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During November 2004, Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. completed a cultural resource reconnaissance survey for the proposed Wolf Creek Park Project located in Fayette Heights, 5.0 mi (8.0 km) north of Oak Hill and 3.0 mi (4.8 km) south of Fayetteville, in Fayette County, West Virginia. The survey was conducted at the request of Eric B. Gillespie of Thrasher Engineering, Inc.

The purpose of this survey was to identify, document, and evaluate all cultural resources located within a pre-defined Area of Potential Effect and to evaluate the potential visual effect of the proposed project on properties eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, if they exist. The Area of Potential Effects was provided to Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. by Thrasher Engineering, Inc. Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. was not involved in the definition of the Area of Potential Effects. For the purposes of this assessment, a cultural resource was defined as any above ground resource 50 years of age or older and a historic property was defined as any cultural resource eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Prior to initiating fieldwork, a search of records maintained by the West Virginia State Historic Preservation Office was conducted by GAI Consultants and Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. to determine if previously recorded cultural resources were located in the pre-defined APE. Results determined that none of the resources within the current APE had been previously documented. During the field survey, six previously unidentified cultural resources were documented (Resources FR-03-638-FA(1) through FR-03-638-FA(6)). None of these resources appears eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

It is recommended that no additional cultural resources investigations are required for the pre-defined visual Area of Potential Effects.
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I. INTRODUCTION

During November 2004, Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. (CRAI) completed a cultural resource reconnaissance survey for the proposed Wolf Creek Park Project (Project) located in Fayette Heights, 5.0 mi (8.0 km) north of Oak Hill and 3.0 mi (4.8 km) south of Fayetteville, in Fayette County West Virginia (Figures 1 and 2). The purpose of this reconnaissance survey was to document and evaluate cultural resources located within a pre-defined visual Area of Potential Effects (APE) for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and if necessary apply the Criteria of Adverse Effects. The survey was conducted at the request of Eric B. Gillespie of Thrasher Engineering, Inc. (Thrasher). CRAI also competed a Phase I archaeological survey for the proposed project, which is reported separately (Smith et al. 2004).

Figure 1. Map of West Virginia showing the location of Fayette County.

CRAI project personnel included Jeremy Edgeworth, Rebecca Rapier, and Aaron Smith. Michael Anslinger served as the project manager and principal investigator. Fieldwork was completed between November 8 and 9, 2004.

Project Background

The Project is located approximately 0.5 mile (0.8 km) east of US 19 and the exit for Appalachian Drive. Wolf Creek Park has a total of 337 ac (137 ha) of suitable land for business, industries, residential developments, schools, retirement communities, recreation centers, and commercial operations (Figure 2). The Fayette County Development Authority (FCDA) is proposing the site as an economic development opportunity, following the multiuse concept of a “live, work, and play” community (FCDA 2003; Fayette County Commission 2003).

FCDA has defined Fayette County as an area with the characteristics that make it a good candidate for the location of a multiuse development. These characteristics are found specifically in and around Wolf Creek Park. Transportation availability, such as the heavily trafficked and developed US 19 that travels north-south directly west of the proposed Project, is one key characteristic. Route 16 is also located along the western edge of the park. In addition, nearby development along I-77 and I-64 indicates the potential for economic development within Wolf Creek Park. One nearby retail, conference, and entertainment center (Tamarack located approximately 15 mi [24.1 km] from Wolf Creek) attracts half a million visitors annually from I-77 and I-64. These transportation routes provide development opportunity; the amount and type of tourism traveling throughout the area suggests that the area would likely profit from recreational activities. As a result, the proposed community incorporates the recreation industry as a central theme and core motivation (FCDA 2003; Fayette County Commission 2003).

The proposed community includes a variety of separate “locales” within the area such as a distinct section set aside for the production of recreational related products (boats, paddles, bikes, fishing accessories, etc.). Another locale would incorporate warehouses or manufacturing, whereas an entirely separate area would include residential space for permanent housing, vacation homes, or retirement living. The topography of Wolf Creek Park provides great opportunities for the natural separation of industries and housing. Ridgelines offer
natural buffers, and provide an opportunity to control the density of development (FCDA 2003; Fayette County Commission 2003).

The entrance to the park, located on the western edge includes two small development pockets that could potentially be used for commercial purposes or for a community / welcome center. The project proposal includes an overall network of walking and biking trails, and a central community gathering space (FCDA 2003; Fayette County Commission 2003).

**Purpose of Investigation**

The Project is being partially funded by the Economic Development Administration (EDA), a federal agency, Therefore, the Project has been classified as an undertaking, as defined by U.S.C. 470f (National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106). The EDA, and in return recipients of EDA funding (FCDA), are obligated to take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is listed on or eligible for the NRHP.

The investigation reported herein was completed to aid EDA and Project proponents achieve compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended, and its regulating language (36 CFR Part 800). Specifically, this report was completed for submission to EDA and the West Virginia State Historic Preservation Office (WVSHPO) for review and comment.

**Scope of Services**

CRAI was contracted by Thrasher to complete the following Scope of Services (Scope). The APE for visual impacts had been previously defined and was provided to CRAI by Thrasher. CRAI’s scope did not include establishing the APE for visual impacts.

The purpose of the survey was to:

1) Conduct a search of records maintained by the WVSHPO to identify any previously documented resources located within or adjacent to the pre-defined APE for visual impacts;

2) Conduct a reconnaissance level survey of the previously designated APE designed to identify cultural resources;

3) Preliminarily evaluate recorded cultural resources for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP);

4) Evaluate the effect of the project on any historic properties included in or eligible for listing in the NRHP; and

5) Provide recommendations for further work, if necessary.

For the purposes of this assessment, a cultural resource was defined as any above ground resource 50 years of age or older and a historic property was defined as any cultural resource eligible for, or listed on, the NRHP.

**II. RESEARCH AND SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

The survey was conducted in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (National Park Service 1983). In addition, guidelines offered in the following document were followed: Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning: National Register Bulletin #24 (National Park Service 1985).

**Records Search**

Before entering the field, all available surveys, reports, studies, maps, and other data pertinent to the project area were identified and reviewed. This task began by reviewing a Phase Ia cultural resource study completed by GAI Consultants (GAI 2004). In addition, CRAI conducted its own search of WVSHPO records on October 24, 2004 (Appendix A). For the purposes of this study, previously reported archaeological resources will not be discussed. For this information please refer to Smith et al. (2004).
Figure 2. Portion of 1969 (1976) USGS 7.5' Fayetteville, WV Quadrangle showing predefined APE and locations of cultural resources.
No previously surveyed cultural resources were identified within the pre-defined APE through these file searches. In addition, no previous cultural historic surveys within the pre-defined APE have been completed. Other sources found in the preliminary research include a 1919 Fayette County Map, and a USGS 15’ 1928 topographic quadrangle.

APE Definition

As per the Scope, CRAI did not define the APE for this study. Instead, Thrasher provided CRAI with a pre-defined APE for visual impacts that was developed through consultation with the WVSHPO (Eric Gillespie, personal communication 2004) (Figure 2).

Recording of Historic Properties

Following the preliminary archival research and review, CRAI staff conducted a survey of the APE during which all properties 50 years of age or older were documented. The pre-defined APE for visual impacts partially encloses the proposed 337 ac (137 ha) project area (Figure 2). To survey the APE, CRAI staff drove all publicly accessible roads deemed to have the potential to contain cultural resources. To do so, CRAI relied on historic maps to identify potential areas of historic development.

When cultural resources were encountered within the pre-defined APE, they were documented using digital photography and West Virginia Historic Property Inventory (WV HPI) Forms. When possible, CRAI personnel attempted to contact knowledgeable locals to obtain further information concerning historical significance. Interviews, if conducted, were recorded informally. As residents were not always available at the time of survey, interviews were not conducted on a systematic basis.

Documentation was completed under a reconnaissance level scope; intensive or exhaustive architectural and/or archival research was not conducted. In addition, access constraints frequently did not allow CRAI staff to examine all properties up-close or intensively. For these reasons, architectural and historical descriptions must be considered preliminary.

Generally speaking, cultural resources were individually recorded. However, with the community of Fayette Heights, an alternative strategy was employed. The following provides a brief discussion of these survey approaches.

Inside Fayette Heights

As a portion of the visual APE included the community of Fayette Heights which was composed of historic residential and commercial resources mixed with modern development (Figures 3, 4, and 5), it was surveyed at the district level. In this instance, the historic integrity, linkage, continuity, and significance of the community was examined as a whole to document potentially eligible historic districts. To do so, all cultural resources were photographed and mapped, and given survey numbers ranging between FR-03-638-FA-6(a-hh). Cultural resources were then organized by architectural form and function into appropriate categories and described on a summary basis.

Outside Fayette Heights

Outside of the limits of Fayette Heights proper, the landscape is largely rural in nature, and continuity between cultural resources more isolated and disconnected. As such, these cultural resources were surveyed on the individual level.

Documentation

Project area conditions were mapped on the appropriate USGS 7.5’ topographic quadrangle, including the general locations of modern resources. All recorded cultural resources were then documented with the completion of a WV HPI form with digitally inserted photographs. As discussed previously, the community of Fayette Heights
Figure 3. Overview of Fayette Heights, looking west along Wolf Creek Road.

Figure 4. Fayette Heights, example of modern renovations (FR:03-638-FA[6x]).
was recorded simultaneously on one WV HPI form.

**NRHP Eligibility Assessments**

Recorded resources were examined for NRHP eligibility under Criteria A, B, C, and if necessary for NRHP Criteria Considerations. The examination included recording architectural details, conducting reconnaissance level historical research, and interviewing local residents or other informants to obtain contextual and historical data.

In general, in order for a property to be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a property must be at least 50 years old and must possess historic significance and integrity. Significance may be found in four aspects of American history recognized by the National Register Criteria:

A. Association with historic events or activities;
B. Association with important persons;
C. Distinctive design or physical characteristics; or
D. Potential to provide important information about prehistory or history.

A property must meet at least one of the criteria for listing. Integrity must also be evident through historic qualities including location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

**Effect Assessments**

Recommendations concerning the potential visual effect the proposed Project might have upon historic properties were based on Section 106 regulating language found with 36 CFR 800.4 and 5. In order for a visual impact to be considered a visual effect (Sec. 800.16(i)) the viewshed from or the viewscape including a historic property, must be considered a characteristic that qualifies the property for the NRHP.

Therefore, CRAI personnel attempted to define the viewshed of each NRHP eligible
historic property located within the APE in terms of its significance toward the property’s eligibility. In doing so, the existing integrity or lack of visual intrusions associated with historic property’s viewshed was taken into account.

In order to assess what makes an object a modern visual intrusion to a property, a period of significance for the property must be established. The period of significance is defined as “the length of time when a property was associated with the important events, activities, persons, or attained the characteristics which qualify it for National Register listing” (National Register Bulletin 16 1991:42). As such, a visual object, or change to the viewscape or viewshed associated with a NRHP property, which post-dates this period is considered a visual intrusion to the property.

III. HISTORIC CONTEXT

Fayette County was formed in 1831, from Kanawha, Nicholas, Greenbrier and Logan counties. The county is named after General Lafayette and is located in the south-central portion of the state (Donnelly 1949). Fayetteville is the county seat of Fayette County. The project area is located between Fayetteville and Oak Hill, in the central portion of the county.

Early Settlement

The first Euro-American to settle near the New River Gorge was Peter Bowyer in 1798. He settled at what is now the community of Sewell, at the confluence of Manns Creek and New River. In 1806, the General Assembly of Virginia voted Bowyer the right to run a ferry for pay, and it became what is believed to have been the first enterprise in Fayette County (Donnelly 1949:127). The Koontz New Road, a wagon road, was opened in 1786 and traveled from Lewisburg to Charleston. It passed through current day Ansted, went northwest by way of Rich Creek. It then crossed the Gauley and extended up Twentymile Creek to Charleston. Another early route of great importance was the Giles, Fayette and Kanawha Turnpike. This road, which was authorized by the General Assembly in 1837-1838, was initiated in 1838 and completed 10 years later. It extended from the Giles Court House to Fayetteville and ran through the current day communities of Beckley, Mt. Hope, and Oak Hill.

By 1790, people had begun to settle in the present community of Ansted. In 1820, these settlers organized the Hopewell Baptist Church. It is the oldest organized church in Fayette County. Gatewood is considered one of the oldest settlements in the county. It is located between Oak Hill and Fayetteville. The Bibb family settled at Bowyer’s Ferry in 1829 and operated a ferry for eight years. The family then purchased a 120 ha (300 ac) tract of land and named it Gatewood in honor of Mrs. Bibbs whose maiden name was Elizabeth Gatewood (Donnelly 1949:129).

The first county seat was located in New Haven. The seat was later moved to Vandalia, a community named after the settler Abraham Vandal. Vandalia was renamed Fayetteville, after Marquis de Lafayette, in 1837. William Blake Jr. is thought to be the first settler at current day Oak Hill. He came to the area in 1820 and constructed a two-story log house. In 1850, there were three families living at Oak Hill. These were the William Blake, Jr., Charles Windsor and Peter Bowyer, Jr. families. Today Oak Hill is the largest town in Fayette County (Donnelly 1949:130).

Civil War

Fayette County was an active scene of various troop movements, skirmishes, and battles during the Civil War. Events in 1861 generally centered on the initial Federal campaign to take the Kanawha Valley. During this campaign, Union troops pushed Confederate forces quickly up the Kanawha River to Gauley Bridge, where Confederate forces briefly held positions near Hawks Nest, Carnifex Ferry, and Fayetteville. However, a loss at the Battle of Carnifex Ferry forced Confederate forces south of Fayette County, where they regrouped and made a stand near Sewell Mountain. Joined briefly by General Robert E. Lee, Confederate forces were able to
stave off further advances from Union troops. From this location forces under the command of General Floyd attempted to retake the Kanawha Valley, but were forced to retreat again from Fayette County following a stalemate at the Battle of Gauley Bridge. The year closed with Union Troops occupying present day Fayetteville and Beckley, with two forts having been constructed in Fayetteville (McKinney 1988).

Events that occurred in 1862, which generally surround what has been termed the Battle of Fayetteville, have perhaps received the most attention by scholars. Due to inactivity in the Kanawha Valley during the summer of 1862, Union forces were being removed from the region and sent to Washington. This left Colonel Joseph A. J. Lightburn in command of a depleted Union force headquartered at Gauley Bridge. In response to this reduction of troops, Confederate General William W. Loring began planning an attack into the Kanawha Valley region. Loring sent a raiding party led by Brigadier General Albert Gallatin Jenkins through the area north of the Kanawha Valley, and began marching his forces toward the valley (McKinney 1988).

On September 10, 1862, Union and Confederate forces engaged a few miles south of Fayetteville, and fighting continued to Fayetteville proper where Union forces occupied three fortifications constructed the previous winter. Union forces included one regiment, six additional companies, two six pound smoothbores, and four mountain howitzers. The attacking Confederate force was considerably larger. At Loring’s command were 5000 troops with 16 pieces of artillery. Though Federal troops offered a stiff defense, the ensuing battle led to an eventual Union retreat. This allowed Loring to take command of the turnpike which led to Gauley Bridge and Charleston. Loring’s capture of Fayetteville eventually led to his occupation of Charleston. However, the occupation was brief as Loring left after only a few weeks, without orders to engage the enemy on other fronts. His abandonment of Charleston and the Kanawha Valley cost him his command, and the Confederate forces lost control of the Kanawha Valley. Despite an attempt to reoccupy the area, forces under the command of General Echols were forced south through Fayetteville to Princeton and locations farther south. The year ended with Union troops again occupying Fayetteville and beginning the work of strengthening forts constructed during 1861 (McKinney 1988).

Events surrounding Fayette County in 1863 were largely centered on the Jones-Imboden Raid. To help distract and keep Union forces in the Kanawha Valley, and to keep them from moving north to reinforce their counterparts during this raid, Confederate General McClausland was ordered to move on Fayetteville taking the same route General Loring used the previous year. The result was heavy skirmishing along the turnpike between Raleigh Courthouse (present-day Beckley) and Fayetteville, and two artillery battles. It is reported that during the first artillery battle a Sergeant Milton W. Humphreys first practiced the technique of “indirect fire”. The attack of Fayetteville was successful in that it occupied Federal Forces, but it did not succeed in advancing. Indeed, following a day and a half of fighting, General McClausland’s troops retreated, briefly making a stand near present day Beckley. While other brief raids on Union camps by army regulars and militia bushwhackers are reported, no other major battles appear to have taken place in Fayette County for the remainder of the year (McKinney 1988).

After 1863, Fayette County appears to have played a greatly diminished role in events surrounding the Civil War. Occupied by Union troops, no major battles appear to have taken place. Fayetteville was used as point of rally as Union troops moved south to attack the Virginia-Tennessee railroad, and Confederate forces launched one final raid on Fayetteville, but it does not appear to have been on the scale of battles that took place in 1862 and 1863 (McKinney 1988).

Railroads

Railways appeared after the end of the Civil War. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway
(C&O) travels through the county northeast to southwest and follows the Kanawha and New river valleys. The rails run 91.2 km (57 mi) through the county. In 1873, the line was completed to Huntington. Several branch lines of the railway extend throughout the county primarily along the tributaries of the Kanawha and New rivers to accommodate the transportation of coal (Peters 1926:243).

**Project APE**

Little written history documenting this portion of Fayette County, or specifically the vicinity of Fayette Heights, was found in readily available previously compiled histories. However, a search of historic twentieth-century maps provided some information concerning its development.

**1919 Map of Fayette County**

The 1919 map of Fayette County indicates that the area between Fayetteville and Oak Hill where the project area is located was not fully settled even by the early twentieth-century (Figure 6). The sparse placement of residences indicates that agriculture was a primary occupation within the area. Only a handful of residences are indicated along the corridor that current day Route 16 follows. The town of Fayette Heights is not indicated on the map; the lack of a cluster of buildings suggests that the community did not exist during this time.

**1928 USGS 15’ Fayetteville, Topographic Quadrangle**

The 1928 topographic map indicates a nearly identical arrangement (Figure 7). Very few houses are depicted in and around the Project. Fayette Heights is not labeled, and a building group indicating its existence is not present. Route 16 is indicated on the map, but does not appear to be completed. The current day Route 16 appears to roughly follow the proposed route through the project area. The route would have provided better transportation opportunities for the area, and likely lead to further development.

**1969 (1976) USGS 7.5’ Fayetteville, Topographic Quadrangle**

A review of the most recent USGS topographic map of the region suggests that further development does occur along the Route 16 corridor during the middle twentieth century (Figure 2). A cluster of buildings is now shown near the intersection of Route 16 and Wolf Creek Road, and is labeled Fayette Heights. Other changes include the mapping of the proposed route of Corridor L, or US 19, a four-lane highway, which was proposed and is now located west of Fayette Heights and incorporates portion of Route 16 located south of the pre-defined visual APE.

**Cultural Resource Potential**

The context suggested that at least two forms of historic resources were likely to exist, farmsteads and residential suburbs. The following provides a description and context for both resource types.

**Farmsteads**

Research suggests that the farmstead model of development has played a significant role in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in the study area. Farmsteads are defined as, “a complex of agriculturally related buildings, yards, enclosures, and special activity or use areas associated with the practices of farming” (McBride and McBride 1990:683). As such, they often required land surrounding the main dwelling to support ancillary dependencies and activities. Common throughout the eastern United States during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, farmsteads were often family operated. They were self sufficient units that were involved in a variety of agrarian activities, including raising and butchering livestock and vegetable and grain production (McBride and McBride 1990).

Prior to the Civil War, agricultural production focused on the farm household, where several generations of family members worked to maintain a self-sufficient environment based on a variety of production techniques. The small urban populations of the time did not require large-scale
Figure 6. Portion of 1919 Topographic Map of Fayette County showing approximate location of predefined APE. Scale: 1” = 1 Mile.
commodification of farm products for mass distribution. Instead, the family based agrarian lifestyle focused on local production that defined the farmstead model (Rotman et. al. 1998:74; s.f. McMurry 1988).

The farmstead model of settlement was perhaps the most common seen in the rural eastern United States. Indeed, this model of settlement was employed by a broad spectrum of social, economic, and ethnic classes (Stine 1990).

In Appalachia, whose coal resources were in large demand, many small farmsteads were abandoned and sold to industrialists looking to begin vast mining or timbering operations. Soon after the turn of the century, this large population boom, growth of urban-based industry, and socio-economic change led to the abandonment of the farmstead. During the early 1900s, Fayette County was one of the largest coal output counties in the state, producing over five million tons in 1914 (Rice 1985:187).

**Residential Suburbs**

The project area likely remained primarily rural through the early twentieth-century, however, its location near Fayetteville and Oak Hill added a suburban element. In addition, the introduction of Route 16 during the mid-twentieth century provided the transportation potential needed for the area to develop into a more dense residential community. Prior to World War II, suburbs were often located near urban areas and associated with factories or places of work. Most of the homes were built for working
class residents. Many of these resources would have been widely available as both stock builder forms and as prefabricated catalog houses. They incorporated many new technological changes such as heating and plumbing. Their appearance is often associated with the arrival of outside influences such as coal companies, the railroad, and improved highway systems and communication.

The post-WWII period was a time of great change and growth for the project area. Route 16 provided ample transportation to and from Fayetteville and Oak Hill. The area of current-day Fayette Heights, located between the two larger cities, must have been seen as a potential draw for development. Farmers in the area likely divided their acreage into small house lots. This allowed them to prosper financially regardless of the downfall of large scale farming. It also allowed them to downsize from the large farm complex to a more manageable small family farm. It is likely, based upon the architecture evident in the area today, that this shift from agriculture to residential occurred during the mid-twentieth century. This is likely when the town of Fayette Heights was created.

The subdivisions of the mid-twentieth century were often curvilinear neighborhoods incorporating large lots and low pitched horizontally spaced houses, called “ramblers.” Ramblers are now more commonly referred to as ranch homes, referring to the Spanish rancheros that influenced early twentieth century California architects. Fayette Heights has a number of ranch houses. Many reflect the characteristic low pitched roofs, wide eaves, and prominent garages. Unlike the larger post-WWII neighborhoods however, Fayette Heights does not feature curvilinear subdivision planning or continuous areas of ranch homes. Instead, the houses of Fayette Heights are spread out amongst the community and are interspersed with less characteristic front and side gable houses and commercial establishments. Although there are many ranch houses present, there is no evidence of a planned community (Jakle et al. 1989).

IV. APE DESCRIPTION

The existing community of Fayette Heights and its surrounding area is primarily comprised of post-WWII housing. Unlike larger post-WWII housing developments, Fayette Heights appears to be randomly developed, with no grid pattern or evident early subdivision plan. The houses feature random street setbacks and forms (Figure 3). Modern infill is interspersed throughout the community, and includes newly constructed homes, and older homes with significant modifications (Figure 4). The current terrain is similar to the terrain desired for the proposed community, with large tree lines separating areas and providing natural boundaries (Figure 5). With a combination of commercial buildings, residences, and open land, the existing Fayette Heights is a multiuse community. Though it does not appear that Fayette Heights was developed through a master plan nor specifically designated as such, the town developed into a scaled down version of a mixed-use community.

Outside of center of Fayette Heights, which is located near the intersection of Route 16 and Wolf Creek Road, isolated and sporadic residential development was also noted within the predefined visual APE. Primarily made up of single family homes, this development also appears to date to the early to late twentieth century.

V. DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

The results of the cultural historic survey are presented in Table 1 and mapped on Figure 2. A total of six previously unidentified cultural resources were documented: Resources FR-03-638-FA(1) through FR-03-638-FA(6). Resources FR-03-638-FA(1) through FR-03-638-FA(5) are individual resources, whereas Resource FR-03-638-
FA(6) (Fayette Heights) is composed of a number of resources, surveyed as a group/town resource.

All resources 50 years old and older are described below. Each resource has been assessed to determine if it is eligible for the NRHP, and the evaluation is found after each description. Survey forms for each of the six resources are submitted with this report (Appendix B).

Table 1. Summary Data for Inventoried Cultural Resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRAI Survey #</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility</th>
<th>Effect of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR:03-638-FA(1)</td>
<td>1-story, 3-bay, rusticated CMU, pyramidal-roof house</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR:03-638-FA(2)</td>
<td>1-story, 4-bay, frame, hip-roof house</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR:03-638-FA(3)</td>
<td>1-story, frame, side gable house with façade addition</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR:03-638-FA(4)</td>
<td>1-story, 3-bay, frame, front gable house</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR:03-638-FA(5)</td>
<td>1-story, frame, front gable house with enclosed front porch</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR:03-638-FA(6a-hh)</td>
<td>Fayette Heights Community</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resource FR:03-638-FA(1)**

**Photographs:** Figure 8  
**Map:** Figure 2  
**Zone:** 17  
**Quad:** Fayetteville, WV 1976  
**UTM:** E: 491307 N: 4208462  

**Description:** This resource is located on the south side of Wolf Creek Road and is oriented to the north. It is a one-story, four-bay (w/d/w/d), pyramidal-roof house constructed of rusticated concrete masonry units (CMU) (Figure 8). The façade features two single-leaf entries, both with replacement doors. A shed-roof porch extends the length of the roof and spans the width of the façade. This porch is supported by square wood posts that rest on a concrete slab. Windows throughout the building have single-over-single-light double-hung sashes. A single-leaf entry with historic door is located on the east side of the building, but access to the entry has been removed. A single-leaf basement entry is also located on the east elevation.

Two frame additions are attached to the west elevation of the building. These additions are clad in vinyl siding. The entire building rests on a poured concrete basement foundation. The roof of the building is clad in asphalt shingles. A single-car garage is associated with the resource.

**NRHP Evaluation:** Not eligible. With side additions, replacement windows and doors, and an overall lack of distinguishing characteristics, this resource does not appear to be a particularly outstanding example of a type, period, or method of construction. In addition, the resource does not appear to be associated with a significant person or event in history. As a result, the resource does not appear to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A, B, or C.

**Determination of Effect:** N/A
Resource FR:03-638-FA(2)

Photographs: Figure 9
Map: Figure 2
Zone: 17
Quad: Fayetteville, WV 1976
UTM: E: 491058 N: 4208421

Description: This resource is located on the north side of Wolf Creek Road and is oriented to the south. It is a one-story, four-bay (w/w/d/w), frame, house with a hip-roof (Figure 9). A single-leaf entry is off-set right on the façade. A metal awning supported by metal decorative posts shelters the entry. Right of the entry is a large picture window flanked by single-light, sliding sidelights. Left of the entry are two windows, both with two-light, metal, louvered, sashes. A large, exterior CMU chimney is located on the east elevation, and pierces a portion of the roof. The house has a rear, frame, addition, with a single-leaf entry on the east elevation. The entire house is clad in vinyl siding; the roof is clad in asphalt shingles. The house rests on a continuous foundation that is clad in parging.

NRHP Evaluation: Not eligible. This building does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a style, method, or period of construction. Also, the rear addition and vinyl cladding detract from the overall historic appearance of the building. Additionally, it does not appear to be associated with a significant person or event. As a result, this resource does not appear eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A, B, or C.

Determination of Effect: N/A
Resource FR:03-638-FA(3)

Photographs: Figure 10
Map: Figure 2
Zone: 17
Quad: Fayetteville, WV 1976
UTM: E: 490765  N: 4208348

Description: This resource is located on the north side of Wolf Creek Road and is oriented to the south. It is a one-story, frame, side-gable house with a gable-end projection masking the original façade (Figure 10). The façade gable-end portion appears to be a porch enclosure, due to steps leading to the front wall. Currently, the house has no façade entry, and the front steps lead to a wall with a single window bay. The window within the façade enclosure has two-light horizontally sliding sashes. Left of the façade projection is a bay that has been altered to accommodate a picture window with single-light sidelights. Right of the façade projection is another altered window bay with two-light horizontally sliding sashes. Windows throughout the remainder of the building have replacement single-over-single-light double-hung sashes.

A shed-roof addition spans the width of the rear elevation. The roofline of this addition has been altered in height. A single-leaf entry is located on the east elevation of the rear addition, and is accessed by a treated lumber deck. A gable-roof cellar entry is also located on the east elevation, and provides access to the area beneath the primary block of the house. The entire building is clad in vinyl siding and rests on a poured concrete foundation. The roof is clad in asphalt shingles.

NRHP Evaluation: Not eligible. With a façade projection masking the original entry, and replacement windows with altered openings removing any evidence of the original façade configuration, in addition to replacement siding and substantial rear addition with modern deck, this building no longer retains the integrity necessary to convey its significance. In addition, the resource does not appear to be associated with a significant person or event in history. As a result, the resource does not appear to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A, B, or C.

Determination of Effect: N/A
Resource FR:03-638-FA(4)

Photographs: Figure 11
Map: Figure 2
Zone: 17
Quad: Fayetteville, WV 1976
UTM: E: 490697  N: 4208287

Description: This resource is located on the south side of Wolf Creek Road, and is oriented to the north. It is a one-story, three-bay (w/d/w), front gable building (Figure 11). A single-leaf entry is centered on the façade. Windows on either side of the entry have six-over-six-light double-hung sashes. A gable-roof porch spans the width of the three façade bays and is supported by turned wood columns that rest atop brick piers on a CMU slab. Windows along both sides of the building have six-over-six-light double-hung sashes. Topography prohibited a close survey of the rear of the building, but there appear to be no additions. The house is clad in rolled asphalt siding. The roof is clad in asphalt shingles, and a CMU chimney with brick cap pierces the west side roof slope. The house rests on a CMU foundation.

NRHP Evaluation: Not eligible. Although it retains its original windows and overall form, this building does not appear to be an outstanding example of early to mid-twentieth century architecture. Also, the rolled asphalt siding significantly detracts from the historic appearance of this building, diminishing integrity of materials, design, workmanship, and feeling. Additionally, the resource does not appear to be associated with a significant person or event. As a result, this resource does not appear eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A, B, or C.

Determination of Effect: N/A
**Resource FR:03-638-FA(5)**

**Photographs:** Figure 12  
**Map:** Figure 2  
**Zone:** 17  
**Quad:** Fayetteville, WV 1976  
**UTM:** E: 490609  N: 4208233

**Description:** This site is located on the south side of Wolf Creek Road and is oriented to the north. It is a one-story, three-bay, frame, front gable residence (Figure 12). An enclosed gable-roof porch is located on the façade of the building. The enclosure has five bays (w/w/d/w/w), with a central single-leaf entry. Windows on either side of the entry and on the side elevations of the porch enclosure have eight-over-eight-light double-hung sashes. Windows along the sides of the building have single-over-single-light double-hung sashes.

The house features a rear addition that wraps around to a side shed-roof addition on the east elevation. A single-leaf entry is located on the north elevation of the side addition. The house and addition are clad in asbestos tile. The roof is clad in asphalt shingles, and a brick chimney pierces the ridgeline near the rear of the primary block of the house. The foundation of the house was not visible.

**NRHP Evaluation:** Not eligible. With porch enclosure, and rear and side additions, this house no longer retains the integrity necessary to convey its significance. In addition, the site does not appear to be associated with a significant person or event in history. As a result, the site does not appear to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A, B, or C.

**Determination of Effect:** N/A
Figure 12. Resource FR-03-638-FA(5), One-story, frame, front-gable house with enclosed front porch.

Resource FR:03-638-FA (6:a-hh)

Photographs: Figures 13-30 (and Appendix C)
Map: Figure 2
Zone: 17
Quad: Fayetteville, WV 1976
UTM: E: 489609 N: 4208367
     E: 489967 N: 4208304
     E: 489689 N: 4207704
     E: 489406 N: 4207750

Description: This resource includes the portion of Fayette Heights that is included within the APE. The group includes a total of 34 resources. Of the 34 buildings, 29 appear to be 50 years of age or older. The predominant house type within the group is the Ranch house. The resources include 14 Ranch houses, five side-gable houses, four front-gable houses, three commercial buildings, two hip-roof buildings, and one Tudor Revival house (Table 2). Digital photographs of all resources surveyed within this group are included in Appendix C.

Ranch

The ranch house is likely the most popular post-war housing in America. The house type is believed to have originated in California during the 1930s. The floor plan is open, with an indoor/outdoor environment created by large picture windows, patios, and bay windows. Other characteristics include low pitched hip-roofs, cross-gable roofs, and dominant carports or garages. There are 14 examples of ranch houses within Fayette Heights. Many reflect the characteristic low pitched hip-roof, prominent garage, and picture windows (Figures 13 and 14). Nearly all have replacement siding and although some retain their original metal sashes, many have replacement windows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Survey #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranch Dwelling</td>
<td>6d, 6e, 6g, 6i, 6n, 6q, 6r, 6s, 6bb, 6cc, 6dd, 6ee, 6ff, 6hh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side-Gable Dwelling</td>
<td>6a, 6l, 6x, 6aa, 6gg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-Gable Dwelling</td>
<td>6j, 6m, 6p, 6v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>6b, 6h, 6t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip-Roof Dwelling</td>
<td>6c, 6o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Revival Dwelling</td>
<td>6f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>6k, 6u, 6w, 6y, 6z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13. Resource FR-03-638(6n), Fayette Heights: Example of Ranch house.
Figure 14. Resource FR—3-638-FA(6hh), Fayette Heights: Example of Ranch house.

Figure 15. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6aa), Fayette Heights: Example of side-gable house.
Figure 16. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6a), Fayette Heights: Example of side-gable house.

Figure 17. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6gg), Fayette Heights: Example of side-gable house.
Figure 18. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6j), Fayette Heights: Example of front-gable house.

Figure 19. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6p), Fayette Heights: Example of heavily modified front-gable house.
Figure 20. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6o), Fayette Heights: Example of hip-roof house.

Figure 21. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6c), Fayette Heights: Example of hip-roof house.
Figure 22. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6f), Fayette Heights: Tudor Revival house.

Figure 23. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6b), Fayette Heights: Example of commercial building.
Figure 24. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6t), Fayette Heights: Example of commercial building.

Figure 25. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6h), Fayette Heights: Example of commercial building.
Figure 26. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6k), Fayette Heights: Example of modern church.

Figure 27. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6y), Fayette Heights: Example of modern church.
Figure 28. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6w), Fayette Heights: Example of modern residence.

Figure 29. Resource FR-03-638-FA(6z), Fayette Heights: Example of modern residence.
Remaining Residential:

**Side-gable, Front-gable, Hip-roof, Other**

There are six examples of side-gable houses within Fayette Heights. These do not include those side-gable houses with Ranch characteristics. Some have a lack of detailing, and merely have the form of a side-gable house typically with three façade bays and a front porch (Figure 15). Others follow the form, but feature more details like rafter tails, dormers, and dominant porches (Figures 16 and 17). Replacement siding, replacement windows, altered porches, and additions are common among the side-gable houses within Fayette County.

There are four examples of front-gable houses within Fayette Heights. All of the front-gable examples merely follow the form, and feature no distinguishing characteristics. They all feature minimal front porches, and typically have a three-bay façade (Figure 18). The four examples have all been clad in replacement siding. Two have enclosed façade porches and indistinguishable original façade bays (Figure 19).

There are two examples of hip-roof houses within Fayette Heights. These do not include those hip-roof houses with Ranch characteristics. One features a gable-on-hip roof and three façade bays (Figure 20). The second example is larger four-bay, nearing the size of a ranch, but it has a steeply pitched roof and no other ranch characteristics (Figure 21). Both buildings have had window replacements and non-historic porch additions.

One remaining residence over 50 years of age within Fayette Heights features a form unlike the other categories of house types. This building is a one-and-one-half-story, three-bay, Tudor Revival (Figure 22). The house is clad in brick and stone veneer. The façade entry is located within a shed-roof vestibule, and a shouldered brick exterior chimney is located left of the entry. A frame shed-roof dormer has been added to the front roof slope directly east of the chimney. Windows throughout the house have metal
casement sashes. What appears to have been a porch on the east elevation has been enclosed with storm windows.

Commercial

There are three commercial buildings within Fayette Heights. All three examples are constructed of CMU. Two feature parapet walls, and are one-story (Figures 23 and 24). One has a gable-on-hip-roof and is two-stories in height (Figure 25). All feature metal casement windows. All three have covered or boarded over façade bays. Two have undergone bay size alterations on the façade.

NRHP Evaluation: Not eligible. The area of Fayette Heights was surveyed as a group and evaluated for potential eligibility as a district. In order for an area to be considered eligible as a district, it must retain the integrity of historic characteristics such as spatial design, circulation networks, and historic views. Individual resources within the group must also retain their integrity. The group must reflect a similar design or transition of design through a common time period. This area lacks the overall cohesion required for a group of resources to be considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP as a district. Although the residential area may reflect the growth or development of the outlying areas of Fayetteville and Oak Hill and reflect a growth in population after WWII, it does not retain the integrity or cohesion to represent that growth in a particularly outstanding way. There appears to be no distinctive spatial planning within the group. In addition, individual resources throughout the group have replacement materials such as siding, sashes, and doors. Many feature additions including porch additions and porch enclosures. Those that do retain the majority of their original materials do not appear to be particularly outstanding examples of a type, method, or period of construction. None were found to be associated with a person or event significant in history. As a result, none of the individual resources within Property 6 appear to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A, B, or C.

Determination of Effect: N/A

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

During November 2004, CRAI completed a reconnaissance level cultural resource survey for the proposed Wolf Creek Park Project located in Fayette Heights, 5.0 mi (8.0 km) north of Oak Hill and 3 mi (4.8 km) south of Fayetteville, in Fayette County West Virginia. The survey was conducted at the request of Eric B. Gillespie of Thrasher Engineering, Inc.

The purpose of this reconnaissance survey was to document and evaluate cultural resources located within a pre-defined visual Area of Potential Effects (APE) for eligibility
for listing on the NRHP and if necessary apply the Criteria of Adverse Effects. The visual APE was provided to CRAI by Thrasher Engineering, Inc. For the purposes of this assessment, a cultural resource was defined as any above ground resource 50 years of age or older and a historic property was defined as cultural resource meeting the NRHP eligible for, or listed on, the NRHP.

The investigation reported herein was completed to aid EDA and Project proponents achieve compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended, and its regulating language (36 CFR Part 800). Specifically, this report was completed for submission to EDA and the WVSHPO for review and comment.

Prior to initiating fieldwork, a search of records maintained by the WVSHPO was conducted by GAI Consultants and CRAI to determine if previously recorded cultural resources were located in the pre-defined APE. Results determined that none of the resources within the current APE had been previously documented. During the field survey, six previously unidentified cultural resources were documented (Resources FR-03-638-FA(1) through FR-03-638-FA(6)). None of these resources appears eligible for listing in the NRHP.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this study it is recommended that no additional cultural resources investigations are warranted for the pre-defined APE.
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