
Figure 16-3:	Water Mill Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 16-4 through 16-26:	Water Mill Historic District Photos
Figure 16-27 through 16-61:	Water Mill Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 17-1:	Hayground-Mecox Area Historic Maps
Figure 17-2:	Hayground-Mecox Multiple Resource District Map
Figure 17-3 through 17-28:	Hayground-Mecox Multiple Resource District Photos
Figure 18-1:	Bridgehampton Historic Maps

Southampton Historic Resources Survey

- Figure 18-2:** Bridgehampton Historic District Map
- Figure 18-3:** Bridgehampton Multiple Resource District Map
- Figure 18-4 through 18-91:** Bridgehampton Historic District Photos
- Figure 18-92 through 18-94:** Bridgehampton Industrial Historic District Photos
- Figure 18-95 through 18-127:** Bridgehampton Multiple Resource District Photos

List of Tables

2-1 Potato Barn Thematic District 2T-1

3-1 Potential Eastport Multiple Resource District 3T-1

3-2 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in Eastport..... 3T-20

4-1 Potential Remsenburg-Speonk Historic District..... 4T-1

4-2 Potential Remsenburg-Speonk Multiple Resource District 4T-20

4-3 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in Remsenburg-Speonk 4T-33

6-1 Potential Westhampton Multiple Resource District..... 6T-1

6-2 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in Westhampton..... 6T-33

7-1 Potential Quiogue Multiple Resource District..... 7T-1

7-2 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in Quiogue 7T-22

8-1 Potential Riverside Multiple Resource District 8T-1

8-2 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in Riverside..... 8T-7

9-1 Potential Flanders Multiple Resource District..... 9T-1

9-2 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in Flanders 9T-11

10-1 Potential East Quogue Multiple Resource District 10T-1

10-2 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in East Quogue 10T-18

11-1 Potential Red Creek Multiple Resource District..... 11T-1

11-2 Potential Squiretown Multiple Resource District 11T-3

11-3 Potential Good Ground Multiple Resource District..... 11T-11

11-4 Potential Canoe Place Multiple Resource District..... 11T-18

11-5 Potential Springville Rampasture Multiple Resource District..... 11T-24

11-6 Potential Ponquogue Multiple Resource District..... 11T-32

11-7 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in Hampton Bays 11T-45

12-1 Potential Art Village Historic District 12T-1

12-2 Potential Shinnecock Hills Multiple Resource District 12T-5

12-3 Other Properties Evaluated in Shinnecock Hills..... 12T-13

13-1 Potential Tuckahoe Multiple Resource District..... 13T-1

Southampton Historic Resources Survey

13-2 Other Properties Evaluated in Tuckahoe.....13T-6

14-1 Potential North Sea Multiple Resource District.....14T-1

14-2 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in North Sea14T-19

15-1 Potential Noyac Multiple Resource District.....15T-1

15-2 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in Noyac15T-17

16-1 Potential Water Mill Historic District16T-1

16-2 Potential Water Mill Multiple Resource District.....16T-14

16-3 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in Water Mill.....16T-33

17-1 Potential Hayground-Mecox Multiple Resource District.....17T-1

18-1 Potential Bridgehampton Historic District18T-1

18-2 Potential Bridgehampton Industrial Historic District.....18T-58

18-3 Potential Bridgehampton Multiple Resource District18T-60

18-4 Other Previously Surveyed Properties in Bridgehampton.....18T-80

19-1 Potential Resources in Unincorporated Sag Harbor and Sagaponack.....19T-1

19-2 Unincorporated Sag Harbor Potential Resources19T-1

A. INTRODUCTION

As one of the earliest settled towns in North America, with a rich cultural and architectural history unlike that of any other part of the state or region, the Town of Southampton possesses a unique and irreplaceable built heritage worthy of careful study and management. Recognizing this, the Town of Southampton commissioned a Historic Resources Survey to identify properties that may be worthy of designation as Town Landmarks. This Historic Resources Survey was prepared by AKRF on behalf of the Town to identify such historic properties or groups of properties. Molly McDonald (AKRF) served as the Project Manager and primary author. Jacqueline Peu-Duvallon also served as a surveyor and author. Emma Marconi and Jason Smith of AKRF assisted with historic research and historic contexts. Kenneth Mack of AKRF prepared the GIS maps and Eunice Inquimboy prepared all other graphics. Claudia Cooney, Steven Krivitzky, Christina Patierno, Sergei Burbank, Brad Stratton, also of AKRF, provided additional support.

The study area includes the entire Town of Southampton with the exception of the incorporated villages and the reservation of the Shinnecock Indian Nation. The architectural historians who performed this survey undertook reconnaissance-level field survey, documentary research, and review of previous survey documents. Tasks were conducted beginning in the summer of 2011 and the final draft was completed in the spring of 2014. Preliminary Draft and Draft reports were submitted to the Town during that time period. Revisions were made to the survey and additional properties were included in the survey based on the requests of the Town. Over the course of the survey, representatives of the Town were closely involved in developing the survey and providing guidance to AKRF regarding the appropriate interpretation of the Town of Southampton Landmark Criteria. Representatives of the Town that were closely involved over the course of the survey process include Sally Spanburgh, Zach Studenroth, David Wilcox, and others. The survey methodology is described below.

This chapter presents an overall methodology for the survey and reviews both the Town of Southampton Landmark Criteria and the State and National Register of Historic Places eligibility criteria. It goes on to discuss in greater detail the guidelines used for the purposes of this survey to select and evaluate potential Town Landmarks, which were developed using the Town of Southampton Landmark Criteria as a basis, and describes the various possible categories of Landmark property, such as Individual Landmark, Historic District, Multiple Resource District, and Thematic District. Chapter 2 presents a historic context for the overall survey area (Southampton Town), which establishes a basis for understanding the themes and patterns of history relevant to the study area and provides a background for the various individual hamlet histories provided later in the report. Chapter 2 also summarizes the results of the survey, which are provided in detail in the subsequent chapters. It briefly reviews the historic properties within the survey area that are already designated as Town Landmarks; National Historic Landmarks; and State and/or National Register of Historic Places (S/NR)-listed properties and properties

officially determined eligible for such listing by the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). It also presents an overview of the resources identified for potential designation status by as part of this survey. Chapters 3 through 19 present the results of the present survey by hamlet, each chapter focusing on a single hamlet and organized roughly from west to east. Chapter 17 is an exception, presenting the Hayground-Mecox area, which is located partly in the hamlet of Water Mill and partly in the hamlet of Bridgehampton. Chapter 19 briefly addresses the unincorporated portions of both Sag Harbor and Sagaponack. Each chapter provides a brief historic context for the hamlet, and a summary of the potential Landmarks identified in it. Each chapter is supported by maps showing the locations of the resources, photographs illustrating each property, and tables listing each property recommended for potential Landmark status. A table is also provided at the end of each hamlet chapter listing the resources that were documented by previous cultural resource surveys but which were not selected for advancement as potential landmarks as part of this survey.

B. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The first task undertaken as part of this survey was to create a baseline Geographic Information Systems (GIS) map illustrating the survey area and relevant existing conditions data. As noted above, the study area includes the entire Town of Southampton with the exception of the Shinnecock Indian Nation Reservation and the six incorporated villages within the Town of Southampton. The incorporated villages excluded from this survey are the following:

- Westhampton Beach
- Westhampton Dunes
- Quogue
- Southampton
- Sag Harbor
- North Haven
- Sagaponack

All of the unincorporated hamlets that are located in the Town of Southampton were included in the survey area, consisting of the following:

- Eastport
- Remsenburg-Speonk
- Quiogue
- Westhampton
- Northampton
- Riverside
- Flanders
- East Quogue
- Hampton Bays
- Shinnecock Hills
- Tuckahoe
- North Sea

- Noyac
- Water Mill
- Bridgehampton
- Sag Harbor (unincorporated portion)
- Sagaponack (unincorporated portion)

The official boundaries of each unincorporated hamlet in the survey area were depicted on the project GIS maps. Tax parcel boundaries, provided by Suffolk County, were also included.

The Town of Southampton provided existing conditions historic resources data in GIS format for previously designated historic resources including Town of Southampton Landmarks and S/NR-listed properties. The Town of Southampton also provided data from select historic resources surveys, including the Town of Southampton Cemeteries Survey and a survey of the possible locations of milemarkers. As part of this project, additional historic resources information was added to the GIS map, including the locations of properties that were previously determined eligible for the S/NR by SHPO. Addresses of S/NR-eligible properties were collected using SHPO's online database (known as SPHINX) and were mapped on project maps.

Following the completion of existing conditions mapping, a historic context was prepared using primary and secondary sources available online and at libraries and historical societies in the Town of Southampton, Suffolk County, and New York City. A historic context was prepared for Town of Southampton as a whole, and for each of the unincorporated hamlets in the survey area.

Next, architectural historians that meet the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualification standards performed a reconnaissance-level field survey to identify properties in the survey area that appeared to meet or potentially meet the Town of Southampton Landmark criteria (these criteria are discussed in greater detail later in this chapter). The architectural historians were equipped with mobile GPS units affixed to tablets on which the surveyors could view an interactive version of the project GIS maps, complete with address and tax parcel information and the locations of the previously designated historic resources described above. The surveyors used these units to help record the exact locations of the potential historic resources identified as part of this survey.

The architectural historians surveyed every road within the study area (usually in a car, and sometimes on foot) and assessed each property that was visible from the public roadway. On a few occasions, property owners offered the architectural historians access to their properties so that better views of the properties could be afforded. In general, however, only properties that could be visually accessed from a public right-of-way were identified in the field survey. In general, building interiors were not accessed as part of the field survey. The architectural historians recorded each building that, based on its visible exterior, potentially met the Town of Southampton Landmarks criteria. Each of these buildings was photographed using a digital camera. Photograph numbers and brief field notes on each building were recorded along with the property location in the mobile GPS tablets used in the field. An attempt was made to photograph and record notes on each visible building and landscape feature on a potentially Landmark-eligible property, including barns, outbuildings, and other structures.

In an effort to include as many potential historic resources as possible in this survey, including those that could not be clearly seen from a public right-of-way, the architectural historians systematically reviewed previous cultural resources surveys covering the survey area. In coordination with the Town, seventeen previous surveys were selected for formal review in

Town of Southampton Draft Historic Resources Survey

addition to the Town's Historic Resources GIS map, the Town Cemetery and milemarker surveys, and the SPHINX database, noted above. They consisted of the following:

- The Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) *Bridgethampston to Southampton Transmission Lines Project Environmental Impact Statement* (2007)
- Town of Southampton *Cultural Resources Survey* (GAI 2004)
- The Town of Southampton *Comprehensive Plan* and its Technical Appendices (1999)
- Town of Southampton Façade Easement List (2008)
- *Water Mill Heritage Area Report* (2003)
- *Quiogue Hamlet Heritage Resource Area Report* (2007)
- *Eastport Hamlet Heritage Resource Area Report* (2008)
- *Bridgethampston Hamlet Heritage Area Report* (2009)
- *Hayground Heritage Area Report* (2011)
- *Draft Flanders Heritage Area Report* (2011)
- Historical Profiles of Eastport, Speonk/Remsenburg, and Westhampton (2004)
- Historic Profile of Hampton Bays: Phase I (2005)
- Historic Profile of Hampton Bays: Phase II (2007)
- Noyac Hamlet Center Study (2004)
- Eastport-Speonk-Remsenburg-Westhampton Area Study (2004)
- Flanders/Northampton /Riverside Revitalization Study (2004)
- *A History of Remsenburg* (2003)

In addition to previously surveyed properties, between the Preliminary and Final Drafts of the survey, representatives of the Town identified several hundred additional potentially historic properties and provided addresses, photographs, and sometimes possible construction dates and/or other historical information to the surveyors for review. The architectural historians tabulated each previously surveyed property and each property inventoried by the Town and reviewed each of these properties for landmark eligibility. As part of this process, the architectural historians viewed the tax photo and/or Town-provided photo for each previously surveyed resource to assess the resource's architectural significance and historic integrity. They assessed the eligibility of each resource based on tax photos, any other available views, and the historical information provided in previous surveys. Resources that appeared to meet the Landmark criteria were included in the survey as resources recommended for consideration as Landmarks. All previously surveyed properties or properties inventoried by the Town that did not appear to meet the landmark criteria and/or properties for which the authors lacked sufficient views or historical information to determine their eligibility, were documented in tables organized by hamlet and included at the end of each hamlet Results chapter. These tables provide the names and addresses of the subject properties, a summary of relevant previous survey information, a brief description of the properties by the authors of this report, and the authors' justification for not advancing the properties as potential landmarks as part of this survey. It should be noted that the properties listed in the Appendix tables have not been determined ineligible for landmark status as part of this survey. Rather, they were not chosen for advancement as potential landmarks as part of the present survey; however, it may be

appropriate to consider these properties again in the future for landmark eligibility if new information or better views of the resources are found.

It should be emphasized that despite this survey's attempt to be thorough and comprehensive, other properties worthy of consideration as landmarks may exist in the survey area which have not been included in the survey or the Appendix tables. Inevitably, architectural resources surveys may miss potentially eligible resources due to lack of visibility of the resource, a lack of awareness on the part of the surveyors of the history or cultural significance of a resource, or human error. Further, some relatively modern properties that are not currently considered significant may come to be valued as historically significant in the future. In short, while this survey has attempted to assess as many potential architectural resources as possible, it should not be considered a definitive or exhaustive list of historically significant properties in the survey area and properties not included in this survey should not necessarily be considered ineligible for landmark status.

A preliminary list of potential Town Landmarks was created based on the field survey data collection effort and review of previous surveys. Limited documentary research was performed on each of these resources. Due to the very large number of resources being considered, detailed research could not be undertaken for each resource. Research typically included the examination of historic maps in order to determine the presence or absence of a building on its property and to identify individual or family with which the resource was historically associated. In some cases, limited additional research was conducted using primary and secondary sources such as historic and recent newspaper articles, and materials prepared by or filed with local historians or historical societies. All recorded resources that were considered to have a high potential for designation as Landmarks based on known and accessible information and available views were included in the survey as potential Landmarks. In some cases, additional research and physical evaluation may be necessary to make a final determination as to whether the properties included in this survey ultimately qualify designation as landmarks.

Properties that were previously listed on or determined eligible for listing on the State/ National Register were all visited and included in this survey as potential Landmarks, unless they were confirmed to have been demolished or dramatically altered. In addition, all cemeteries documented as part of the Town of Southampton Cemetery Survey were included in this survey, except in limited cases in which the surveyors and the Town Historian concluded that no above-ground traces of the cemeteries appear to survive. In these cases, the cemeteries were included in the tables of previously surveyed properties not currently being advanced as potential landmarks, and it was noted that the site may still be considered sensitive due to the possibility of burials below ground.

The properties included in this survey have been identified as contributing to either a potential Historic District, which has discrete boundaries, or a non-contiguous Multiple Resource Districts. In some cases, resources may also be considered part of a non-contiguous Thematic District. Each of these designation types is described in greater detail in Chapter 3. It should be noted that while the survey considered all of the included properties as part of multiple-property listings, all of the surveyed resources are also considered eligible for consideration as Individual Town Landmarks unless otherwise noted.

The results of this survey are presented by hamlet in Chapters 3 through 19. The results are presented using the following media: maps illustrating the location and identification number of each resource; photograph pages presenting an image and a description for each resource and noting the Town Landmark Criteria under which the resource is considered eligible; and finally,

tables listing each resource, its identification number, the author's description of the resource, and a summary of information presented on the resource in previous surveys, if applicable. Previously surveyed properties that were not selected for advancement as potential landmarks at this time are included in tables located at the end of each hamlet chapter. The majority of the photographs used in this report were taken by the authors during the field survey. In some cases, tax photographs (which were taken anywhere from one to nine years before the time of the survey) were used or a photograph was supplied by members of the Town Landmarks and Historic Districts Board.

C. SOUTHAMPTON LANDMARK CRITERIA

The Southampton Town Landmarks and Historic Districts Board was established in 1998 pursuant to Town Code Chapter 330, Article XXVII, with the purpose of recognizing and protecting the historic resources of the Town. Their responsibilities include conducting cultural resources surveys within the Town; recommending the designation of Landmarks and Historic Districts; increasing public awareness of the importance of cultural resources through public outreach; making recommendations to the Town Board regarding façade easements, development rights, etc.; making recommendations to the Town Board regarding the use of state or private funds for preservation purposes; assisting the Town Board in selecting staff and consultants to carry out the duties of the Board; engaging in professional development; reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness; and assisting in the identification of Hamlet Heritage Resource Areas.

As stipulated in Southampton Town Code, Section 330-320 "Landmarks and Historic Districts Board," the Board consists of nine Town residents appointed by the Town Board, who should be representative of the entire community, have an interest in historic preservation, and should have backgrounds in architecture, architectural history, archaeology, local history, law, historic preservation, and/or real estate. The Southampton Town Historian serves as an ex-officio member of the Board.

Within the Landmarks and Historic Districts Board there is a Cultural Resources Subcommittee. This Subcommittee consists of at least three Town residents with a demonstrated interest in historic preservation and archaeology. The specific duties of the Subcommittee consist of identifying potentially sensitive historic or archaeological sites; recommending a structured archaeological process for the Town; assisting the Town Board in the selection of consultants to conduct archaeological studies; reviewing archaeological reports; and working with the Landmarks Board, the Planning Board, and the Town Board to identify and manage archaeologically sensitive areas in the Town, including but not limited to potential burial grounds and sacred sites.

According to Southampton Town Code, Section 333-321, "Designation of landmarks or historic districts," the Town Landmarks will only be designated after a public hearing and with the written consent of the property owner. Additional detail regarding the designation and public consultation process is included in that Section.

The Section also identifies the criteria that the Town Board considers when evaluating the eligibility of potential individual landmarks and historic districts.

The Town Board may designate a property as an individual Landmark if it:

- A. Possesses special character or historic or aesthetic interest or value as part of the cultural, political, economic, or social history of the locality, region, station or nation; or,

- B. Is identified with historic personages; or,
- C. Embodies the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style; or,
- D. Is the work of a designer whose work has significantly influenced an age; or,
- E. Because of a unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature in the neighborhood.

The Town Board may designate a Landmark historic district if it:

- A. Contains properties which meet one or more of the criteria for designation of a landmark; and,
- B. By reason of possessing such qualities, it constitutes a distinct section of the Town of Southampton.

D. STATE/NATIONAL REGISTER CRITERIA

The National Register criteria are the criteria used by the National Park Service (NPS) and the SHPO, also known as the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) to evaluate the eligibility of properties for the State and National Register of Historic Places (S/NR). The S/NR guidelines are relevant to the present survey for a number of reasons. First, because they provide a detailed set of considerations commonly used to evaluate historic resources, which were applicable in many (but not all) cases to this survey's identification of potential Town Landmarks. Second, a review of these guidelines demonstrates the criteria that were previously used to evaluate the existing S/NR-listed and eligible properties included in the present survey.

According to National Park Service guidelines, buildings, structures, sites, objects and districts that are over 50 years old are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places if they possess historic significance (as defined by the National Register criteria, described below) and if they possess historic integrity (also defined below).

The Criteria for Historic Significance as defined by 36 CFR 60.4, Part I, apply to properties:

- A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history; or
- B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In order to qualify for National Register listing, properties must retain a sufficient degree of the following aspects of historic integrity:

- Location: The property must not have been moved after its period of significance.
- Design: The property must retain historic elements that create the form, plan, space, structure and style of the property.
- Setting: The setting of the property must retain its historic character.

- **Materials:** The property must retain the key exterior materials dating from the period of its historic significance.
- **Workmanship:** The methods of construction from the property's time of significance must be evident.
- **Feeling:** The physical features of the property must convey its historic character.
- **Association:** The property must be the actual place where a historic event or activity occurred and must be sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer.

In addition, the National Register criteria (36 CFR 60.4, Part II) include these further specifications: "Ordinary, cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for the National Register." However, the guidelines further state that any such properties may qualify for the National Register if they fall within the following categories:

- A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or
- A buildings or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or
- A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building directly associated with his productive life; or
- A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves or persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
- A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or
- A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance; or
- A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.

E. SURVEY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

The present survey uses the Town of Southampton's Landmark criteria (presented above in Section C of this Chapter) as a basis for evaluating properties for potential designation. However, in order to present a more comprehensive overview of the guidelines used in this survey, the authors provide the following more detailed interpretations of the Landmarks Criteria developed through discussions with representatives of the Town of Southampton Bureau of Land Management and the Town Historian.

DESIGNATION TYPES

Properties may be identified for potential Landmark designation status either individually or as part of a grouping. A number of possible designation types involving groups of buildings are possible according to the Town's practice and/or consensus during the preparation of this survey. These include bound Individual Landmarks, Historic Districts, Multiple Resource Districts, and Thematic Districts. Each of these designation types is reviewed briefly below.

INDIVIDUAL LANDMARKS

Individual Landmarks are single properties, typically single buildings located on a discrete parcel of land. In many cases, however, Individual Landmarks may include multiple buildings or features on a single property, such as a house and its associated carriage house, or a farm with its associated residential and agricultural buildings. In some cases, Individual Landmarks span more than one parcel of land, but relate to a single building or complex of buildings. In other cases, one building on the property may comprise an Individual Landmark, while other buildings or features on the same property are not considered to contribute the historic designation. Sites, structures, landscapes, and objects may also be designated as Individual Landmarks.

HISTORIC DISTRICTS

Historic Districts are locations with defined boundaries, which constitute a distinct section of the Town of Southampton, and contain resources that are geographically proximate to each other and contribute to the character of the Historic District. Historic Districts may also contain buildings that do not contribute to the character of the historic district. Properties within a Historic District, therefore, are identified as being either Contributing or Non-Contributing Properties.

MULTIPLE RESOURCE DISTRICTS

Multiple Resource Districts, like bound Historic Districts, identify a distinct section of Southampton Town made up of groups of properties that embody or express the character of that section. Unlike historic districts, however, Multiple Resource Districts do not have defined boundaries. While they are generally grouped geographically (unlike Thematic Districts) they need not be contiguous. Therefore, Contributing and Non-Contributing Resources are not identified within Multiple Resource Districts; instead, only properties that comprise Multiple Resource Districts are identified.

THEMATIC DISTRICTS

Thematic Districts may be identified to designate a series of thematically or historically associated structures that may not be geographically close to each other. For example, a certain type of agriculture building may be designated as part of a Thematic Grouping, even if the contributing agricultural building types are located in wide dispersal throughout the Town.

PROPERTY TYPES TO BE CONSIDERED

The Town of Southampton's Landmarks criteria potentially apply to a wide range of property types, including buildings, structures, objects, sites, landscapes, and landscape features. All building types may be considered for potential designation either individually or as part of a grouping, including but not limited to houses, commercial buildings, and industrial complexes.

Agricultural buildings, a generally threatened building type on the East End, need not necessarily be associated with an extant house or farmstead. Structures and objects to be considered for potential Landmark status include bridges, monuments, statues, gravestones, and mile markers, among other property types. Historic sites are also candidates for potential landmark designation, including archaeological sites, locations where something significant to the history of the Town is located or formerly occurred, or locations where extraordinarily significant features that are no longer extant formerly stood. Landscapes and landscape features may also be considered for potential designation, including both designed landscapes and vernacular landscapes.

AGE CRITERION

Unlike the S/NR, the Town of Southampton Landmark criteria include no official age criterion or written rule of thumb regarding the age that a property must be in order to qualify it for Landmark designation. However, in general, properties less than 50 years old are not considered for Landmark designation. In order for such properties to qualify for Landmark designation they must possess extraordinary significance. Properties constructed in the 20th century that are over 50 years old may be considered for Landmark designation but must either possess cultural or historical significance, be particularly fine examples of their architectural type, or retain excellent historic integrity.

HISTORIC INTEGRITY

Even if a property is considered historically important, it may be disqualified from designation if its historic integrity is not sufficient to effectively convey the qualities that make the property significant. For example, if a property is primarily significant for its design and the design has been changed in recent years to the point where the original intent is not clearly discernable, the property would not qualify for designation. As with the National Register guidelines for historic integrity, evaluation of a property for potential Town Landmark status should include an analysis of whether the location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association of the subject property are sufficiently intact that the property still expresses or encapsulates its historically significant qualities. However, while the National Register guidelines typically exclude buildings that have been moved from their original location from being listed on the S/NR, the Town of Southampton Landmark criteria do not exclude moved buildings. Instead, the Town recognizes that moving buildings was a common practice and pervasive cultural tradition in the area beginning in the earliest days of settlement and extending into the present time. Moving buildings is part of the history of the area and may in fact be seen as contributing to the historic interest of a building. Moved buildings should only be excluded from designation, if the buildings were originally significant for their setting (possibly in the case of buildings or objects purposely designed within specific grounds or landscapes, for example).

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins with a brief historical overview of the Town of Southampton. It then reviews the historic properties within the survey area that are already designated as Town Landmarks and/or are S/NR-listed or eligible properties. Finally, it summarizes the survey results presented in more detail in Chapters 3 through 18, including Potential Historic Districts, Potential Multiple Resource Districts, and Potential Thematic Districts identified as part of this survey.

B. TOWN OF SOUTHAMPTON HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The Town of Southampton is located in Suffolk County (formed in 1825) on the South Fork of Long Island, New York. It extends 28 miles and is bound by the Peconic Bay and Riverhead to the north, the Town of East Hampton to the east, the Atlantic Ocean to the south, and the Town of Brookhaven to the west.

Algonquin Indian tribes originally inhabited the area, along with most of Long Island. Located at Shinnecock Neck was a “seat” of the Algonquin tribe who had other villages in North Sea and Sag Harbor. These villages typically centered on creeks, which provided a means of travel and fish for food and trade (GAI 2000: 9).

In 1640, Puritan settlers from Lynn, Massachusetts, led by Daniel Howe, were the first of English descent to colonize the area, making the Town of Southampton “the oldest English settlement in the State of New York” (GAI 2000, 8-10; Frederick S. Lightfoot 1984: v.; Southampton Association 1939:1). Having secured eight square miles of land from the Earl of Stirling, the colonists originally planned to settle at Schout’s Bay (located in Manhasset), in Nassau Country on the north shore of Long Island. Being close to New York City, this strategic location would halt the eastward expansion of Dutch settlements; however, before long the Dutch forced the settlers out of Manhasset. The colonists then sailed for three weeks until they reached today’s North Sea Harbor where they were guided, by Native Americans, down what is now North Sea Road and settled three miles south of their original docking location at Conscience Point. This first settlement was located north of today’s Old Town Road at the head of Old Town Pond and included 19 families (GAI 2000:8-10; Southampton Association 1939: 1; “Southampton History” 2011). Traveling with seeds, roots, and plant cuttings the settlers began the Town of Southampton’s long history as a farming community (Esten 2004:13).

The original settlers landed in Shinnecock tribal territory. The Shinnecoeks were friendly towards the settlers and no significant conflicts took place between them and the colonists (Rattray 1979:35). In 1640, the “Indian Deed of December 13, 1640” was drafted to signify the first purchase of land by the settlers. This purchase included land east of Canoe Place in exchange for sixteen fur coats, three bushels of corn and protection from raiding Native American tribes (*Hampton Bays Online*). By 1641, the first church was built in Southampton (Thompson 1839:214).

Town of Southampton Draft Historic Resources Survey

During the first years in Southampton the colonists governed themselves, meeting twice a year to discuss legal matters (Bayles 1964:4). Maintaining close connections with New England, by 1644, Southampton reinstated its political loyalty to the Connecticut Colony and started paying taxes to the colony (Hefner 1983:15). Each year two residents, who would report to Connecticut, were chosen as magistrates of the governing body of Southampton (*Hampton Bays Online*). If a Southampton law differed from Connecticut's, East End residents could choose which law they preferred.

While the Shinnecocks were peacefully inclined, the colonists feared hostility. All males over the age of sixteen were required to attend military drills six times a year. In 1645, it is likely that tensions with the Native Americans increased since the town mandated that residents carry guns with them to church (Bayles 1964:4).

In 1648, the some settlers moved their houses half a mile south of the first settlement and planned today's Main Street of Southampton Village (Greeley-Polhemus Group, 47). The Thomas Halsey House, 251 South Main Street in Southampton Village, was built at this location in 1648 by Thomas Halsey, one of the first settlers of Southampton. This house is considered the oldest frame house in New York State (GAI 2000:11; The American Institute of Architects 1992:171). In 1650, John Ogden opened the first port within Southampton at North Sea (Adams 1918:140). During this time, trade continued with New England and expanded to the West Indies (Adams 1918:142). On September 17, 1666, the Town of Southampton purchased land to the west of the original settlement (Bayles 1964:3). By 1698, the population of Southampton grew to include 83 African Americans and 152 Native Americans within an overall population of approximately 600 (Ratray 1979:201). As the local population continued to increase and expand to the north, North Sea became the first significant off-shoot of the Southampton settlement (GAI 2000:8-10). On August 16, 1703 the entire town was repurchased from the Native Americans (Bayles 1964:3). In 1703, the Shinnecock Indian Reservation was established making it the oldest reservation in the United States ("Southampton History" 2011).

In 1760, the whaling industry was established in Sag Harbor when three whaling ships left the harbor and by 1789; it became one of the most productive whaling ports in the world, surpassing New York City in the quantity of goods traded (Zaykowski 1991:81; Cummings 2005). On May 10, 1791, David Frothingham printed the first Long Island newspaper, the Long Island Herald, in Southampton (Thompson 1839:226).

One of the original industries within Southampton was lumber. Located in woodlands, colonists viewed their surroundings as a valuable crop that could be shipped to New York by boat (Historic Profile of Hampton Bays Phase I 2005:7). Additional industries included agriculture, fishing, and cattle farming. During the early to mid-1800s, common areas within Water Mill, Southampton and Bridgehampton were reserved for raising cattle and sheep (GAI 2000:14).

In 1812, the whaling industry came to a standstill due to the war of 1812, the Embargo Act, and the threat of British ships within the harbor (Zaykowski 1991:82). This decline was short-lived and from 1837-1847, whaling within Sag Harbor peaked, boasting more than fifty ships in its local fleet (Cummings 2005:8). Agriculture, however, shifted from primarily corn and grains to vegetables and fruit after the opening of the Erie Canal, which made available less expensive grain from the Midwest (Lightfoot 1984:VI). By 1847, the whaling industry quickly declined due to the discovery of gold in California, the scarcity of whales, forcing fishermen to follow whales further afield, and the discovery of petroleum in Pennsylvania (Zaykowski 1991:105).

From 1800 to 1870, Sag Harbor and Southampton Village were the commercial centers of the Town (GAI 2000:20). In the early 1870s, the introduction of the Long Island Railroad boosted Southampton's local agricultural economy (Ziel and Wettreau 1988:37). By the late 1800s, the railroad became the primary mode of transportation for shipping goods, such as produce, fish and ducks, into Manhattan. In 1873, nine White Peeking ducks, said to have descended from the Imperial flocks of China, arrived on eastern Long Island. The sandy soil, humid climate and abundance of fresh water on the East End proved to be ideal for duck farming. While duck farming took place throughout the Town of Southampton it was concentrated within Eastport. Potatoes, farmed by Polish immigrants who moved to the area after the 1880s, also became an important crop within Bridgehampton and Water Mill that could be transported by rail to distant markets (GAI 2000:21).

Additionally, the railroad stimulated Southampton's economy by providing safe, inexpensive and fast service for tourists and summer residents visiting the East End. During the late 1800s, Southampton became an exclusive and fashionable resort town due to the increased rail service, a growing leisure class, the natural beauty of the East End and the 1876 centennial celebration which increased interest in our colonial past. From the 1870s to the 1920s was an era of boarding houses in East Quogue, Hampton Bays, Eastport, Westhampton and Water Mill. To supplement their income, local residents would convert their large residences into boarding houses during the summer months. The period after the 1870s also saw growth in the smaller hamlets of Eastport, Hampton Bays, East Quogue and Quogue. This growth included the construction of schools, churches, small manufacturing and commercial businesses (GAI 2000:22).

The increasingly wealthy population of Southampton attracted the famous architecture firm McKim, Mead & White. Three of architect Stanford White's earliest commissions in the Southampton area, one in Southampton Village and two in Shinnecock Hills, are often claimed to have ushered in the American Shingle style. These commissions include White Fences for Samuel L. Parrish built in 1889, the William Merritt Chase House from 1891-1892, and the Shinnecock Hills Golf Club built in 1892. In 1898, White designed another structure, The Orchard, which is considered one of the earliest examples of Colonial Revival in the United States (GAI 2000:28). Today, the Town of Southampton, rich in historic structures that give clues to the earliest settlements on Long Island, continues as a popular resort community known throughout the world for its architecture, history and local residents.

C. PREVIOUSLY DESIGNATED HISTORIC RESOURCES

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS

There are currently no previously designated National Historic Landmarks within the unincorporated hamlets of the Town of Southampton.

STATE AND NATIONAL REGISTER-LISTED RESOURCES

A number of individual properties that were previously listed on the S/NR are located in the survey area. These properties were all field-visited and researched as part of this survey and were evaluated as potential Town Landmarks or contributing properties within a potential Town Historic District or Multiple Resource District. S/NR-listed properties, all of which are proposed for Town designation status, are illustrated in blue on the project maps. Where properties have existing designations as Town of Southampton Landmarks and are also S/NR-listed, they are

illustrated in purple on the project maps. No existing S/NR-listed historic districts are located in the survey area.

STATE AND NATIONAL REGISTER-ELIGIBLE RESOURCES

Many individual properties that were previously determined eligible for listing on the S/NR by the SHPO are located in the survey area. These properties were all field-visited and researched as part of this survey and were evaluated as potential Town Landmarks or contributing properties within a potential Town Historic District or Multiple Resource District. State/National Register-eligible properties that are proposed for Town designation status are illustrated in orange on the project maps. Many of the S/NR-eligible properties located in Bridgehampton, Water Mill, Noyac, and North Sea, were identified as part of a survey undertaken by AKRF on behalf of the Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) in 2007 in connection with a project that would install new transmission lines between Southampton and Bridgehampton. Other S/NR-eligible resources were identified as part of other surveys and were listed in the files of the SHPO.

Multiple existing S/NR-listed historic districts are located in the survey area. These include an S/NR-eligible Bridgehampton Historic District, Bridgehampton Industrial Historic District, and Water Mill Historic District. All of these historic districts were revisited and reevaluated as part of this survey and each building within the existing historic districts was photographed. The Bridgehampton Industrial Historic District is included in this survey as a potential Town Historic District; its boundaries and contributing elements are identical to those of the previously identified S/NR-eligible historic district. In the case of the Water Mill and Bridgehampton Historic District, the boundaries were altered from the existing S/NR-eligible boundaries and the list of contributing resources was also changed. The newly proposed Potential Landmark Historic Districts for Water Mill and Bridgehampton include larger areas with a greater number of contributing resources.

TOWN OF SOUTHAMPTON LANDMARKS

Fifteen previously designated Town Landmarks are located within the survey area and are indicated on project maps. In three cases, existing Town Landmarks have been included as proposed Contributing Properties within Potential Town Historic Districts (the Beebe Windmill and the Nathaniel Rogers house as part of the Bridgehampton Historic District, and the Water Mill as part of the Water Mill Historic District). If these districts are adopted in the future, the resources would remain Individual Town Landmarks as well as being considered Contributing Properties within Historic Districts.

For the purposes of the Draft Report, previously designated Individual Town Landmarks have also been included among the photographs and descriptions provided for the Landmark groupings for the respective hamlets in which they are located; however, the designation status is not being reevaluated as part of this survey. The existing Town Landmarks in the survey area (in addition to the three described above) include the Noyac Schoolhouse and the William Cauldwell House in Noyac; the Conscience Point Rock in North Sea; the Canoe Place Chapel, Prosper King House, and Elias Squires House in Hampton Bays; the Blue Barn and the Big Duck Ranch in Flanders; and the Fordham Mill in Remsenburg-Speonk. In addition, the Foster House in Water Mill; the former Shinnecock Hills Train Station in Shinnecock Hills; and 820 Brick Kiln Road in the unincorporated hamlet of Sag Harbor have been designated as Landmarks.

D. POTENTIAL SOUTHAMPTON LANDMARKS

POTENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

Five Potential Historic Districts have been identified as part of this survey: the Remsenburg-Speonk Historic District (see Chapter 4), the Art Village Historic District (see Chapter 12), the Water Mill Historic District (see Chapter 16), and the Bridgehampton Historic District and Bridgehampton Industrial Historic District (see Chapter 18). Each of these districts is shown on an individual map in the chapter devoted to the respective hamlet. These maps illustrate the proposed boundaries of each Potential Historic District, and identify resources that appear to contribute to that Historic District. Each proposed Contributing Property within a Potential Historic District has been given a unique Identification Code, shown on the project maps, and included in the photographs and descriptions of each resource, which are included in the Figures section. The codes and addresses of each proposed Contributing Property in each Potential Historic District are also listed in tables included in the Results chapter for each hamlet.

POTENTIAL MULTIPLE RESOURCE DISTRICTS

With the exception of Northampton and the unincorporated hamlets of Sag Harbor and Sagaponack, Multiple Resource Districts have been identified in each hamlet in the survey area, including those hamlets in which bound Historic Districts are also proposed. Hamlets containing potential Multiple Resource Districts include Eastport (Chapter 3), Remsenburg-Speonk (Chapter 4), Westhampton (Chapter 6), Quogue (Chapter 7), Riverside (Chapter 8), Flanders (Chapter 9), East Quogue (Chapter 10), Shinnecock Hills (Chapter 12), Tuckahoe (Chapter 13), North Sea (Chapter 14), Noyac (Chapter 15), Water Mill (Chapter 16), and Bridgehampton (Chapter 18). In Hampton Bays (Chapter 11), six distinct Multiple Resource Districts were proposed, which were grouped by neighborhood or historically distinct area within Hampton Bays, including Red Creek, Squiretown, Good Ground, Canoe Place, Springville/Rampasture, and Ponquogue. In addition, a Hayground-Mecox Multiple Resource District was delineated, which is addressed in its own chapter (Chapter 17) since this area falls partly in the hamlet of Water Mill and partly in the hamlet of Bridgehampton.

Each of these Potential Multiple Resource Districts is shown on individual maps in the respective chapters referenced above. These maps identify the resources that comprise each Potential Multiple Resource District; each of these properties has been given a unique Identification Code, which is shown on the project maps, and included in the photographs and descriptions of each resource, which are included in the Figures section. The codes and addresses of each proposed property comprising each Multiple Resources District are also listed in tables included at the end of each chapter.

POTENTIAL THEMATIC DISTRICTS

As described above, a Thematic District is a non-contiguous grouping of historic properties based on shared historical themes or attributes. The resources contributing to Thematic Districts need not be located in one hamlet or locality. It may be appropriate to develop any number of Thematic Districts drawing from the potential Landmarks identified in this survey in various hamlets or other potential resources that may be identified in the future. Only one potential Thematic District is being specifically outlined in this report, that of Potato Barns in the Town of Southampton (in this case limited to the survey area: the unincorporated hamlets in the Town).

This should not preclude the identification of other potential Thematic Districts in the Town of Southampton in the future. The potential Potato Barn Thematic District is described below.

POTENTIAL POTATO BARN THEMATIC DISTRICT

A potential Thematic District composed of potato barns has been identified in the survey area. The potentially contributing buildings are located throughout the unincorporated hamlets of the Town of Southampton; all have been identified as potential contributing resources within one of the Historic Districts or Multiple Resource Districts described in Chapters 4 through 19. The potentially contributing properties to the Potato Barn Thematic District are summarized in **Table 2-1** at the end of this Chapter. Photographs of each structure are provided in the Photographs sections at the ends of the chapters corresponding to the hamlet or area in which the given property is located. Twenty-nine potato barns have been identified as part of this survey. Of these, 13 are located in the hamlet of Water Mill, 13 are located in Bridgehampton, 2 are located in East Quogue, and 1 is in Tuckahoe. Some properties contain both potato barns and other building types; only the potato barns should be considered contributing resources within the Thematic District.

Potatoes originated in South America. From there, they were brought to Spain, where they became a common agricultural product by the 16th century. From Spain the potato spread to other parts of Europe, and from there was brought back across the Atlantic Ocean to North America. Potatoes became a staple of North American farming in the 18th century; however, it was not until the early 20th century that the crop was planted on a large scale. By the 1950s, potatoes had become Long Island's most important crop (Chamberlain 2006). Whereas potatoes were formerly stored in root cellars or other small underground structures, by the early 20th century on Long Island and in other major potato-growing areas, large barns were constructed on farms specifically for potato storage (Visser 1997).

Potato barns on Long Island constructed during the first half of the 20th century were often banked structures built into a berm or hillside. The lower portions are typically built of concrete and the upper portions are of wood-frame construction, clad in wood shingles or clapboards. In order to regulate heat and moisture in the interior of the structure, most potato barns are built with few windows (one or two windows with shutters or shields are often located at the gable end) and the barns typically have vents along the roof. Buttresses typically reinforce the sidewalls of the barns, where sidewalls are exposed. There are often one or two brick chimneys rising from the structure. Potato barns are typically located close to a roadway for easy access and are usually adjacent to the field in which the potatoes are grown (not always adjacent to a farmhouse as many older agricultural buildings might be).

While large-scale potato farming persists to some extent in Southampton today, the agricultural economy on the East End of Long Island has steadily given way to the pressures of development made more intense by the high value of local real estate. Although many potato barns currently survive in Southampton (some still in agricultural use, other converted for other uses) potato barns can be considered a threatened building type. Largely dating to the first half of the 20th century and constructed of modern materials such as concrete, potato barns are nonetheless an iconic building type emblematic of Southampton's historically agricultural economy.

**Table 2-1
Potato Barn Thematic District**

ID	Address	Name/Description from Previous Survey	Name/Description from AKRF Survey	Previous Survey
East Quogue				
EQ-01	2594 Quogue Riverhead Rd		This farmstead includes a cross-gable residence dating to the late 19th century (which has been altered somewhat with replacement siding and an enclosed hip-roofed porch), as well as several wood-frame barns. Among the barns are a gambrel-roofed barn probably built at the turn of the century, a potato barn, and several other barns and sheds dating to the late 19th and early 20th century. A farmstand occupies a small, prefabricated structure on the property which does not contribute to the historic character of the property. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	
EQ-02	132 Damascus Rd		A potato barn with two large doors in its front-gable façade and a shed-roofed addition also containing a large door. Characteristic of the function type, the barn at 132 Damascus Road has a high concrete foundation; the upper portion is clad in wood shingles. The entries are located immediately adjacent to the road for easy access by farm equipment. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	
Tuckahoe				
TU-08	512 County Rd 39		The Roscoe Barn is one of the largest known potato barns in the Town of Southampton. It is a banked gambrel-roofed structure clad in wood shingles. The front-gable façade fronts on County Route 39 and contains four large doors across the ground story. Several windows, most containing six-over-six-light double-hung sash, occupy the front façade. A series of regularly spaced large metal vents rises from the roof ridge. The barn is a fine and unusually large example of an agricultural building type that associated with potato farming, a crucial industry in Southampton's economic history. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	
Water Mill				
WMHD-16	173 Davids Ln		The David Halsey House is an early vernacular two-story three-bay farmhouse with a center chimney, six-over-six-light double-hung-sash windows, and a simple cornice and door surround. Several barns, some of which are in good condition and others in ruinous condition, are located on the property, as is a potato barn, and a privy. It may be the oldest extant house in Water Mill, built ca. 1750. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	SHPO Database (S/NR-eligible); LIPA Survey; GAI Survey

Table 2-1 (cont'd)
Potato Barn Thematic District

ID	Address	Name/Description from Previous Survey	Name/Description from AKRF Survey	Previous Survey
WM-09	4 Pierson Ct		This unusual complex appears to date from the early 20th century and includes a series of barns that were originally associated with the Pierson Dairy Farm and a small frame building that may be a residence. The possible residence is clad in wood shingles and is dominated by a three-story hip-roofed tower. The barns are single-story structures with jerkinhead roofs, with high buttressed concrete foundations and wood-shingle clad frame exteriors. A plaque mounted on a stone on the property reads: "This conservation easement established by Charleton and Nancy Halsey with the Help of the Peconic Land Trust in Memory of William H. Pierson, 2011." (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	
WM-16	142 Blank Lane		The house at 142 Blank Lane is a simple single-story late Queen Anne-style farmhouse, probably constructed ca. 1915. The house is part of a large farm containing many barns. Four potato barns are located on the property. They are banked concrete structures with shingle-clad gables and brick chimneys. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible); Façade Easements List 2008
WM-17	50 Upper Seven Ponds Road		This structure is a large concrete potato barn with buttresses along each elevation and vents along the roof ridge. It has a brick chimney at one end and a small window in the gable. The barn is a fine example of its function type, which is significant for its association with local agricultural history. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	
WM-20	794 Head of the Pond Rd		The potato barn on this property is a fine example of its function type, featuring concrete retaining walls and foundation banked into a hillside. The front-gable façade features a large doorway surmounted by a rectangular vent aperture. Vents are located along the roof ridge and a single brick chimney rises from the center of the roof. The gable is clad in wood shingles. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	
WM-22	513 Deerfield Rd	"Major James White House; This resource is potentially eligible for individual listing in the NR" (GAI 2000); This address is also identified by GAI as "Foster House: This resource is potentially eligible for individual listing in the NR" (GAI 2000); "Halsey House, ca. 1840" (FEL 2008).	This front-gable Greek Revival-style farmhouse with triangular gable window and side ell is clad in wood shingles. It has been in the Halsey family since its ca. 1840 construction, and is still part of a working farm. A potato barn is also located on the property at 513 Deerfield Road. An earlier 18th century farmhouse which once stood on the same property, was recently moved and now stands on a neighboring parcel with an address at 351 Deerfield Road. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible); GAI Survey (WA-36 and WA-44); Façade Easements List 2008

Table 2-1 (cont'd)
Potato Barn Thematic District

ID	Address	Name/Description from Previous Survey	Name/Description from AKRF Survey	Previous Survey
WM-24	42 Water Mill Towd Road	"House (unknown)" (FEL 2008). Barns on property identified in FEL as being located at 480 Head of Pond Road.	This property includes a very small single-story structure clad in vertical boards with a brick chimney and six-over-six-light windows. This structure may be a small dwelling, however, its construction date is not known. Also on the property are a large number of barns, associated with the Corwith Farm. At least two potato barns stand on the property in addition to other agricultural buildings. The property appears to have been owned by the Foster family in the 19th century and by the Corwiths for much of the 20th century. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey (WM-19); SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible); Façade Easements List 2008
HM-03	832 Scuttle Hole Rd (Water Mill)	"Potato Barn (1940)/ ca. 1800" (FEL 2008); "Sandford Site/Wenofske Farms, ca. 1920; Nathan Sandford, the most distinguished public figure in Hay Ground history, measured by attainment of high government office, lived here. Bridgehampton-born in 1777, he was chosen for the New York Assembly... then the State Senate, followed by two terms in the US Senate. Sandford ran for vice-president with Henry Clay in the national election of 1824. He was the uncle of Edwin Rose, another extraordinary public servant. The parcel now carries on the area's agricultural tradition. There are numerous buildings over fifty years old, notably a 1920s three-story, cross-gable, shingle-covered house which is distinguished in its own right (HHAR).	A Queen Anne-style house with a turret, wrap-around porch, and multi-light windows, the house is part of the Wenofske Farm. The property, which also includes several barns, including a banked concrete potato barn with wood clapboard gable siding and roof vents. Depicted on the 1858 Chace map as the home of S. Haynes, and on the 1916 Belcher-Hyde map as the home of William Collins. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible); Façade Easements List 2008; Hayground Heritage Area Report (Resource #18).
HM-04	99 Cooks Ln (Water Mill)	"Barn, ca. 1885" (FEL 2008). "Repurposed to become a family home, this house was a worker's cottage at The Maples farm. The large barn does not appear in a period photograph, but it must have been there at that time and, despite being left out of the picture, properly valued" (HHAR).	While the house located at 99 Cooks Lane, a small early 20th century dwelling, does not appear to meet the landmark criteria, this large barn located on the same property, is unique, both for its large size and the good preservation of its two ornamented cupolas. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible); Façade Easements List 2008; Hayground Hamlet Area Report (Resource #14).

Table 2-1 (cont'd)
Potato Barn Thematic District

ID	Address	Name/Description from Previous Survey	Name/Description from AKRF Survey	Previous Survey
HM-11	421 Scuttlehole Road (Water Mill)	"Rogers Potato Barn, ca. 1946; Paul Rogers, who inherited this barn from his father Hildreth, has explained how the structure was formed and how it functioned: 'We called them side hill cellars, so named because the earth was banked up on three sides. ... The potatoes were literally piled up from floor to underside of trusses, with the pile reaching a height of over 12 feet...'" (HHAR).	This structure is identified by previous surveys as the Rogers Potato Barn, built ca. 1946. The banked barn is clad in wood shingles, features concrete buttresses on its front façade, and two louvered apertures on its gable. It has a brick chimney. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C). (Photo from Hay Ground Heritage Area Report [Flack 2011]).	Hayground Heritage Area Report (Resource #51)
HM-12	53 Narrow Ln (Water Mill)	"Potato Barn, ca. 1940" (FEL 2008). Identified by FEL and LIPA Survey as 55 Narrow Lane.	While the Craftsman-style house on this property does not appear to represent a potential landmark, a potato barn is also located on the property. The barn is a partly banked concrete and frame structure with buttresses along the side elevations and a wood shingle-clad gable. It has large doors on the front façade, louvered apertures in the gable, and a brick chimney at the rear end of the roof ridge. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible)
HM-14	240 Hayground Rd (Water Mill)	"Potato Barn/ Hayground Nursery (FEL 2008)	A potato barn located at 240 Hayground Road is emblematic of its agricultural building type, with its rectangular plan banked into a hillside and a high concrete foundation. The front gable is clad in wood shingles. Vents are placed periodically along the roof ridge, and a brick chimney rises from one of the roof slopes. An eight-over-one-light window is located in the gable field flanked by triangular apertures containing louvered vents. A smaller concrete block structure is appended to the side. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	Façade Easements List 2008
HM-36	433 Mecox Rd (Water Mill)		A potato barn, probably dating to the early to mid-20th century, 433 Mecox Road exhibits many characteristics typical of its function type. The narrow rectangular-plan structure is banked into a hillside immediately adjacent to the roadway. Its front-gable façade contains a large door flanked by concrete buttresses. The structure is clad in wood shingles and has one or more brick chimneystacks. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	
Bridgehampton				
BH-02	2126 Scuttle Hole Rd		This potato barn is located close to Scuttlehole Road. The banked concrete structure is clad in wood clapboard, and has hooded multi-light windows. Stepped concrete retaining walls flank the façade. Until a recent repainting, the structure had a painted stone pattern on the soffits of the garage doors along the façade. (This building is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible)

Table 2-1 (cont'd)
Potato Barn Thematic District

ID	Address	Name/Description from Previous Survey	Name/Description from AKRF Survey	Previous Survey
BH-05	732 Lumber Ln		This large potato barn appears to date to the second quarter of the 20th century. Like most structures of this function type, it is a banked rectangular-plan structure with a concrete block foundation, oriented with its front-gable entry at the roadside for easy access by tractor. The barn façade features two large entries each containing double doors (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	
BH-11	390 Lumber Ln		This converted potato barn appears to be an unusually high-style example of its agricultural function type. It is a rectangular-plan banked structure with its large front-gable entry immediately adjacent to roadway, as is common for potato barns. Its exterior is clad in board-and-batten with the exception of the gable field which is clad in wood shingles and is given a wavy wall treatment. A paired window containing six-over-six-light double-hung sash is located on the gable. Shed-roofed dormers have been added on the roof slopes of the side elevations. This barn was probably constructed in the first quarter of the 20th century. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	
BH-17	173 Norris Ln		This large farm includes several barns and a small house. While the house, probably built ca. 1920, does not appear S/NR-eligible, the potato barns may be significant as representatives of a function type significant in the history of the area. The two abutting banked potato barns, constructed of concrete and wood, are arranged with roof ridges perpendicular to each other. One is a front-gable structure clad in wood shingles; the other has a hip-on-gable roof. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible)
BH-20	270 Lumber Ln	"Tiffany/Hendrickson House, 1866" (FEL 2008); "Built by Ichabod Sheffield Seabury who had constructed the Bridgehampton Literary and Commercial Institute (see Hedges House) in 1859... Nathan Tiffany probably owned the house but it was sold in 1906 to Howard Hendrickson, who cultivated potatoes and turnips... while he expanded his herd of dairy cows that grew to average about forty heard. Passed down to his son Richard, it was known as Hillview Farm from 1906 to 1999" (BHAR).	The Hendrickson Farm, also known as Hillview Farm, is depicted on the 1873 Beers map as the home of N.N. Tiffany and on the 1916 Belcher-Hyde map as the home of H.F. Hendrickson. This front-gable clapboard-clad farmhouse was built in 1866. The farmhouse, in excellent condition, has a half-round gable window and an Italianate-style porch. It retains associated barns (including a three-bay English threshing barn) and other agricultural buildings, including several poultry houses. The property was used as a farm until recently. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible); Facade Easements List 2008; Bridgehampton Heritage Area Report

Table 2-1 (cont'd)
Potato Barn Thematic District

ID	Address	Name/Description from Previous Survey	Name/Description from AKRF Survey	Previous Survey
BH-23	225 Butter Ln	"Farmhouse with barn. Ca. 1920" (FEL 2008)	225 Butter Lane is a shingle-clad Queen Anne-style cross-gable farmhouse with two-over-two-light windows. The hip-roofed porch, supported by brick piers, is a later addition. The parcel also contains a shingle-clad barn. The property may be depicted on the 1916 Belcher-Hyde map as the home of E. Hildreth. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible); Facade Easements List 2008; Bridgehampton Heritage Area Report.
BH-27	367 Butter Lane	"Large potato house. ca. 1920." (FEL 2008)	Several structures are located on this property, including a large wood-shingle-clad potato barn with three small cupolas/vents along roof ridge. Only the potato barn appears to qualify as a potential historic resource. (This barn is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	Facade Easements List 2008; Bridgehampton Heritage Area Report.
BH-29	79 Snake Hollow Rd		A clapboard-clad cross-gable farmhouse with two-over-two-light windows and an entry porch supported by turned posts. Depicted on the 1916 Belcher-Hyde map as the home of Eugene Sayre. An associated potato barn, clad in wood shingles, is also located on the property. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible)
BH-30	34 Snake Hollow Rd		A banked and shingle-clad potato barn, aligned with roof ridge perpendicular to Snake Hollow Road. A large shopping center is now located immediately north and west of the barn. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible)
BH-38	454 Millstone Rd	"Potato Barn, ca. 1920" (FEL 2008).	This potato barn is located at the side of Millstone Road. The banked concrete building's gable is clad with wood shingles, and contains a six-over-six-light window flanked by vents. A house and other structures still stand on the property, apparently built ca. 1920, but do not appear S/NR eligible. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible); Façade Easements List 2008
BH-39	30 Millstone Rd		These two buildings are part of the Nova's Ark Project, a gallery and public art park at Millstone Road and Scuttlehole Road in Water Mill. The peak-roofed building is a converted potato barn, while the structure immediately east of which has the unlikely form of a barrel on its side, appears to have been constructed anew as part of the complex. Nova's Ark dates to ca. 1970. While it is only approximately 40 years old, the unique design of these prominently located structures makes them a unique and familiar local landmark. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria C and E).	

Table 2-1 (cont'd)
Potato Barn Thematic District

ID	Address	Name/Description from Previous Survey	Name/Description from AKRF Survey	Previous Survey
HM-01	1040 Scuttle Hole Rd (Bridgehampton)	"House & Potato Barn (ca. 1920)/ ca. 1900" (FEL 2008). "Former home of Sayre Baldwin, dairyman, Bridgehampton National Bank officer, and civic leader" (HHAR).	The Atlantic Golf Club, created ca. 1990, occupies land that was formerly known as Equinox or Guyer Farm. In addition to a more recently constructed clubhouse, the property contains a former farmhouse (a two-story four-bay shingle-clad structure, which may date to ca. 1900) as well as a potato barn (a banked concrete block structure with a shingle-clad gable, shuttered windows, and a brick chimney). According to the Bridgehampton Heritage Area Report, this structure was the former home of Sayre Baldwin, a dairyman, Bridgehampton National Bank officer, and civic leader. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible); Façade Easements List 2008; Hayground Heritage Area Report (Resource #16).
HM-02	890 Scuttle Hole Rd (Bridgehampton)	"House & Potato Barn (ca. 1920)/ ca. 1870" (FEL 2008). "Conklin House, ca. 1845; For 165 years this farmhouse, proclaimed 'Breeze Hill,' on its stone circular driveway pillars and in large lettering on its barn roof, has commanded the upper reaches of Hayground. Early maps associate the location with Cooks, Halseys, and Rogers; since 1921, it has been in the Conklin family who maintain it as a working farm. ... Breeze Hill also includes a potato barn... This property has been preserved through Southampton Town's Community Preservation Fund" (HHAR). "Breeze Hill (Esq. Hynes, NYC), ca. 1845; Federal style with Italianate brackets added later onto a porch and under the eaves" (BHAR).	This two-story five-bay Italianate-style house is clad in wood clapboard, and has round arch gable windows and decorative eaves brackets. The property also includes a potato barn: a banked structure with wood-shingle siding, six-over-six-light windows, a brick chimney, and roof vents. According to the Bridgehampton Heritage Area Report, this is known as the Conklin House, built ca. 1845, and historically called "Breeze Hill." The house is depicted on the 1858 Chace map as the residence of S. Haynes, on the 1873 Beers map as the home of S. Haynes, and on the 1916 Belcher-Hyde map as the home of William R. Post. (This property is potentially landmark eligible under Town Criteria A and C).	LIPA Survey; SHPO Database (S/NR-Eligible); Façade Easements List 2008; Hayground Heritage Area Report (Resource #17); Bridgehampton Heritage Area Report.