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1. Name of Property
   historic name   Dolbeer-Ware House
   other names/site number   Lampkin House

2. Location
   street & number   850 Terrill Road
   city or town   Plainfield City
   state   New Jersey
   code   NJ
   county   Union
   code   039
   zip code   07060

3. State/Federal Agency Certification
   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I certify that this nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant nationally statewide locally. See continuation sheet for additional comments.
   
   Signature of certifying official/Title
   Date

   State or Federal agency and bureau

   In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria. See continuation sheet for additional comments.
   
   Signature of certifying official/Title
   Date

   State or Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification
   I hereby certify that this property is:
   
   entered in the National Register. See continuation sheet.
   determined eligible for the National Register. See continuation sheet.
   determined not eligible for the National Register.
   removed from the National Register.
   other, (explain:)

   Signature of the Keeper
   Date of Action
### 5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Check as many boxes as apply)</td>
<td>(Check only one box)</td>
<td>(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ private</td>
<td>✓ building(s)</td>
<td>contributing Noncontributing buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ public-local</td>
<td>district</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ public-State</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ public-Federal</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name of related multiple property listing**
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

N/A

**Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register**


### 6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/ single dwelling</td>
<td>VACANT / NOT IN USE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/ secondary structure</td>
<td>VACANT / NOT IN USE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER: East Jersey Cottage</td>
<td>foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Description**
(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

See Continuation Sheets
### 8 Statement of Significance

**Applicable National Register Criteria**  
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- [ ] A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- [ ] B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- [ ] C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- [X] D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

**Criteria considerations**  
(mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:

- [ ] A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- [ ] B removed from its original location.
- [ ] C a birthplace or grave.
- [ ] D a cemetery.
- [ ] E a reconstructed building, object or structure.
- [ ] F a commemorative property.
- [ ] G less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

**Period of Significance**

ca. 1772 – ca. 1836

**Significant Dates**

ca. 1772  
1791

**Significant Person**  
(Complete if Criterion B is marked above)

N/A

**Cultural Affiliation**

N/A

**Architect/Builder**

UNKNOWN

**Narrative Statement of Significance**

(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

### 9. Major Bibliographical References

**Bibliography**

(cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

**Previous documentation on file (NPS):**

- [ ] preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- [ ] previously listed in the National Register
- [ ] previously determined eligible by the National Register
- [ ] designated a National Historic Landmark
- [ ] recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey
- [ ] recorded by Historic American Engineering Record

**Primary location of additional data**

- [ ] State Historic Preservation Office
- [ ] Other State agency
- [ ] Federal agency
- [ ] Local government
- [ ] University
- [ ] Other

Name of repository:
10. Geographical Data

Acreage of property: 0.43 Acre

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates
(Follow similar guidelines for entering these coordinates as for entering UTM references described on page 55, How to Complete the National Register Registration Form. For properties less than 10 acres, enter the lat/long coordinates for a point corresponding to the center of the property. For properties of 10 or more acres, enter three or more points that correspond to the vertices of a polygon drawn on the map. The polygon should approximately encompass the area to be registered. Add additional points below, if necessary.)

Datum: WGS 84

1. Latitude: 40.631538
   Longitude: -74.386340

Verbal Boundary Description
(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification
(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title: Ann Parsekian and Dennis Bertland
organization: Dennis Bertland Associates
date: March 2016
street & number: P.O. Box 315
telephone: 609-397-3380
city or town: Stockton
state: NJ
zip code: 08559

Additional Documentation
Submit the following items with the completed form:
Continuation Sheets
Maps
   A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
   A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.
Photographs
   Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional items
(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner
(Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO.)

name: ____________________________
street & number: ____________________________
telephone: ____________________________
city or town: ____________________________
state: ____________
zip code: ____________

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C 470 et seq.)

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this from to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Projects (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.
The Dolbeer-Ware House is a 1½-story timber frame house of 18th-/early 19th-century origins and East Jersey cottage form that is situated on .43 acre along the southwest side of Terrill Road in the City of Plainfield, Union County, New Jersey. The house, a rare survivor of the small English, Dutch, and Anglo-Dutch farmhouses that once proliferated throughout the broad Raritan Valley, is bordered by modern residential neighborhoods to the north, east, and south, and to the west by publicly owned open space (a thirty-acre water retention basin serving the Robinson’s Branch of the Rahway River). Terrill Road, originally surveyed in 1699, is now a busy county road, and the east end of the south-facing Dolbeer-Ware House lies six feet within the public right of way (Photo 1).1 The double pile, side gable house, which consists of three blocks joined laterally, and was constructed in three major building campaigns. All of the blocks were of traditional frame construction, incorporating both hewn and saw-cut timber and traditional mortise and tenon joinery, and each employs some variant or hybrid of H-bent framing. Expressed construction and finishing details differ within each section, and it is likely that the currently inaccessible framing would illustrate additional methodological differences. The central block, the dwelling’s oldest section, most likely was the house in existence in 1791, the year Jesse Dolbeer purchased land that adjoined the “Dollbare plantation he now lives on,” and might have been constructed some years earlier, as suggested by such features characteristic of the region’s mid-18th-century domestic architecture such as the large corner fireplace.2 A will from 1772 indicates that John Clark, who was descended from one of the original Elizabethtown Associates, was the property’s owner at that time, and the central block could well date to Clark’s ownership.3 The west, slightly deeper two-bay section, also likely constructed during the 18th century, was apparently erected as a free-standing building and later moved to adjoin the west end of what is now the center block. The south end of the west section projects about four-and-a-half feet beyond the center block, creating asymmetry in the west gable (Photo 2). The eastern two-bay section – which matches the depth of the middle section – appears to be the newest construction and features a Rumford fireplace that helps to date the building campaign to sometime after the 1796 introduction of the Rumford design.4

The exterior of the dwelling was substantially remodeled during two major campaigns, one during the middle decades of the 19th century and the second time at some point after the turn of the 20th century. During

2 Sept. 2, 1791 Deed John Meeker to Jesse Dolbier. Unrecorded deed from Joan Barnett. The mid-18th-century section of Abraham Staats House exhibits a similar plan, corner fireplaces and H-bent framing [HABS NJ-57].
3 NJ Wills, 4425-28G. John Clark descended from Richard Clarke (1661-1742), who was a ship carpenter from Southampton, Long Island who moved to Elizabethtown around 1678. [Charles Carroll Gardner, Genealogical Collections 1665-1800, Vol. 29, Clark, quoted at www.westfieldnjhistory.com]
4 In 1796, American-born scientist Benjamin Thompson (1753-1814), who later became Count Rumford, published in Europe an essay on his theories to improve fireplaces, a number of which were widely adopted. [Henry J. Kauffman, The American Fireplace: Chimneys, Mantelpieces, Fireplaces & Accessories, New York: Galahad Books, 1972, p. 231]
the 19th century, the exterior was remodeled with Italianate details: Large center gables and smaller flanking dormers were inserted on both slopes of the roof; a bracketed overhanging eave was added; and a flat roof, porch was appended to the south façade (Fig. 7). These changes were probably undertaken sometime between 1843 and 1884, when the property was owned by Bernard Latapie. Many of the Italianate details were replaced with Colonial Revival features in the early 20th century (Photo 3). It is likely that the front entrance was reoriented to the north side of the house and a second porch was appended there as part of this Colonial Revival remodeling, which most likely occurred shortly after composer Harriet Ware and her husband acquired the property in 1917. Some Colonial Revival interior alterations also took place around this time, primarily in the east block. The chronology of other interior alterations – for example, insertion of the stairway in Room 104 and the second floor partitioning – is unknown. At some point during the late 20th century, the south center gable was extended and a porch (that no longer survives) was added to the northwest corner of the house. Despite these remodeling campaigns, the form and siting of the house make plain its earlier origins. A two-story frame barn is located about seventy feet west of the house; likely constructed during the 19th century after the period of significance, it is not counted as a contributing resource (Photo 16). While the house has deteriorated over the last two decades and considerable early fabric has been lost, its original framing and floor plan survive, its form remains intact, and it retains its original setting as a farmhouse.

Present site conditions impeded inspection in numerous exterior and interior areas. Porches and most first-floor openings have been covered with plywood. Structural issues and enormous amounts of debris prevented visible inspection of or access to large portions of the interior. In addition, access to the timber frame elements was limited to those currently exposed; no probes were conducted. An opportunity to study the overall construction of the dwelling in greater detail is expected to yield more clues to its origin and history. See Section 8 for a detailed discussion of a research program likely to yield information relevant to significance under Criterion D.

Setting

The Dolbeer-Ware House is located on the west side of Terrill Road, now a heavily traveled route at the east border of the City of Plainfield, which was originally laid out in 1699 as part of the Elizabethtown Clinker Lots division. The dwelling is located on the northern flank of a small hill that is one of a series of hills known as the Short Hills, a glacial moraine, that run approximately north and south and cover an area roughly 1.2 miles east to west and 3.4 miles north to south, and at their peak are 160 feet high. Robinson’s Branch of the Rahway River, which empties into the Arthur Kill, is located west of the property. A number of the dwellings located north, south, and east (across Terrill Road) of the Dolbeer-Ware House are on land that was subdivided over time from the Dolbeer farmstead. An asphalt-paved driveway is located on the south side of the house, and a

6 UC Deeds, Book 720, page 147.
7 McGrath, Clinker Lots.
two-story frame barn stands seventy feet west of the house (Photo 16). The remainder of the gently sloping property is covered with overgrown shrubs, brush and mature trees.

**Dwelling**

**Exterior**

The 1½-story frame, side-gable dwelling is comprised of three blocks representing lateral expansion over time; the center and west blocks are 24.21 feet deep while the west block is 28.80 feet deep; the overall width of the dwelling is 52.70 feet, with each block about 17 feet wide. The house is clad with clapboard (likely installed during the 19th century) that in most areas has been attached with what appears to be cut nails; its roof is covered with asphalt shingles installed over wood shingles, and it stands on a foundation, which, where visible at the east end, is of random coursed, roughly squared stone (sandstone and basalt) on the exterior faces and random coursed rubble on the interior.\(^8\) One of the most intriguing features of the dwelling is the roofline of the deeper west block, which gives the impression of a saltbox or cat slide roof. Although the framing of the north wall of the west block is presently visible as a result of a partial collapse (showing evidence of several alterations and repairs), a more detailed examination of the framing in the west block would be required to understand the intention of the design.\(^9\) Interior, gable-end brick chimneys are located at each end of the dwelling. The east gable-end chimney served two fireplaces. The west gable-end chimney, which served one fireplace, features an exposed chimney back of coursed roughly squared stone laid in alternating rows of wide and narrow stones (Photos 1 & 2). The use of stone for the chimney back is curious for an early dwelling in an area where even the earliest houses had brick fireplaces with exposed brick backs.\(^10\) A third, interior brick chimney (which served one fireplace and a bake oven) is located at the west end of the center block. The large 19th-century center gables are flanked by dormers on each slope of the roof, all of which (except the south roof slope center gable) feature round arch windows with plain architraves and 2/2 sashes. The center gable on the south slope has been extended by means of a poorly constructed porch appendage with a corrugated fiberglass roof and modern windows. The overhanging eaves feature built-in, metal-lined gutters, a cornice (attached with wire nails over the siding) with molded crown and bed moldings, and plain modillion blocks. This cornice is continued onto the east gable; the west gable has flush raking eaves. Early 20th-century porches on the north and south sides of the house feature paneled corner columns and over-hanging eaves with plain modillion blocks (Photos 1 & 3). Porch openings were subsequently enclosed with window sashes and solid railings covered with clapboard; several fluted pilasters were also added. First-story and gable-end second-story windows on the north, east, and west elevations have 6/6 sashes and plain moldings. The four first story windows along the

---


\(^9\) The two-aisled house, common in some areas of the Netherlands and Flemish Belgium, had a saltbox or lean to that extended fairly low to the ground at the rear or to one side (whereas the west block of the Dolbeer-Ware house extends at the south or original front). Although once fairly numerous in the New York area, very few have survived. [John R. Stevens, *Dutch Vernacular Architecture in North America, 1640-1830*, West Hurley, NY: The Society for the Preservation of Hudson Valley Vernacular Architecture, 2005, p. 55]

\(^10\) Richard Veit email to Dennis N. Bertland, January 15, 2015. The Dr. Robinson Plantation in Clark, NJ, is one such early dwelling.
south façade of the center section feature leaded glass interior sashes and 2/2 wood exterior sashes; three windows on the south façade of the west section have metal grills behind wood 1/1 sashes; the sole first-story window on the south façade of the east section has 6/6 sashes. Where the foundation is exposed in the east section, there are casement windows with two-light sashes (Photo 1). There are four entries: one is located on the north façade in the center of the middle section (the current “front” entry); two are located on the south façade – one in the west bay of the west section and one in the west bay of the center section; and one located at the north corner of the west end elevation. They are fitted with a variety of replacement doors.

General Interior Notes

Though all three sections are examples of the heavy timber framing tradition, each section is distinct in the size, spacing and finishes of the expressed portions of H-bents, which serve as first floor ceiling joists. Dendrochronology testing conducted during 2015 did not yield any useful results; however, floor joists beneath the center and west blocks, along with other timbers that are not exposed to view, could yield datable timbers for future study.11 None of the first floor rooms seem to have ever had a plaster ceiling. Interior wall and second-floor ceiling plaster and finishes have been damaged or lost. The center and east sections both retain their original south-facing entries, which provided entry from the exterior directly into heated rooms. Both sections were double pile in plan, consistent with the regional house type known as a “deep East Jersey cottage.” The northern, secondary room in the center section had no direct heat source, while both rooms in the later east section contained corner fireplaces. The only surviving entry into the single pile west section is at the northwest corner; it was not possible to determine if this presently boarded up entry was part of the original construction.

Interior: Cellar

Excavated cellar space is present beneath the east block only. The center and west blocks have no accessible “crawl space” and it was not possible to examine floor joists, footings, or chimney bases. The cellar access (which is reached by a narrow floor hatch located in Room 103, what was originally the back hall of the center block) has wide stone steps that resemble early exterior areaways.12 The cellar floor is earth. The first-floor joists above the cellar form a frame with what may be a summer beam. There is an intact early window on the south side of this section with a wooden barred window. A simple, massive masonry corbel supports the diagonal corner fireplaces in the first-floor east chamber.13 The two chimney flues are separate at the first floor level, but join together into a single stack in the second story. The center and west blocks were constructed with

12 A brief survey of HABS records revealed several early houses in the vicinity (Union, Middlesex and Somerset Counties) whose cellars were accessed by wide interior masonry steps that were located in a rear hall opposite an exterior doorway (Smock House and Runyon-Shotwell House). The Ainn-Smalley House has stone steps and is interesting because it has a section that is two steps higher than an adjoining unexcavated portion of the house. All of the interior cellar steps were accessed via doors, not floor hatches.
13 It is reminiscent of the Trust house in Green Brook Township, Somerset County. It is also similar to the fireplace support beneath the Drake House on Clinton Avenue in South Plainfield, Middlesex County.
low crawl space and were not accessible. Clay and brick nogging beneath the east wall of the central block (which is visible from the cellar in the east block) has been partially snapped off or cut away to allow the frame of the east section to abut more closely with the center block, indicating that the east block was constructed after the center block.

Interior: Center Block First Floor

Believed to be the original dwelling at this location, the center block consists of a large south room with a brick fireplace in the northwest corner (Room 102; Photos 6 & 7). The smaller north end of the first floor is divided by a light partition wall to create a small entry hall (Room 103), which contains a stairway to the second floor and a narrow hatchway to the cellar beneath the east wing, and another small room (Room 104; Photo 9) behind the main room’s corner fireplace. Room 102 is dominated by the presence of six heavy joists – the visible expression of what are believed to be H-bents – which run north to south creating five narrow, structural bays (Photo 6). The joists’ spacing ranges from about 39.5 inches to 42.5 inches on center; joists are dressed with beaded edges, indicating the absence of plaster. The five-bay arrangement in Room 102 suggests that the south wall – the original front wall of the house that was substantially reconfigured in the early 20th century – could have accommodated a center entry that opened directly into the main living space and was flanked by one or two windows on each side. This possibility should be investigated further. The room’s roughly hewn southeast corner post is visible (Photo 8). This room contains early 20th century tongue-and-groove flooring. Door and window moldings feature quirk-beaded inner edges. The corner fireplace, the largest of the dwelling’s fireplaces, was constructed with reddish brick with a timber lintel and a wood mantelshelf supported by a large cove molding (Photo 7). There is a narrow three-panel chimneybreast above the mantelshelf. Designed for cooking, the fireplace features an iron swing crane and an arched oven opening in its rear wall. The oven opening has been fitted with a metal frame surviving from an oven door (now missing), which may have been a later addition. The bake oven apparently extended into the space behind the built-in cupboard in the west block, an arrangement that seems to support the theory that the west section was added later. The western wall of the central block has brick nogging, possibly an indicator that it was originally constructed as an exterior wall – further supporting the theory that the west section was a later addition. Joists in Rooms 103 and 104 are also hewn and are similar in dimension to those in Room 102; the joists in Room 104 have no quirk bead molding. Two beams in Room 103 have been sistered for reasons that are not clear. The open stairs in Room 103 were most likely constructed in connection with remodeling what might have been an open attic into finished bedrooms, perhaps when the Victorian gables and dormers were added. However, as early as the early 1800s 1½-story houses were built with finished attic stories accessed by open stairs. It is not known if the present stairs represent a reworked original feature; an early or mid 19th-century alteration; or an early 20th-century change.

Interior: West Block First Floor Plan

The first floor of the west block consists of one large room – used most recently as a kitchen – with five exposed crudely hewn joists (i.e., the crossbeam section of H-bents) that span the depth of the room; the joist at
the west wall is interrupted by a brick fireplace approximately six feet in width (Room 105; Photos 10 & 11). Spacing between the bents ranges from about 42 inches to 45 inches on center. The unembellished joists span the entire depth of the room, making them longer than those in the central block. There are no interim posts; however there is a built-in cabinet on the east wall of the room that likely conceals the back of the bake oven located in the rear wall of the center block’s fireplace. Large iron brackets have been added to support the south ends of the joists, and the north wall of the west block has collapsed (Photo 4), which together suggests some structural deficiency either inherent in the original design or introduced during later alterations – an interesting subject requiring further study. An enclosed stairway to the second floor is located along the east side of the room. The west fireplace has evidence of substantial rebuilding: it has a metal lintel and a different, more orange brick used above the jambs, including a row of headers above the lintel; also, it appears there may be a shelf extending out from each side about halfway up each jamb (Photo 10). It is worth noting that despite the use of brick for the fireplace and the chimney, the exposed back of the chimney is stone.

Interior: East Block First Floor Plan

The first floor of the east block, which was originally constructed with front and back rooms, is now one open space that is divided by two corner fireplaces and a large crossbeam supported on paneled pilasters (Room 101; Photo 5). It is not clear if the crossbeam is a true summer beam or if it was added as part of the early 20th century remodeling. There are five bents, each spaced about 42” apart; exposed joists have quirk bead molding. The shallow brick Rumford fireplaces have mantels with molded cornice shelves characteristic of the Federal style popular in the early 1800s. An exterior doorway, fitted with a glass and wood panel door, is located in the southwest bay of the block. Door and window trim have quirk beaded inner edges. Flooring was not visible. A double-leaf doorway located in the west wall of what was originally the front room connects to Room 102. The block is elevated two steps higher than the center and west blocks, evidently to accommodate headroom in the cellar (which is accessed by interior stairs located in Room 103 of the center block).

Interior: Second Floor

The second floor was reconfigured or partitioned over time and the original floor plan of each section is unknown. Rooms 201-204 are accessed from the stairway in the center block; rooms 206-209 are accessed from the west stairwell. Both plaster and beaded board wall and ceiling finishes are found on the second floor; flooring is wide wood planking. Chimneys are visible in rooms 201, 207 and 208 and have thimbles for stove pipes. The center chimney is not exposed on the second floor. What appears to be an east/west-oriented summer beam is supported on a post, possibly a trimmed gunstock post, at the top of the west stairs.

Interior: Attic

14 This door is not shown in the sketch plan.
Roof framing in all three sections utilizes pairs of common rafters connected at the peak with pegged lap joints. At some point during the 19th century, perhaps in connection with installation of the center gables and dormers, the roofs were aligned and new rafters were installed where necessary. In all three blocks, the original collar beams (which form the ceiling of the attic chamber and the “floor” of the attic) were shaped with adzes and broadaxes, while the new elements were cut in a sawmill. In addition, each section has several distinctive features. The rafters in the center section are tapered and are notched for lath. The central section has planking – possibly from an early floor. The east section has rafters that have been notched to receive lath but are not tapered. Some of the rafters in the west section have been notched to receive earlier lath; the rafters here have no detectable taper. This section is also noteworthy for having what appears to be a summer beam running east to west supporting the attic joists on the second floor of the house. There is what appears to be a small but now blocked door entering from the stairway below.

Barn (Non-contributing building)

As with the dwelling, the barn contains massive amounts of clutter and debris, making a careful examination impossible at this time. Located approximately 150’ from house on a slight hill, it is a frame, gable-front, one-and-one-half-story building. The foundation is random-coursed stone rubble with clay-lime mortar still extant at several locations. The roof is covered with asphalt shingles. A small shed roof porch is located at north gable end. Exterior walls are clad with vertical board and batten siding. The barn features a mixture of early and later windows and doors configured to accommodate 20th-century use as a studio. Interior first floor walls and floors have been covered with various modern materials. What appears to be early hewn and saw cut framings survive, along with sections of brick nogging, but much of the frame appears to have been reworked in the 20th century with dimensional lumber. While probably dating to the mid-19th century, the building was extensively reworked in 20th century and little of its early historic character remains.

Site

The dwelling is sited on a natural ridge that drops away to the north, south, and west, and is adjacent to a marshy area. Its potential for colonial period archaeological deposits is very high. This includes the possibility that subfloor pits survive within the center section of the house, a pattern seen in other local farmsteads. These tend to date from the 18th century and could provide very interesting data about rural life in central Jersey during this period. Located close to Ashbrook Swamp, an area with known prehistoric sites, the site also has very high potential for Native American archaeological deposits.

---

16 Veit email.
17 Veit email.
Statement of Significance

Summary Paragraph

The Dolbeer-Ware House\(^1\) at 850 Terrill Road in Plainfield, New Jersey, is locally significant under Criterion D for the information that the structure of the house has already provided and may continue to provide about the evolution and persistence in parts of New Jersey of an important but little studied house type known as the “East Jersey cottage,” a vernacular house type that is believed to have first appeared in sections of New Jersey around the middle of the 18th century and become ubiquitous during the early decades of the 19th century among persons of middling estate. The dwelling is also significant for the information potential to shape our understanding of the 18th-century cultural melding process that took place in central New Jersey. The dwelling consists of three 1½-story sections – east, center, and west – that apparently were built at different times sometime during the late-18th and early 19th centuries – perhaps somewhat earlier – utilizing a variety of framing systems and representing several different floor plans. None of this is apparent from the exterior, which was remodeled during the mid-19th and early 20th centuries with architectural elements and details that conceal the dwelling’s origins. Initial investigation of the house resulted in the identification of construction and floor plan features that suggest 18th-century construction of the earliest portion of the house. Certain details of construction that have been uncovered suggest an intermingling of Dutch and English building traditions, in which case the house could provide information significant to the evolution of vernacular New Jersey architecture.\(^2\) The period of significance extends from ca.1772, the earliest date for which there is suggestion of the site’s occupancy, to ca.1836, the year in which the property left the ownership of the Dolbeer family, by which time all three sections had been constructed.

East Jersey Cottage

A generally applicable description of the exterior appearance of an East Jersey cottage is a 1½-story frame dwelling that is two, three, or (seldom) five bays wide and one or two rooms deep, with side gable roof and one or two interior gable-end chimneys. The East Jersey cottage appears to have been once ubiquitous in Plainfield, judging by a remarkable manuscript map of the village drawn in 1832 when the population was 740

---

1 In recent decades, the subject house has been known as “Lampkin House.” However, this name is most likely a corruption of “Lambkins Farm,” which was the pastoral name used by composer Harriet Ware and her husband William Krumbhaar when they owned the property (1917-1951). A more historically accurate name for the house, based on the two most prominent family names that can be associated with architectural development of the property, would be the Dolbeer-Ware House. It is important to note that by 1772, John Clark, a descendant of one of the original Elizabethtown associates, owned a parcel that included the site of the present dwelling; however, it is not known if Clark occupied the property and materials testing has not been able to confirm that some portion of the present dwelling was constructed during Clark’s ownership.

2 In New Jersey before 1800, the term “Dutch” referred to not only those settlers from Netherlands (including Friesland), but could also refer to settlers of Flemish or Walloon ethnic origins, among others, who through association (either before or after arriving in America) acquired Dutch-sounding names. The Flemings and Walloons are the two major ethnic groups in Belgium. [Peter O. Wacker, “Traditional House and Barn Types in New Jersey: Keys to Acculturation, Past Cultureographic Regions, and Settlement History,” Geoscience and Man, Vol. V, June 10, 1974, p.165]
(1832 map, Fig.2). At that time, Plainfield was in Essex County and still a part of Westfield Township. Of the 100+ buildings depicted on the map that can be identified as probable dwellings, forty-three were likely East Jersey cottages, one or one-and-a-half story side-gable main block dwellings, or their wings. The majority of these are two or three-bays wide, although there are several with four bays, and at least one – the Drake House – had been expended to five bays by 1832. While the vast majority of the dwellings are shown with one or two interior gable end chimneys, there are several that appear to have center chimneys. The placement of the door varies among the three-bay dwellings; the four-bay dwellings typically have two front doors, another noteworthy characteristic. These details reveal several interesting facts about Plainfield. First, as late as 1832 there were still examples in Plainfield of New England and Dutch influenced dwellings, a result of the heterogeneous population that was characteristic during the initial settlement of the region. Second, and more important for this discussion, although there was variety within Plainfield’s East Jersey cottage building type, as a group these modest houses are distinctive in the landscape, evidently representing a melding or adaptation of Anglo and Dutch building traditions to create a dwelling that was geographically more suitable and practical. However, for the most part, the nature of the synthesis of these two building traditions is not visible on the exterior, wherein lies the potential and significance of the house at 850 Terrill Road. In the words of cultural geographer Janet Sheridan:

> [E]ach house embodies a blueprint of shared cultural knowledge. The particular details of structural logic, that is, how the frame was arranged to support loads, and the crafting and function of members and joints, have provided clues to each frame’s cultural and individual origin as well as environmental and economic modifying forces.

**Research Plan**

A number of dwellings in the region that survive from the period – beginning around the middle of the 18th century and extending into the early decades of the 18th century – have been identified as East Jersey cottages. The term East Jersey cottage was introduced in 1938 by Princeton University historian Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker in his book, *The Founding of American Civilization: The Middle Colonies*. Peter O. Wacker, a highly respected cultural geographer, has also used the term, and in 1967 introduced a variant that he called the “deep East Jersey Cottage,” of which the Dolbeer-Ware House is an example. However, neither Wertenbaker nor Wacker (nor anyone since) was able to explain the origin of these houses. The form occurs predominantly (though not exclusively) in the counties of the former East New Jersey, including Essex, eastern Morris, Union, Middlesex and Monmouth counties, where settlers with English roots predominated and the Dutch seemingly had minimal presence. Some of these small houses had characteristics that seem very Dutch,

---

3 The area covered by the map does not include Terrill Road. Virtually all of the buildings depicted on the map are now gone.

4 It is quite likely that numerous dwellings also contained shop or artisans work space that is not possible to discern on the map. Also, it is possible that some of the 2-story dwellings shown were originally constructed as 1½-story buildings.

5 Wacker, “Traditional House and Barn Types.”

while others have seemed to have very English features, and still others seem to be a mixture. Yet, as a group, their outward form is similar. In East Jersey, both Dutch- and Anglo-American families would have been comfortable with this recognizable small, post-frontier house type, which fell somewhere between the crude dwellings of the earliest pioneers and the grander Georgian types that prevailed in more urban settings.

It seems likely that the East Jersey cottage was an early hybridization that created what might be described as a distinctly American dwelling – at least on the exterior. So the question is what evidence can be found of some kind of cultural blending – a fusion of building traditions that resulted from an intermingling, perhaps recognizing practicality in terms of available manpower, construction methods, local materials, and utility. And behind the façade, did some cultural traditions persist, for example in floor plans? To date, the East Jersey cottage has not been thoroughly considered in the context of the process of melding framing and floor plan traditions. Although numerous examples of this 1½-story East Jersey dwelling exist and more than a few have been individually studied, a comparative study has never been undertaken.7

Documentary evidence indicates that the immediate vicinity was settled in 1685 by a group of Scottish immigrants, who were largely replaced before the mid-18th century by settlers with New England roots. No known resources survive in the area that can be identified with the original Scottish settlers. Therefore attention turns to the New England settlers and the traditions they brought with them. Also important to consider is that during the 18th century, other European cultural groups moved into the area in lesser numbers, including French Huguenots, Quakers, and Dutch. As a result of multiple land claims in the region made by two competing entities (the Elizabethtown Associates and the East Jersey Proprietors), the earliest history of the property – and the dwelling – remains obscure other than that there was a dwelling on the property in 1790, which was probably erected some years before then, either for Jesse Dolbeer who apparently acquired the property in the 1780s, or for John Clark (Sr), a descendant of one of the original Elizabethtown Associates, who owned it in 1772.

Field data collection, which has been limited by the condition of the house and by the 20th-century remodeling that obscured much of the early architectural fabric, points strongly to the center section as the original dwelling. However, the construction sequence of the west and east sections is not yet clear. The east section has some Federal period characteristics and Rumsford corner fireplaces, suggesting early 19th-century construction, while the west section is the most crudely constructed of the three sections and evidence suggests at one time it existed as a freestanding building, with the implication that it was moved to this location. An important feature of each section is the half-story created by knee-walls, which are characteristic of the East Jersey cottage.

With its three distinct sections, the Terrill Road house presents a rare opportunity to investigate and document changes and adaptations in traditional framing systems, construction techniques, and floor plans over

7 Moreover, field research undertaken by others, such as Janet Sheridan’s work in Fenwick’s Colony in southwestern New Jersey, which was settled by an ethnically diverse group, suggests possibilities for even broader study.
time within a single house. For example, the presence of a summer beam in the cellar of the east section is suggestive of English box framing, while the expressed ceiling joists and corresponding posts in the room above are indicators of H-bent construction. And the heavy beams visible in the west section ceiling that extend from front to rear are particularly suggestive of Dutch H-bent framing.\footnote{An H-bent is a crossframe made up of floor-to-roof posts connected by a heavy, braced tie beam. An anchor-bent utilizes tie beams jointed to H-bent posts by means of outside-wedged through-tenons.} The data collected so far, though limited, provides sufficient evidence to propose a series of targeted research questions relating to what we can learn from the Dolbeer-Ware House regarding the origins and development of the East Jersey cottage. What can be gleaned from physical and contextual research about the adoption and spread of the East Jersey cottage form in New Jersey? Answers to these questions will require a combination of field investigations, materials analysis, and additional contextual research.

Questions for Further Research

An East Jersey cottage has been described as a 1½-story dwelling, two or three bays width with single or double pile plan, an interior end chimney (sometimes two), and gable roof with ridge parallel to the front wall. Can an East Jersey cottage be constructed with H-bent framing or box frame or a hybrid of the two? Are “knee walls” a character-defining feature of the East Jersey cottage type? Were any East Jersey cottages with knee walls built with English box frame construction? Is it possible to determine which aspect of each tradition (box-frame or H-bent) prevailed? Was H-bent construction disseminated by Anglo-Americans as well as by Dutch-Americans? Is a Dutch-American house of comparable form distinct from an East Jersey cottage? Is the form specific to East Jersey?

Further physical investigation of the Dolbeer-Ware House will reveal essential construction information about the similarities and differences in the framing and joinery used in each section. What typically Dutch-American and/or Anglo-American (i.e. New England) construction practices or design characteristics can be identified in the Dolbeer House? Is it possible to determine for each section (for example, by further dendochronology or radiocarbon testing) when it was constructed? If so, what does it reveal about the development and evolution over time of vernacular architecture and construction practices in central New Jersey during the 18th and early 19th centuries?

Can the Dolbeer-Ware House provide information that can be used to develop a rationale for the hybridization and/or simplification of construction methodologies? Does the Dolbeer-Ware House shed light on economic forces, such as the availability of materials and labor in the vicinity? Was a particular construction methodology better suited to a sparsely populated area, such as the Plainfield vicinity at the end of the 18th century? What differences among the sections can be related to development of a better understanding of structural engineering? Which details can be identified as builder-driven vs. tradition-driven?

How do the construction methods compare to those used in other houses from the time period in the immediate vicinity, such as the Gershom Frazee House (Scotch Plains), the Drake house (Plainfield), the
Elkanah Fitz Randolph house (Plainfield), the Baker House (Scotch Plains), and the Samuel Dolbeer House (Scotch Plains). How do dimensions, proportions and arrangement of framing components and individual joinery work compare to known/dated examples?

From examining development over time (including longitudinal expansion, creation of 5-bay symmetry, floor plan, absence of a center hall, and use of open vs. closed stairs), does the building yield important social and/or cultural information about the occupants during the 18th and early 19th centuries? How did the use of rooms change over time? Were these changes in keeping with economic and social norms of the area?

**Anglo-Dutch Context**

Beginning in the late 17th century, the Plainfield area was settled by three main groups of immigrants: Scottish and Quaker immigrants from Europe; New Englanders – some of whom had subsequently relocated to Long Island; and, to a lesser degree, Dutch-American immigrants from the Hudson Valley region and Long Island. Two primary timber frame building traditions are associated with these groups for their dwellings: An English or British box framing tradition that relied on a box frame to construct a side-gable house with a large central chimney and a steep roof that resulted in a constricted attic space; and a Dutch framing tradition, which utilized a system of H-bents to construct a side-gable house that featured tall garret space and internal gable-end chimneys. That the English and Dutch in New Netherland intermingled building traditions there at least from the 1640s, has been documented by architectural historian Jeroen van den Hurk who examined building contracts that survived among thousands of legal documents left by the colony’s administrators. Van den Hurk commented:

---

9 Other early houses in the Plainfield vicinity: Stage House Inn, Scotch Plains, Union County, Vail-Trust House, Green Brook, Somerset County; Alward Farmhouse, Basking Ridge, Somerset County, Annin-Smalley House, Basking Ridge, Somerset County, Cornelius Low House (Ivy Hall), Piscataway; Middlesex County, Jeremiah Dunn House, North Stelton, Middlesex County, Cornell House, Raritan, Somerset County, Groendyk House, Schalk Station, Middlesex County, Meeker House, Newark, Essex County (demolished), Moses McCollum House, Basking Ridge, Somerset County, Dr. Robinson House, Clark, Union County, Matthias Smock House, Piscataway, Middlesex County.

10 Surviving examples of New Jersey box-framed dwellings with true central chimneys are very rare. From the exterior, an internal gable-end chimney that was subsumed during later alterations can give the appearance of a central chimney, a not uncommon occurrence in the region.

11 Jeroen Van Den Hurk, “The Architecture of New Netherland Revisited,” Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, Vol. 10, Building Environments (2005), pp.133-152. The earliest of these contracts, which typically identify the individuals and describe the proposed building, dates from 1639 and was for a house and storehouse to be constructed for Thomas Hall, a New Englander, by Juriaen Hendricksen and Pieter Wolphertsen. The dwelling was to be 32 feet long, 18 feet wide, 19 feet in height, with three joists with braces and one mantelpiece. Another early contract was for a house with an “English chimney” (as distinct from a Dutch chimney with a jambless fireplace) to be built by two English carpenters. Of fifteen dwelling contracts (excluding those for combined housebarns), only four specified side aisles, though seven contracts called for a total of twelve bedsteads (an enclosed sleeping closet). Cellars, which were mentioned in six contracts, were usually located under only a portion of the house. One detailed contract included specification for an upper room: “A certain house, forty feet in length and twenty feet in width, with on one side an extension, six feet wide and as long s the house is; six beams with braces and two without braces; six cellar beams; the posts as required, twelve feet long; four window frames with intersecting transom and mullion, two door frames and one suitable cellar door; the front room eleven feet high and the upper room nine feet.”
All of the contracts were written in Dutch, and the terminology and particulars clearly point toward Netherlandic architecture. Given the right circumstances, one could therefore assume that these contracts would have produced Dutch buildings, just as building contracts in New England had produced English buildings. However, … not all of the employers or contractors were from the Netherlands. New Netherland was not an ethnically homogeneous society…. Of the contractors at least five were English and one was of German descent…. Whereas in New England the majority of the settlers were English and were accustomed to comparable building traditions, New Netherland had to contend with carpenters of various nationalities.12

So for about three decades prior to the English conquest of New Amsterdam in 1664, there had already been an intermingling of Dutch and English building traditions in Manhattan and nearby Dutch-settled areas. Whether or not this intermingling persisted with the Dutch as they spread north into the Hudson Valley and west into Bergen is unclear (though likely), but it is certainly possible that dwellings erected in the Raritan Valley several decades later by Dutch-American immigrants from those areas were to some degree already a synthesis.13 According to historical geographer Peter O. Wacker and historian Paul G.E. Clemens, Dutch culture was very persistent. The Ten Eyck family, for example, originally settled in Somerset County around 1700. And yet a century the Ten Eycks “still gave their children Dutch [given names], stored hay in ‘barracks’ rather than in barns, and used a ‘Dutch fan’ for cleaning wheat.”14 At home and at church members of Raritan Valley Dutch households – including their slaves – typically spoke Dutch until at least as late as the Revolutionary War.15 This persistence of Dutch culture meant that some Dutch traditions might endure in the midst of the predominately Anglo population of 17th- and 18th-century Essex County.16

The earliest-known European settlers in the Plainfield vicinity were a small group of Scots who immigrated in 1684 in response to the encouragement of the Scots Proprietors of East Jersey and settled “on Cedar Brook”.17 As a result of disease or other serious setbacks, at least some of the original small pioneer group abandoned their Cedar Brook location and moved to Perth Amboy, the seat of government of East Jersey.

---

12 Van den Hurk, p.144ff. In the group of eighteen contracts examined, at least three of the employers and five of the contractors were English.
13 Although located approximately midway between the Passaic and Raritan Rivers, most of Plainfield, at the western border of historic Essex County, is within the Raritan watershed; however, a small portion at the southeastern end of the city, including the site of the Dolbeer-Ware House, lies within the Rahway River watershed, which drains to the Arthur Kill. But the nearest stream useful for industry and navigation was the Greenbrook, a tributary of the Raritan. Also part of the Raritan watershed was the Cedar Brook, which drained portions of Plainfield and was referenced in several early documents.
16 Dutch-sounding surnames were among the list of men swearing allegiance at Elizabethtown in 1665/6. During the late 17th century, Dutch-American settlers from Long island and the Hudson Valley arrived in the Raritan Valley. According to Wacker, the presence of New Englanders and Scots “served to restrict the in-migrants in terms of location.” [Wacker, 1974, p.169]
There was no further encouragement by the East Jersey Proprietors of emigration of large groups of Scots after about 1685, when the ill-fated voyage of a ship resulted in death of one group of Scots; by then the religious persecution against Quakers and Presbyterians, which had spurred the emigrants, had waned.¹⁸

Anglo-American immigrants from New England and eastern Long Island arrived in Essex County beginning in 1664 to establish Elizabethtown. These New Englanders were culturally distinct from immigrants who came directly from the Old World. By the time the New Englanders arrived in East Jersey, they already had more than a generation of experience in America and had already adapted their building materials and construction methods to a new country, so from the outset the wood-clad frame dwellings of Elizabethtown were distinctive in appearance from the stone or half-timbered dwellings of the wood-starved British Isles.¹⁹

Elizabethtown, which comprised most of present day Union County, was laid out in typical New England tradition with a nucleated town surrounded by more distant pastures and fields. Gradually it became necessary and practical for some—frequently descendants of the original Elizabethtown Associates—to move out to the more distant parcels where they established dispersed farmsteads. This process was facilitated by the 1699 Clinker Lots survey, which was undertaken in late 1699 to apportion distant lands that had been granted by Governor Nichols but were never divided. The surveyor, John Harriman, Jr., was assisted by John Clarke, Jonathan Ogden, Benjamin Lynn, Samuel Carter and Cornelius Hatfield.²⁰ The survey, which disregarded proprietary surveys for the same area, created 171 new lots of 100 acres each (forty by twenty-six chains) that included the area that would become Plainfield. Terrill Road, which was laid out as part of this 1699 survey, formed the eastern boundary for about six of these 100-acre lots.²¹

From its location near the western edge of Elizabethtown’s claimed lands, Terrill Road was a link between the nascent Plainfield neighborhood and neighboring Middlesex County, where the Great Raritan Road was laid out along the north bank of the river between Piscataway and Bound Brook in June 1684.²² Much of the fertile farmland along the Raritan River was settled during the late 17th century by Dutch American immigrants from Long Island, the Hudson Valley, or Bergen County. From its earliest settlement, then, the Plainfield neighborhood, though ostensibly populated by New Englanders of Elizabethtown, was influenced by


¹⁹ Architectural historian Abbott Lowell Cummings quotes a 17th-century English surveyor’s concern about timber depletion: “for you see this country inclinable to wood and timber much: yet within these twenty yeeres they have bene diminished two parts of three: and if it go on by like proportion, our children will surely want.” Abbott Lowell Cummings, *The Framed Houses of Massachusetts Bay, 1625-1725*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969, p.50.

²⁰ Edwin Platt Tanner, *The Province of New Jersey, 1664-1738*, New York: Columbia University, 1908, p.80. A number of the lots were surveyed to members of the Clarke family.


– if not actually part of – the more culturally heterogeneous Raritan Valley, where Calvinist New Englanders mixed with members of Dutch Reformed, Quaker, and Baptist congregations. Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker commented: “The transit from New England to the near-by province of East Jersey produced a distinct culture, shaped in part by the New England inheritance, in part by local conditions on the banks of the Passaic or the Raritan, and in part by the melting-pot.” And Peter Wacker has called Central New Jersey the “shatter zone,” a term meant to suggest mutual assimilation, not conflict. The East Jersey cottage, which began to appear by the mid-18th century, is likely the material evidence of the cultural blending that took place during the decades before the Revolutionary War.

**East Jersey Cottage Context**

Architectural historian Janet Foster has provided a succinct, helpful description of the particular evolution of the East Jersey cottage:

Presented with all the timber that could be harvested, [in NJ] wood was used for all building frames and trimwork…. Because of the abundance of wood and the lack of brick and tile manufacturing facilities, wood was adopted for roofing and sheathing of almost all buildings, giving the colonial settlements right from the start a distinctive, ‘American’ look…The hybridization of Anglo-Dutch building techniques was…inevitable. In time, carpentry and building reflected a new, American sort of vernacular architecture that accounted for the abundance of wood, the climate that was both hot and cold in season, the versatility of the English frame, and the simplicity and sturdiness of the Dutch frame. This hybrid form, developed from about 1730 on, has been called the ‘East Jersey Cottage.’

The archetype of the East Jersey cottage has several certain characteristics: They are of frame construction, 1½ stories in height, usually two or three structural bays in width; they possess a side gable roof (i.e., the ridge is...
parallel to the front wall), and one or two interior gable-end chimneys. Foster’s description of the exemplar East Jersey cottage shows it is fairly easy to look around and, by external appearance only, identify them in the landscape:

The East Jersey Cottage was a story-and-a-half in height, with a gable roof over a three-bay façade. The front entry was located at one of the side bays; the door leads into a hallway containing a staircase and accessing two rooms, one front and one back. Additions are typically made to the side, as in the Dutch fashion. Some additions, particularly in the post-Revolutionary era, were made so that the original front door became the center of a balanced, symmetrical composition. The high wall between the tops of the first floor windows and door, and the eave line of the roof gives a distinctive appearance to this regional vernacular architecture. This broad space was at first treated simply as well, but later examples in the 19th century may have placed windows on this level, at least on the façade, giving rise to the ‘kneewall window’....

The broad space between the tops of the first floor windows and door and the eave line of the roof that Foster describes is perhaps the most distinctive outwardly visible characteristic of the East Jersey cottage, and the one that is most commonly associated with Dutch influence on the synthesis.

In his influential 1938 history, *The Founding of American Civilization*, historian Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker described the distinct culture of East Jersey and what he called East Jersey houses, which he said were essentially pioneer architecture showing New England, Long Island and Flemish influences, and noted “an interesting blending of the Cape Cod cottage and the Bergen County Flemish farmhouse:”

Here one still has difficulty in classifying this house as definitely New England in origin and that house Flemish, the chief, if not only, clue being the propensity of the Connecticut settlers to sheath all or a part of the stone walls with weather-boarding. In contrast to the New England arrangement of rooms around a central chimney, the East Jersey houses were usually but one room deep, having a living-room on one side of a narrow entrance hall, and a bedroom on the other. Additions were made not in the form of an L, as in New England, but in true Flemish style, to the right or left of the main building, sometimes as extensions of the original lines, sometimes as small wings, sometimes as larger and more pretentious structures.

Wertenbaker was the first to identify and name the East Jersey cottage as a culturally distinctive vernacular form. In a book published in 1968, Peter Wacker expanded the definition to encompass a double-pile version that he called a “deep East Jersey cottage” with New England and Flemish influences:

The primary cultural influence causing the evolution from what had been a two-room-deep house with a central chimney to a one-room-deep house with a gable-end location for the chimney was most likely Flemish. Flemings were especially numerous in northern Morris and Essex counties and generally on the north bank of the Raritan in Middlesex County.... Closely related to the East Jersey cottage is a structure we might term the ‘deep East Jersey cottage.’ This house type is closer to New England precedent than is

---

27 Foster, “Domestic Architecture.”
the East Jersey cottage, except for the general gable-end location of the chimney and the frequent use of stone as a building material. These, again, are probably Flemish influences. 29

Not surprisingly, there are important exceptions to a simple Anglo-Dutch amalgamation to consider and explain. For example, folklorist Henry Glassie pointed out that most of the New England immigrants came from eastern England, where houses were usually built with central chimneys, while Chesapeake Tidewater immigrants came from western England, where houses often had a gable-end chimney. 30 Yet Wacker’s opinion was that “[t]he primary cultural influence causing the evolution from what had been a two-room-deep house with a central chimney to a one-room-deep house with a gable-end location for the chimney was most likely Flemish.” 31 Further complicating any tidy identification of the East Jersey cottage’s gable-end chimney as a Dutch (or Flemish) influence is a late 19th-century study of some Rhode Island houses—the first scholarly work on American vernacular architecture—that found gable-end chimneys were characteristic of some of the earliest dwellings in that New England colony. 32

According to architectural historian Clifford Zink, although more Dutch masonry houses survive, during the 17th and 18th centuries Dutch houses were more commonly timber-frame than masonry construction, and he traces their timber framing system to colonists from the Netherlands:

"The Dutch transferred their seventeenth-century building technology to the New World in simplified forms that relied on their rules of construction yet met the need for expediency in settling a new land…builders employed only key elements of the Dutch conceptualization of building, some of which became symbols of the colonists’ cultural heritage….Immigrant builders adapted their Old World traditions to new environmental requirements, material sources, and building ideas and, following the English conquest of 1664, merged their timber-framing practices with those of Anglo Americans.” 33

On this subject of adaptation and evolution, architectural historian Bernard L. Herman commented that:

"Tradition in vernacular architecture is a process by which builders must both draw on a traditional body of knowledge from the past and reconcile it with the exigencies of the present, the specific economic means, availability of materials, or technological limitations. Identifying types of construction based on

31 Wacker, 1968, p.87.
the relationships between multiple elements, we discern the breadth of their knowledge; and by examining the range of possibilities found in detail, we begin to appreciate the flexibility expressed in putting that knowledge to use.34

Wacker pointed to the 1717 Dirck Banta house in Bergen County, which was recorded by HABS, as an example of a frame Flemish dwelling:

[The Banta house] is almost indistinguishable from the East Jersey cottages built a few miles to the south by settlers of New England background…. I can do little better than reiterate Wertenbaker’s statement that ‘the East Jersey cottage, although retaining some of the features of the small New England house, shows a strong Flemish influence.’ And vice versa! A great deal of acculturation obviously occurred in the area between the Passaic and Raritan watersheds in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries” … Those in Essex and Morris Counties are almost entirely of frame construction, often having exposed chimney backs, and can be labeled as true East Jersey cottages. Those in Bergen County are largely of stone construction, have additions built at a gable end, and are Flemish cottages.35

The Banta house had the typical broad area of unbroken wall between the top of the first floor windows and the eaves of the roof, a feature that correlates with Dutch H-bent construction, yet the mid-17th century Roger Mowry house in Rhode Island used box frame construction to create exactly the same broad space above the windows.36 Clearly, the half-story existed at an early date in both Dutch (or Flemish) and New England building traditions.

In contrast, “[t]he English box framing from Connecticut…was typified there by central chimneys, heavy members, shouldered posts, articulated (exposed) and decorated frames, summer beams, jetties, principal-raftered and purlinned roofs, outshot (lean-to or shed) additions, saltbox form and the absence of false plates (i.e., rafters bear directly on the top wall plate).”37

35 Wacker, 1971, p.50.
37 Sheridan, p.71. Sheridan offered these definitions: Simplified Anglo-American: A simplified principal-post box frame with sawn or hewn timbers; articulated framing with quirk-beads and/or chamfers; mortise and tenon joints with wood pins; straight or jowled posts; with or without summer beams; common rafters that: taper, have pinned bridle joints, are matched with scribed numerals, are with or without collar ties, and are not trenched; false plate; single or double pile; open plan; steeply pitched roof; floor joists using tusk, butt cog or central tenons. New English: A principal-post box frame using a jowled post; a chimney bay with chimney posts; with or without summer beams; mortise and tenon joints with wood pins; articulated framing; common rafters that: taper, have pinned bridle joints, are matched with scribed Roman numerals, have collar ties, are trenched; no false plate. New Netherlandic: An H-bent frame with or without braces; common rafters that: taper, have pinned bridle joints, are matched with scribed Roman numerals, are with or without collar ties, and are not trenched; no false plate; articulated floor joists with chamfers.
In his study of Massachusetts framed houses, Abbott Lowell Cummings postulated on the raising sequence of the house frame, suggesting a method for erecting the Gedney House, a ca.1665 two-story dwelling in Salem, which he based on a common assembly method used in New England for raising late 19th-century barns: “We can postulate here a raising sequence in which the various story posts would have been laid out on the ground” and then hoisted or levered into place.\(^{38}\) Cummings suggested the bents would then be connected by girts and summer beams to create the familiar box frame. He also described the early story-and-a-half house form in the Massachusetts Bay area – where there was no “Dutch” influence. Though only a handful of examples remain, Cummings suggested that

Such ‘cottages’ must have been much more common in the seventeenth century than the small number of survivors would suggest, especially in the early years when short-order housing was very much in demand. While the existing structures reveal very little new information about the methods of assembly and rearing, they do vary slightly among themselves in form. For the most part, these houses are framed according to a bay system consisting of posts and binding beams, so joined that the posts extend some three feet or more above the point of junction. Thus the chamber or loft contains a short section of upright wall, and... could be furnished with façade gables which provided both light and some slight additional headroom. The normal tie beam was impractical in such a situation and the rafters therefore spring directly from the plate.\(^{39}\)

Cummings’ discussions of technological development of elaborate joints and the evolution of rafter attachment are helpful in showing the complexity of the English box frame as well as its adaptability. His descriptions of the finishing and embellishment of framing elements, which on the interior were frequently left open to view, suggests parallels with early Dutch architecture.

Potential evidence supporting direct English influence on development of the 1½-story house in East Jersey can be found in an 1686 order by the Board of East Jersey Proprietors regarding minimum requirements for small houses in Perth Amboy, Middlesex County, which were intended for mechanics and tradesmen: “Agreed and ordered that all houses that shall be built upon any back lot for the future shall not be less than twenty-four feet in length and twelve feet stud.”\(^{40}\) Two early sketches of the now-demolished Long Ferry Tavern in Perth Amboy show a relatively low building consisting of two sections of equal height, one of which is 1½ stories while the other is two stories. In contrast to the requirement for a minimum of twelve-foot studs in these smaller houses, the larger “proprietors’ houses” had posts and studs of eighteen feet in length, which would yield an ample two stories.\(^{41}\) On the other hand, it is interesting to note that Dutch were present in Elizabethtown in 1672 after New York and New Jersey were briefly surrendered to the Dutch.\(^{42}\) At Elizabethtown, seventy-six men took the oath of allegiance to the Dutch–whom they viewed as their saviors

\(^{38}\) Cummings, pp.64 & 81-82.
\(^{39}\) Cummings, p.89.
\(^{40}\) Quoted in Robert W. Craig, “Starting from Scratch: The First Building Tradesmen of Middlesex County,” *New Jersey Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, Winter 2016, p.70. Elizabethtown did not have similar building regulations.
\(^{41}\) Craig, p.69.
from the Proprietors. Not only did the Dutch reorganize the local government, but also the only church permitted was the Dutch Reformed Church, which was similar to their own Congregational (Independent) church. Although Dutch rule lasted only six months before the English regained control, the experience suggests that an early willingness by the Associates (New Englanders) to live under a Dutch government may have been accompanied by a willingness to also accept some Dutch influences in building ways.

The Dutch H-bent system relies of a closely arranged series of large timbers to carry the loads. Jeroen van den Hurk has described two versions of the Dutch H-bent:

The quicker solution was to simply mortise and tenon the girder into the principle posts – called a *tussenbalkgebint*. The more labor intensive method became known as an anchor-beam bent – called an *ankerbalkgebint*. There the girder was tenoned through the principle posts creating protruding tongues at either side.44

Van den Hurk’s study of New Amsterdam contracts indicated that braces were an integral part of the H-bent construction, serving a structural as well as an aesthetic function.45 Architectural historian John R. Stevens described the anchor beams as being “about the same width, or nearly as wide as the posts, and about fourteen inches in depth.” The result of using these oversize timbers was a frame that well exceeded its structural needs. Stevens noted that “through the first half of the eighteenth century, there was a noticeable reduction in [timber] size.”46 According to Clifford Zink, “the spacing between bents in Dutch American houses usually ranged between 3½ feet and 5½ feet.”47 In contrast to the Dutch system of bents, the 17th-century New England box frame house used a system of structural components that relied on a massive summer beam and lighter joists. But, based on surveyed examples, the tendency in East Jersey cottages in areas that were overwhelming New Englander seems to have been for “joists to frame into studs but the size and spacing of these joists to be more like joists than like anchor beams.”48 Roof construction detailed in some of the ancient New Amsterdam contracts indicates that each bent carried a roof truss (*flieergebint*).49 This system differs significantly from the English box frame construction wherein roof trusses are mortised into wall plates that were held together by tie beams; and the number of roof trusses in either a common rafter or a purlin roof might differ from the number of posts.50

There’s evidence that both New Englander and Dutch-American builders and their clients independently comprehended the greater utility that resulted from higher attic headroom created by the half-story or kneewall,

---

43 Both the Dutch Reformed church and the Associates own Congregational (Independent) church were Calvinistic.
46 Stevens, p.29. The ca.1750 Hendrick Hendrickson house, in Monmouth County, New Jersey, is an example with smaller beams. Cohen calls the Holmes-Hendrickson House “a mixture of English and Dutch framing with a Dutch floorplan.” [Cohen, p.53]
47 Zink, p.274.
48 Robert Craig email, December 1, 2014.
49 Van den Hurk, p.139.
50 Garvin, p.13.
which may explain its relatively rapid and wide adoption for East Jersey dwellings. Both groups independently adopted frame rather than stone or brick construction for their post-pioneer dwellings, at least in rural areas. The Dutch H-bent system of construction required more heavy timbers – in East Jersey, there was no shortage of timber – but used far simpler joinery than the English box frame, which prevailed in New England, although bent construction was occasionally used. The complicated joinery of the box frame required a well-trained carpenter, who would have been in high demand by waves of immigrants needing dwellings. Also, erection of a full two-story frame house required a sizable work crew and more technology – in the form of hoists or cranes, for example – than may have been feasible in mid-18th century New Jersey.  

51 The solution was a hybrid approach that relied on Dutch-like H-bents that over time became increasingly lighter weight and more widely-spaced – somewhat along the lines of New England construction, though without the smaller studs common in a box frame. This hybridization, which avoided the need for the elaborate joints of an English box frame, would have been appealing to both Dutch- and Anglo-Americans. Reduction in the use of traditional arch braces and decoration of characteristic of traditional Dutch framing were important evolutionary steps in the trend toward simplification.  

52 Another variation to the hybridization of the two traditional framing systems involved the insertion of a heavy perpendicular beam, resembling the “summer beam” associated with Anglo traditions, mid-span along the long beams that connected the wall posts of the H-bent system. The Bodine-Carkhuff House in Branchburg, Somerset County, New Jersey is one example, notable in that its “half H-bents” were slightly offset, presumably to lessen the weakening of the summer beam.  

Floor plans varied behind the 1½-story façade of the East Jersey cottage. Wertenbaker wrote in 1938: “In contrast to the New England arrangement of rooms around a central chimney, the East Jersey houses were usually but one room deep, having a living-room on one side of a narrow entrance hall, and a bedroom on the other,” which suggests a three-bay dwelling with a center door.  

53 There are always exceptions to a general model and while H-bent construction was most commonly used for 1½-story dwellings, it was also occasionally used for two-story dwellings. The earliest documented central New Jersey dwelling using H-bent construction is the c.1745 Rhea-Applegate House (Monmouth County), which uses “English post-to-plate connections.” [Dennis N. Bertland, Portland Place National Register Nomination, p.8-5] The Stelle House, constructed sometime between 1790 and 1820 in New Englander-settled Piscataway (Middlesex County), is a good example of a two-story, three-bay dwelling using H-bents. [Personal information of Dennis N. Bertland and Richard F. Veit, who participated in the Stelle House documentation prior to its demolition in 1990] The original Stelle immigrants were French Huguenots. The main block of the late 18th-century Van Horne House in Somerville (Somerset County) is the largest known example in New Jersey. The dwelling, whose symmetrical five-bay façade reflects Georgian influence, measures about fifty-two feet wide and forty-one feet deep. [Historic Building Architects, LLC, & Dennis Bertland Associates, Preservation Plan for the Van Horne House, April 2001, pp. II-4 & 24]  

54 Van den Hurk theorized that buildings in New Netherlands gradually changed or “creolized” as a result of a mixed population, easy availability of certain building materials, and scarcity of trained craftsmen. [Van den Hurk, p.31]  


Stacy Spies, “The Elizabeth and Gershom Frazee House National Register Nomination Form,” Sec. 7, p.5.
Wacker also described a two-room deep version that he called a “deep East Jersey cottage,” exemplified by the three-bay western section of the Frazee house in Scotch Plains, constructed ca. 1761-1766, which contained a parlor and a rear bedchamber on the first floor, each with a fireplace, and an unheated garret above that was divided by one or more vertical board partitions and evidence of at least one bed box adjacent to the chimney stack.56 Another floor plan, found in the east wing of the Vail-Trust House in nearby Green Brook (constructed in the late 18th or early 19th century), consisted of a large main room with a fireplace and two small, unheated rear chambers with unheated garret above.57 In contrast to Werbenbaker’s example, there is no evidence of an entrance hall in either the Frazee or the Vail-Trust examples.

The result of the melding or adapting of traditional designs and construction methods to be practical and useful for a specific time and place was the frame, 1½-story East Jersey cottage, an identifiable American vernacular house form that became ubiquitous in the area. The presence of two distinct cultural groups – the Anglo-Americans and the Dutch-Americans – who were willing to engage and adopt each other’s ways was critical to its relatively rapid evolution and adoption.

Narrative History of Property

Early Land Divisions

A review of the earliest European settlement of the Plainfield vicinity reveals a variety of ethnic groups. During the colonial period, settlement of the Plainfield vicinity experienced an intermingling of immigrant groups, mainly dissenting Protestants from Scotland, England, Holland, and France. In 1682, William Penn and eleven other Quakers purchased East Jersey from the estate of Lord George Carteret, creating the company of East Jersey Proprietors.58 Twelve additional proprietors, many of who were Scots or had business interests in Scotland, were added soon after.59 The company included earls, barristers, merchants, and well-to-do gentlemen from London, Dublin, and Perth; one, Arent Sonmans, was a Hollander by birth. The associates received a series of grants of large tracts of unappropriated lands throughout East Jersey, most of which were subsequently subdivided and sold to others.

The history of the early settlement of the Plainfield vicinity is complicated by competing claims to land titles by two companies, the East Jersey Proprietors and the Elizabethtown Associates. In 1664, the Elizabethtown Associates obtained their patent from Governor Richard Nicolls for land purchased from the

56 Spies, Sec.7, p.9.
58 Wacker and Clemons concisely summarized the proprietary system of landholdings: “In both East and West New Jersey, the Councils of Proprietors periodically assigned the ‘rights’ to a given number of acres to individual proprietors depending on how many proprietary shares they held. A proprietor could take his allocation and have it surveyed for his own use or for sale, either in whole or in part, or he could sell his right in whole or in part.” [Wacker and Clemens, p 90.]
59 Wacker and Clemens, p.126.
Native Americans before Nicolls learned that, by means of a Proprietary grant, the Duke of York had conveyed the province to his friends Lords Berkeley and Carteret earlier that same year. The Proprietors sought to invalidate the title the Associates had been granted by Nicolls and to compel the Associates to take out new patents under the Proprietors and to pay quit-rents. 60 In 1675, Philip Carteret, Governor of East Jersey, moved to enforce the Proprietors’ claim against the lands of the Elizabethtown Associates and ordered those who had received patents under Governor Nicoll to re-survey their lands with the East Jersey Proprietors, which many reluctantly did, and to pay quit-rents, which many refused. 61 The dispute, which continued for decades and resulted in many contested surveys and deeds as well as local riots, was one of the great land controversies in Colonial American history, and would eventually impact settlement patterns in Plainfield.

The earliest known permanent European settlement in the Plainfield area occurred in late 1684 at the western end of the recently formed Essex County, where a small group of about eight Scottish immigrant families arrived and constructed temporary dwellings “on Cedar Brook,” as documented in a letter dated November 16, 1685, written by Thomas Gordon “of Edinburgh.” 62 Gordon reported that he quickly erected a wigwam and then built a house “24 feet long, 15 feet wide, containing a hall and kitchen, both in one, and a chamber and a study, which we put up pretty well with pallisadoes on the sides and shingles on the roof.” 63 Others in the group included John Forbes, John Barclay, Dr. John Gordon, and Andrew Alexander, most of who were Quakers and associates (or related to associates) of William Penn and his company of East Jersey Proprietors. 64

The land title controversy between the Elizabethtown Associates and the East Jersey Proprietors had resurfaced just before the Cedar Brook settlers arrived. In July 1684 Gawen Lawrie, Deputy Governor under Governor Robert Barclay, asked Captain John Baker to survey and mark the western bounds of Elizabethtown lands, in the vicinity of Cedar Brook. 65 Baker’s survey was disputed as encompassing a much larger tract than the town had originally purchased in 1664. 66 The “pertinacious adherence” by the Elizabethtown Associates “to

60 Thayer, p.33f.
61 The Elizabethtown landowners capitulated to the proprietors and agreed to resurvey of their properties, but without any intention of abandoning the legitimacy of their titles under the Nicolls’ patents. [Clayton, p.58.]
62 Honeyman, 1923, p.215. Cedar Brook was referenced in numerous early deeds. Describing its condition in 1923, Honeyman wrote that it “... was formerly a larger stream than now.... At present it is inconsequential and often dry.”
63 The walls of pallisadoes consisted of hewn or cloven timbers – like planks – eight to ten inches wide, set vertically and nailed to the framing. [Wertenbaker, p.149]
65 Captain Baker, a patentee of Elizabethtown, was an Englishman by birth. He had been a resident of New Amsterdam and was familiar enough with the Dutch language as to act a formal interpreter on several occasions. He became a prominent citizen of Elizabethtown and was “ever among the foremost in resisting the proprietary assumptions.” [Clayton, p.23]
66 Clayton, p. 59. Adding to the contention, in October 1684 Lawrie purportedly purchased a large tract west of the Elizabethtown purchase where several influential Scottish immigrants were already located and which it was asserted was at least partly within the claimed bounds of the 1664 Elizabethtown purchase
the right, real, or supposed, obtained under the Indian grant, was cause of disturbance and commotion, not only during the government of the proprietaries, but for many years of the royal administration.67

Evidence of the competing claims can be found in early East Jersey land conveyances, such as a document dated May 10, 1688, which confirmed to Robert Gordon, a Proprietor, 910 acres in Cedar Brook vicinity that was “in the pretended bounds of Elizabeth Town,” bounded on the south by the Woodbridge line, on the east by Thomas Hart, and on the west Robert Burnett.68 The lands conveyed to Gordon and his fellow proprietor, Robert Burnet(t), which encompassed portions of present-day Plainfield, are indicated on a map prepared around 1685.69 The survey also shows neighboring tracts on Cedar Brook conveyed to Peter Sonmans (who never occupied his tract), which together with Burnet’s and Gordon’s tracts encompassed present-day Plainfield; the southern boundary of the Burnet and Gordon parcel was slightly south of and approximately parallel to the present south line of Plainfield.70 Somewhat south of Burnet and Gordon was the tract of John Barclay, which he called “Plainfield Plantation.” Further adding to the confusion of competing property claims was a survey conducted in 1699/1700 on behalf of the Elizabethtown Associates of 171 lots known as the Clinker Lots Survey. Almost immediately, descendants of the original Elizabethtown settlers began to move to these western lands: Westfield, Scotch Plains and Plainfield.71 A vestige of these Clinker Lots survives in the modern street pattern in portions of Plainfield. As part of the 1699/1700 surveys, land was “left for highways”

68 William Nelson, *Patents and Deeds and Other Early Records of New Jersey, 1664-1703*, Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co, 1899, p.137. Italics added. An important instance of eviction in the Plainfield vicinity, which occurred in 1693, resulted in a precedent favoring the Elizabethtown Associates. The case involved the Fullerton brothers, who acquired land from the East Jersey Proprietors, and Jeffrey Jones, who had previously acquired the same land from the Elizabethtown Associates. As historian Clayton explained:

The Fullerton brothers – Thomas, Robert, and James – came to the province in 1684, and settled on Cedar Brook on the plot bought by Governor [Gavin] Laurie of the Indians, but previously claimed by the Elizabeth Town people under the Nicolls grant. Jeffrey Jones, one of the [Elizabeth Town] Associates, had by conveyance from Laurie come into possession of land there on which James Fullerton had settled, ‘upon which the said Jeffry Jones did enter and oust him.’

The Scotsman Gawen Lawrie, one of the twenty-four East Jersey Proprietors, was appointed in 1683 as Deputy Governor under Robert Barclay, who served as Governor of East Jersey from 1682 to 1690 but never lived in the colony. James Fullerton subsequently brought an action of trespass and ejectment against Jones and the case came to trial in 1695, with the court at Perth Amboy deciding against Jones. Jones appealed, and the decision was reversed in 1697 by the Privy Council in England. Obtaining clear title to land in the contested area at the western end of Essex County, where the boundaries in the original Indian title were imprecise, would continue to be a problem until well into the 18th century. However, Peter Sonmans, who owned a large parcel on Cedar Brook and was one of the wealthiest proprietors, preferred to sell his lands and convey deeds in fee simple rather than to attempt to collect quit-rents from tenants. [Clayton, p. 60; Thomas L. Purvis, “Origins and Patterns of Agrarian Unrest in New Jersey, 1735 to 1754,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol.39, No.4 (Oct., 1982), pp.603 & 611]

69 I. Reid, *A Map of Rariton River Milstone River South River Rahway River Boundbrook Greenbrook & Cedar brook with the Plantations thereupon*, 1685.


Disputes about land titles continued into the second half of the 18th century. On the one side were the proprietors, composed largely of an aristocratic gentry – many of whom were the “lesser relations” of Scottish lairds – who envisioned a hierarchical society dominated by large estates that relied on payment of quitrents from whose who settled on the tracts – a highly exploitative pattern of landholding. On the other side were yeoman, such as Calvinist New Englanders of the Elizabeth Town Associates, who migrated from politically independent towns, believed in individual property ownership – freeholds – and would pay no quit rents. Refusing to surrender their claim to the Elizabeth Town Tract, the Associates continued to rely on their patent from Governor Nicolls and purchases from Native Americans in defiance of pressure from the proprietors. In 1742, James Alexander began preparation of a massive lawsuit against the Elizabeth Town Associates that persisted for decades but ultimately was never settled. Disaffected inhabitants of some contested areas took part in numerous acts of collective violence, including violence toward surveying parties. Eventually a multiethnic coalition from Newark, Harrison Tract, Great Tract, Ramapo, Peapack, Maidenhead and Hopewell, and Turkey formed a coalition to establish a mutual defense pact against the proprietors. The Elizabeth Town Associates did not participate, and instead pursued a resistance by legal means. The arrival in 1747 of a new governor, Jonathan Belcher, a Massachusetts native who shared a cultural identity with the New Englander settlers in New Jersey, saw a gradual restoration of confidence and order.

Early Settlement

By 1735, East Jersey had a population of over 26,000, of whom a quarter to a third were Dutch despite more than seventy-five years of English rule. The Raritan Valley north of the river’s main stem was occupied by settlers of Dutch, French, English, and New England descent. According to Verneule, although none of the original Scottish families remained by 1720, in 1735 the Plainfield locality included “William Webster, John Vail, John Shotwell and Henry Lines, all of whom like Barclay, Forbes and the Laings, were Quakers. Also the

---

74 After the Revolutionary War, “the state adopted a policy of recognizing land titles whenever people had long been settled with deeds from either the Proprietors or from the Associators.” [Thayer, p.67]
75 McConville, p.124. McConville recounts the story of Newarker Samuel Dunn who said he and his brothers had purchased their land twice, their father had done the same, and they would not pay again. [p.131]
76 Ibid., p.145.
77 Ibid., p.183.
Piscataway Baptist families of Isaac Drake... and James Manning, and the Dutch Calvinists, Cornelius and Frederick Vermeule and Ide Marselis, from Bergen. All of these had become an integral part of the Blue Hills Community.”78 While there were relatively few families with obviously Dutch surnames in the neighborhood, the Green Brook, a tributary of the Raritan River (where the majority of property owners were Dutch), may explain the presence of the Vermeule family.

At the same time that immigrants from Scotland and England, attracted by fertile soil and level land of the Raritan Valley were moving into the Cedar Brook area, there were Dutch-American agriculturists moving for similar reasons to lands along the Raritan River. These Dutch-Americans were descendants of Dutch who immigrated decades earlier to New Netherlands – New Amsterdam, Bergen County, Long Island, the Hudson valley – and included numerous intermarried Dutch and English families. From its earliest settlement, New Amsterdam was a heterogeneous society–primarily European–where Dutch families interacted and intermarried with English and other families. One New Amsterdam building contract surviving from 1639 for a dwelling house and tobacco warehouse to be built by two Dutchmen for an English merchant; another early contract was for two English carpenters to build a house for a Frenchman.79 By the time the descendants of these early immigrants moved into the Raritan Valley, some of the most prominent settlers represented marriages between Dutch and English or French families, what early 20th-century local historian Cornelius Vermeule called the “blending of races.”80 Gershom Frazee, the joiner/carpenter who lived near Jesse Dolbeer, purchased his house at Two Bridges, a locality within the present Scotch Plains Township, from Dutch-American Jacob Winans, a joiner, who likely constructed the 1½-story section of the dwelling before 1761.81

By the middle of the 18th century, and perhaps much earlier, land in the immediate vicinity of the subject property was owned by members of well-established New England/Long Island families who immigrated to Elizabeth in the late 17th century. John Laing, an English Quaker from Woodbridge, acquired Robert Barclay’s “Plainfield Plantation” in 1692.82 Around 1721 Laing established a new offshoot of the Woodbridge Quaker meeting, which would be known as Plainfield Meeting, and in 1731 erected a meetinghouse on his land; later, the Plainfield name would move several miles north when a new meeting house was erected in 1780s at the meeting’s current location near the intersection of two major early roads, the present

78 Vermeule, 1928, p.11. Dutch and English families that intermarried and worshipped at the Dutch church in Raritan (now Somerville) included the Webster family. The Blue Hills, or Blew Hills, was a location name mentioned in numerous early conveyances and referred to the southern section of First Watchung Mountain, which rises abruptly from the plains of the Raritan Valley.
79 Van Den Hurk, p.136.
80 Vermeule, 1928, p.15. Vermeule identified numerous intermarried families in the Raritan Valley: White and Staats; Morris; Neilson and Coeyman; French and Phillipse; and Livingston to name a few. No doubt with some bias, Vermeule reported a “close bond between all in the [Raritan] Valley,” which he attributed largely to the Dutch, some of whom had long established friendships formed generations before immigrating to America.
81 Spies, Sec.8, p.30. Winans immigrated from Staten Island and may have been a relative of Frazee.
According to one county history, in 1800, the year a post office was established at the newly renamed hamlet of Plainfield, there were about 150 people and only twenty houses in the village, which would suggest...
very limited development during the years since 1685, when the first eight settlers arrived. An 1812 map shows no evidence of the hamlet, but a crossroads hamlet is shown on an 1828 map (Fig. 1). While the accuracy of these maps is debatable at best, a carefully hand drawn map from 1832 appears to represent the existing conditions at that point, and includes a small sketch of each building (Fig. 2). The map documents the area along the “Main road through Plainfield” – what is now Front Street – which had developed considerably during the four decades following the erection of the new meetinghouse. There were now several millponds supplying a series of races that powered a number of unidentified industries. In an expectation of continued growth, a number of new streets were laid out – Liberty, New, Center, Mechanic, and Cherry Streets – and the land south of the main road had been surveyed into a regular grid of blocks and lots. Interestingly, a sizable number of the village houses, which must have been erected after 1800, are two- and three-bay East Jersey cottages. The implication is that the East Jersey cottage persisted as a popular house type for many decades after its introduction as a practical post-pioneer dwelling – at least in the flourishing village of Plainfield.

A gazetteer from 1834 reported that Plainfield was “a large and thriving village of Westfield t-ship” with 120 dwellings in the midst of “rich, well cultivated” country. Along with two gristmills, a sawmill, and four stores, there were also thirteen master hatters and five master tailors. The population of the village increased to over 1,000 by 1835. The Elizabethtown and Somerville Railroad started service to Plainfield in 1839. Eight years later, the railroad went bankrupt and was reorganized as the Central Railroad of New Jersey. John Taylor Johnston, a fast-rising, socially connected New York businessman, became the new railroad’s president. Plainfield was within railroad commuting distance to New York City, and Johnston established a summer residence in what was largely still a pastoral landscape. During the second half of the 19th century the town grew rapidly as a railroad suburb with more and more New York businessmen building large fashionable homes and country estates there. An 1874 bird’s eye view (Fig. 4) shows a dense commercial district along Front Street – replacing virtually all the small buildings shown on the 1832 map – surrounded by residential blocks that extend to the south as far as the Short Hills. An 1899 bird’s eye view (Fig. 6), which documents the continuation of commercial and residential development, also shows that farmland persisted at the edges of the town, such as along Terrill Road. Farmland existed until about 1920, when a number of farms were subdivided for residential development.

---

91 Ricord, p.397. 
92 Gordon, p 217. 
95 The City of Plainfield, an early leader in historic preservation in New Jersey, has six city-designated residential historic districts: Crescent Area HD; Hillside Avenue HD; Van Wyck Brooks HD; Putnam Watchung HD; Netherwood Heights HD and Broadway HD. 
97 Hunton, p.1.
Dolbeer Family

Jesse Dolbeer, the son of John and Rachel Dolbeer of Woodbridge Township, was born August 28, 1748.\(^{98}\) John Dolbeer died in 1773 and his widow, Rachel, acted as Administratrix.\(^{99}\) In the spring of 1776, his mother, Rachel, “widow of Woodbridge,” died and Jesse, who was also living in Woodbridge, handled the administration of her estate.\(^{100}\) Nine months later, in January 1777, Jesse moved to the Township of Elizabeth in Essex County (in the western portion of the township that was subsequently set off first as part of Township of Westfield and then as Plainfield), where he resided until his death in 1832.\(^{101}\) Jesse Dolbeer enlisted in the First Regiment, Essex County Militia, in 1776 and served until 1781.\(^{102}\)

Tax rolls for the Westfield Ward of Elizabeth for the years from 1778 to 1781 list Jesse Dolbeer as a resident owning no land.\(^{103}\) He married his first wife, Esther, before March 1781, when their infant son, Jesse, died.\(^{104}\) Esther died in February 1783.\(^{105}\) Jesse remarried to Mary Valentine in July 1783; witnesses were Harriet Valentine and John Darby, Jr., who was a member of a prominent Baptist Scotch Plains family.\(^{106}\) Several months before his 1783 marriage to Mary, Dolbeer had Gershom Frazee, who lived nearby, perform carpentry work for him, including making a wagon, and supplying some timber, which suggests that Dolbeer

---

\(^{98}\) Jesse Dolbeer Revolutionary War Pension Application, Pension File W91. The history of the Dolbeer family of Woodbridge, NJ is unclear. Dolbeers were living in the vicinity of the Piscataqua River in New Hampshire, by around 1700. Early New Hampshire records indicate that Dolbeer professions during the early 1700s included shipwright and joiner/woodworker. New Hampshire real estate transactions refer to John Dolbeer as a joiner. The inventory of the deceased John Dolbeer of NJ lists the tools of a furniture maker and joiner, including Eleven chisells, four gouges, four fiels, a pane of Compas, three Drawing kniefs, forty one Joinars pla ins, five torners gouges and three chissels, two adds and one mallot. Furniture in the inventory included Two square tables, foure square boxes and one chest, six fiddle back chairs, one large looking glass…one high Cheast, and Eight Black Walnut Chairs Not finish. [Joan Barrett, “The Dolbear of New Hampshire,” typescript, November, 2014] A number of families from the Piscataqua region immigrated to New Jersey where in 1668 they founded the town of Piscataway, which adjoined Woodbridge. [Clayton, pp.555, 589] No record has been found that documents when or from where John Dolbeer of Woodbridge arrived in NJ. However, the Dolbeer family was apparently living in Woodbridge by 1748, when Jesse Dolbeer was born. Numerous branches of the family, including Jesse Dolbeer’s grandsons, used the spelling “Dolbier.”


\(^{100}\) Calendar of Wills, 1771-1780, p.147.

\(^{101}\) EC Wills, Book F, p.63.

\(^{102}\) Dolbeer. During his service, he participated in battles at Woodbridge (April 19, 1777), Quibbletown (May 10, 1777), Short Hills (June 26, 1777), Connecticut Farms (June 7, 1780), and Springfield (June 23, 1780).

\(^{103}\) Kenn Stryker-Rodda, Revolutionary Census of New Jersey, Lambertville, NJ: Hunterdon House, 1986, p.211.

\(^{104}\) Headstone of Jesse Dolbeer at Scotch Plains Baptist Church: “Here lyes ye body of Jesse, sone of Jesse & Esther Dolbeer, died March ye 13 1781 in his 6th month.”

\(^{105}\) Scotch Plains Baptist Church Cemetery. It is not known when Jesse married Esther or whether they had any children together.

may have acquired his first land parcel by then.\(^{107}\) Records indicate that sometime between 1781 (when tax ratables list him without land) and 1791 (when a deed documents that he bought land bordering land where he was already living), Dolbeer acquired the ten-acre parcel of land where his dwelling now stands at 850 Terrill Road.\(^{108}\) It seems very possible that he acquired this home farm parcel by 1783. Although no deed has been found, it is likely that he acquired the land occupied by the Dolbeer-Ware House from John Clark, a descendant of Richard Clarke, one of the Elizabeth Town Associates.\(^{109}\) The will of Nehemiah Hand establishes that John Clark owned the site of the house in 1772.\(^{110}\) Clark’s land also bordered the south boundary of land owned by John Meeker, a descendent of another Elizabethtown associate.\(^{111}\) The lands of Hand, Clark and Meeker were most likely portions of lots originally laid out in 1699 as part of the Clinker Lots Division.\(^{112}\)

In September 1791, Dolbeer bought a narrow tract from John Meeker, a carpenter, along what is now Terrill Road, north of the property where Dolbeer was already living.\(^{113}\) The deed refers to both men as living in “the Short Hills” of Essex County.\(^{114}\) A road return for a two-rod road, which was surveyed just weeks after

---

\(^{107}\) Gershom Frazee lived near the intersection of Terrill Road and Raritan Road, about one and a half miles south of Dolbeer. [Spies, Sec. 8, p.23]

\(^{108}\) “Indenture Between John Meeker & Jesse Dolbier–1791.” Typewritten manuscript copy, courtesy Joan Barrett.

\(^{109}\) Richard Clarke (1661-1742), a ship carpenter, was born in Southampton, Long Island and immigrated to Elizabeth town with his father, also Richard, around 1678. According to a deposition he made in 1742 in connection with the Elizabethtown Bill in Chancery, by 1742 he had already conveyed to his sons all his lands “within the Claim of Elizabeth Town.” However, according to his will of August 17, 1742, he still owned 200 acres “by the Ash Swamp” which he devised to his son Jonathan (d.1748). This land was likely Lots 81 and 82 that Joseph Sayre acquired in the 1699 Clinker Lots division. Richard Clarke’s descendants included several John Clark(e)s who could have been the owner in 1772 of the land that later was purchased by Dolbeer. Richard’s son, Richard, had a son named John; his son John, had two grandsons named John; and his son (or grandson) Henry had a son named John (ca.1718-10/25/1799). [NJ Wills, Lib.D, p.58; Lib.D, p.97; Lib.D, p.298; Lib.F, p.443; “Henry Clark,” Westfieldnjhistory.com]

\(^{110}\) William Meeker (ca.1620/5-1690/1) emigrated from England to Massachusetts Bay Colony. From there he moved to New Haven, Connecticut. Around 1664, he emigrated with a group from Long Island to establish Elizabethtown. [Leroy J. Meeker, The Meeker Family of early New Jersey as Revealed in the Correspondence of Charles H. Meeker, Junior, Charleston, WV: Meeker, 1973, Section One]

\(^{111}\) McGrath. Unfortunately no recorded deeds or mortgages have been found relating to the Tappon/Hand conveyance or the purchase of the adjoining lands by John Meeker and John Clark.

\(^{112}\) “Indenture Between John Meeker & Jesse Dolbier – 1791.” The lot evidently formed part of the farm owned by John Meeker, who died in 1768 leaving his lands to his sons John, Jotham and his unborn son Joseph Ogden (1/1/1769-6/25/1861). [NJ Wills 3725-26G]

\(^{113}\) These low hills extended south from Terrill Road and east of Ash Swamp. The deed indicates that John Meeker inherited the parcel from his father, also John Meeker. The ten-acre parcel adjoined lands owned by his brothers, Ogden and Jotham, John Clark and
Dolbeer acquired his land from John Meeker, refers to the area as “a place called the Short Hills.”\textsuperscript{115} In October 1791, John Dolbeer, son of Jesse and Mary, was born.\textsuperscript{116} The deed from 1791 and another for a small parcel in 1793 both described Jesse Dolbeer as a wheelwright, while a deed in 1795 referred to him as a carpenter. The implication is that by 1795 Dolbeer possessed the skills of a carpenter, and earned at least part of his livelihood from carpentry.\textsuperscript{117}

By 1796, Jesse Dolbeer had acquired more property; Westfield Township Tax ratables that year listed Jesse Dolbeer as owning sixty acres, three horses, and two head of cattle.\textsuperscript{118} The acreage seems to have been typical for the area. Neighbors of Dolbeer listed that year were Stephen Hand with sixty acres, 2 horses and 4 head of cattle; Ogden Meeker with sixty acres, 1 horse, and two head of cattle; and John Clark with thirty-nine acres.\textsuperscript{119} Wacker and Clemons reported that in 1802 in neighboring Woodbridge Township (also settled by New Englanders) the median size farm was fifty acres.\textsuperscript{120} Jesse’s sons Samuel and John also paid taxes on land that year, although their father kept title to the properties, which were located a half-mile south of his home farm. Samuel Dolbeer was taxed for twenty-seven acres, one horse and two head of cattle; John Dolbeer was taxed for thirty acres, one horse and one head of cattle. In July 1804, Dolbeer acquired an L-shaped twenty-acre lot from John Clark, paying $750.00.\textsuperscript{121} Several days later, Dolbeer sold to Jonathon Hand twenty acres that he previously acquired from John High.\textsuperscript{122} Dolbeer’s home farm now comprised forty acres on the south side of the road and twenty on the north. Tax ratables for 1810 again list him with sixty-two acres.

\textsuperscript{115} Unrecorded road survey dated September 22, 1791. This Short Hills, which was the location of the Revolutionary Battle of Short Hills, is not the same as present-day Short Hills, which is part of Millburn Township in Essex County. [Lee Family genealogy records.]

\textsuperscript{116} John Dolbeer was buried in the burial ground of the First Presbyterian Congregation of Connecticut Farms, in Union, NJ. [Ancestry.com] Jesse Dolbeer’s will, signed in 1822, listed his sons John (1791-1827) and John’s sons Amos and Aaron; younger son Samuel (b. c1794) and Samuel’s four sons, Cutter, Gilbert, Jesse and Jonathan and two daughters, Elizabeth and Sibbel. [Essex County (EC) Wills, Book F, p.63]

\textsuperscript{117} Nothing is known about Dolbeer’s education or early training. During this period, apprenticeship typically provided training in trades. Dolbeer’s neighbor, Gershom Frazee, was apprenticed for three years to Peter Pain, a carpenter and joiner of Elizabeth. [Spies, Sec.8, p.21]

\textsuperscript{118} In June 1793, Dolbeer paid Peter Fairchild fifty pounds for a five-acre lot. [Unrecorded deed included in the papers of the Lee sisters.]

\textsuperscript{119} 1796 Westfield tax ratables.

\textsuperscript{120} Wacker and Clemons, p.223.

\textsuperscript{121} EC Deeds, Book I, p.381. The 1804 deed describes the lot “being part of the plantation formerly John Clark deceased which he conveyed to the said John Clark (his son) by deed of gift duly executed 1/13/1790.” Thus, the senior John Clark evidently died sometime between 1790 and 1804. How he fits into the Clark genealogy is unclear. One possibility is that he is the John Clark listed on the Westfield Historical Society web site who died in Westfield on October 25, 1799, son of Hannah and Henry Clark and husband of Susannah. Henry Clark, who died in Westfield in 1771, according to this source was the son of Richard Clark II, and grandson of Richard Clark I. The Clarks evidently were New Englanders who migrated to Long Island and then NJ in the late 17th century.

\textsuperscript{122} July 12, 1804 Deed, Jesse Dolbeer to Jonathon Hand. [EC Deeds, Book I, p.60]
between 1812 and 1815 list him owning seventy-one acres, increasing to seventy-four acres in 1821, the latest preserved ratables.123

In 1812, Dolbeer paid $81.25 for a 3.25-acre parcel of salt meadow about fifteen miles away in Woodbridge Township, Middlesex County.124 Salt hay was used for winter fodder as well as mulch, insulation, and packing material. The transaction provides a glimpse into his farm practices, which appear to have been influenced by the New England system of settlement and land use. In their book, _Land use In Early New Jersey_, Peter O. Wacker and Paul G. E. Clemens, describe the activities of the Scudders, a farm family living in Essex County during the early 19th century.125 The Scudders, who owned a comparatively large farm of one hundred acres near the Rahway River, were New Englanders who came from Huntington, Long Island. According to family records that document seasonal activities, the Scudders spent much of January and August each year cutting or carting salt hay from the Newark meadows: “Despite Scudder’s above-average landholdings in this northern area, he still had to go relatively far afield for many of his agricultural activities, such as pasturing stock, gathering wood, and haying… salt hay was of great importance to Scudder.” The hard work of harvesting and transporting salt hay was offset by the fact that it required no cultivation. Scudder carted cordwood from the Watchung Mountains, ten or so miles away. There is a reference in Jesse Dolbeer’s will to a separate five-acre woodlot that was apparently nearby.126 The Plainfield area was evidently not as deforested as Rahway was by the early 19th century.

Jesse was living on his property in 1822, when, “being in a low state of health but of sound mind and memory,” he wrote his will, which describes his home farm as consisting of two lots: twenty acres on the “north side of the road” and forty acres “on the south side of road where house is.” According to the will, Jesse’s sons, Samuel and John, were living on lands he owned located a short distance south his home farm.127 Jesse’s son, John, died in 1827, after which his widow and children evidently moved in with Jesse and Mary.128 The 1830 Federal census lists Dolbeer as the head of a household of six: A male between 80 and 89 living with a female (70-79), presumably Jesse and his wife; two young males whose ages correspond with the ages of John’s sons, Aaron (born c.1813) and Amos (born c. 1811); and two females, likely two of John’s three daughters.129

123 Jesse apparently acquired additional parcels for which no deeds have been recorded.
124 Oct. 5, 2012 unrecorded deed from John C. Noe and Mary his wife to Jesse Dolbeer. [Daughters of the American Revolution, Scotch Plains Chapter, _Genealogical Records: Blue Hills Deeds, etc., of the Frazee’s and Allied Families of Essex County, New Jersey, Year 1708 to 1838_, Salt Lake City: Genealogical Society of Utah, 1971] The parcel was along an unnamed creek near “the Sound,” likely in the vicinity of the mouth of the Raritan River.
125 Wacker and Clemens, pp.249-251.
126 EC Wills, Book F, p.63.
127 EC Wills, Book F, p.63.
128 John Dolbeer, who died in his 36th year, was buried in the “Old Burial Ground” of the Presbyterian Congregation of Connecticut Farms, now Union, NJ.
129 US Population Schedule for Westfield, 1830. The ages of Jesse Dolbeer’s grandsons are based on their ages in the 1860 census. John Dolbeer had three daughters, Mary, Emmala, and Jemima, who were named in his will. The 1830 census also lists Sarah Dolbier, the widow of Jesse’s son, Samuel who evidently died sometime after his father wrote his will in 1822.
Construction of the east wing of the house may have been undertaken around this time in order to accommodate the expanding household.

Upon Jesse’s death in 1832, his sixty-acre home farm passed to his grandsons, Amos and Aaron Dolbeer, the sons of his deceased son, John. The inventory made after his death includes farm products, farm equipment, cows, poultry hogs and sheep, as well as carpenter’s tools, a turning lathe and lumber. He also had $500.00 in cash on hand, which may reflect income from his carpentry work or real estate transactions. The sixty-acre farm was divided upon his death, with the parcel that included the house allotted to his grandson, Aaron. In his will, Jesse followed the practice of partible inheritance of land (v. primogeniture, the practice of devising all land to the eldest son), a practice also followed by his neighbors. This practice often resulted in the division of lands into parcels that proved too small to operate as separate farms; therefore, often one son would buy lands from his brothers and reassemble the original farm, or lands would be sold to neighboring farmers, which is what apparently occurred with Dolbeer’s heirs.

**Later Ownership**

Aaron Dolbeer, who moved to Rahway, sold his share of the farm in 1836 to his cousin, Silas Fatoot. The property was resold in 1839 to Joseph Ross for $1,400.00 and again in 1843 to Bernard Latapie a French immigrant living in New York City, who paid $1,875.00. Latapie moved out to Plainfield and farmed his new land. In 1850, the aspiring Latapie also acquired Amos Dolbeer’s half of the farm inherited from his grandfather, paying $900, effectively reassembling Jesse Dolbeer’s home farm. He continued to own the land until his death in 1881. A map published in 1850 shows “B. Latapie” near “J.O. Meeker;” “C. Dolbeer” and “J. Dolbeer” occupied neighboring dwellings farther south along Terrill Road. A map from 1862 indicates “B. Latapie” along what was by then called Terrill Road (Fig. 3). A map from 1878 shows the extent of Latapie’s land (Fig.5). It appears likely that the Italianate remodeling seen in a late 19th-century photograph was undertaken by Latapie (Fig.7).

---

130 EC Wills, Book F, p. 63. John Dolbeer’s death is recorded on his headstone at the burial ground at First Presbyterian Congregation of Connecticut Farms in Union, NJ. Jesse’s other son, Samuel, was also deceased by this time and his four sons — Cutter, Jesse, Jonathan, and (heirs of) Gilbert — inherited sixty acres south of the home farm. Jesse’s will also names daughters Elizabeth Linn and Sibbel, wife of Abraham Ryno; and three grandsons, Silas, Amos, and [illegible] Fatoot, who were likely the sons of Aaron Fatoot mentioned in the will, from whose executor Jesse bought a house and lot that he devised to his daughter Sibbel.

131 Jesse Dolbeer’s estate records include a map of the tract that Jesse devised to his grandsons, Cutter, Gilbert, Jesse and Jonathan. The heirs of Gilbert Dolbeer, who had predeceased his father, received the portion of the tract on the north side of the “Road from Scotch Plains to Two Bridges.” The other three all received lots on the south side of the road. [EC Wills, Book F, p.63]


133 EC Deeds, Book V5, p.304. Most of the sons of Jesse Dolbeer’s sons spelled their last name “Dolbeer.” In the 1850 Rahway census Aaron H. Dolbeer was listed as a 37-year-old carpenter. The 1860 Plainfield census listed Aaron H. Dolbeer as a grocer. Silas Fatoot was listed in Jesse Dolbeer’s will as a grandson. [EC Wills, Book F, p.63]

134 EC Deeds, Book I5, p. 92; Book V5, p.447; 1850 Fed Census for NYC.

135 EC Deeds, Book I7, p.344

136 1850 Federal Census for Plainfield.
In 1884, both halves of the Dolbeer property as well as the neighboring property to the south were acquired by Warren Ackerman, one of the largest landowners in the county. Ackerman rented the property to a succession of tenant farmers. James and Caroline Borrup, who emigrated from Denmark, lived there between 1884 and 1902. In 1900, the household comprised James, his wife, three sons, four daughters, and a boarder who was a farm laborer. Between 1902 and 1911, Rasmus and Carline Krog, also Danish immigrants, lived with their young son and daughter and two laborers who worked on the dairy farm. In 1911, Louis H. Hosmer, acquired the property from Ackerman’s estate. Hosmer, a Manhattan businessman, bought the property from the Ackerman estate as an investment, and continued to rent it out. Because the property was tenant-occupied from 1884 to 1917, it is likely that the elegant Colonial Revival remodeling was undertaken after this period.

**Harriet Ware (1877-1962)**

In 1917, composer Harriet Ware and her husband, Hugh M. Krumbhaar, bought the old Dolbeer house and 21.5 acres from Louis Hosmer. Several years later, an article in the *Newark Sunday Call* described what had become their bucolic sanctuary:

> Called Lambkins Farm, it was a short train ride from Manhattan and provided an artist’s climate of solitude, gardens, and animals. The couple bought other old buildings in the area and moved them to the farm. The restored buildings, each in its own setting of trees and gardens, gave the farm the appearance of a small colonial village.

Evidently Lambkins Farm was simply a charming name evoking a pastoral country retreat. It seems likely that Ware and her husband were responsible for the Colonial Revival remodeling, much of which survives (Fig.8). Inserts appearing in a couple of New York social registers suggest that Harriet Ware (she continued to use her maiden name professionally) and her husband, Hugh Krumbhaar, also maintained a residence in Manhattan, despite their appearance in the Plainfield census reports. Ware dreamed of starting an artists’ colony at her farm, an idea that never materialized, although she held musical programs there that featured New York artists.

---

137 Ackerman was well known as the developer who transformed Feltville, a deserted industrial village in the Watchung Mountains, into Glenside Park, a summer resort.
138 1900 U.S. Census Plainfield.
139 1910 U.S. Census Plainfield.
140 Union County (UC) Deeds, Book 587, p.524.
142 UC Deeds, Book 720, p.147. Ms. Ware was a rarity as a female composer during the early 20th century. She composed about 100 works that were published.
143 *Newark Sunday Call*, August 23, 1936. The misnomer “Lampkin” was attached to the house by 1984, when it was identified as such in the City of Plainfield Survey.
Harriet Ware, a rarity as a female composer during the early 20th century, was born in Wisconsin and studied music from an early age, in Minnesota, New York, Paris and Berlin. Ware became well regarded as a composer-pianist, giving recitals and performing with orchestras throughout the United States. She composed about 100 works that were published and was described in contemporary accounts as “one of the Nation’s leading women composers.” Her most well-known works include: The Boat Song (1908); Sir Oluf, a cantata (1911); White Moth, a ballet (1925); Women’s Triumphant March (1927; the national song of the General Federation of Women’s Clubs); The Rose is Red, (the national song of the American Mother’s Association); two pieces composed for poems by her friend, British poet Edwin Markham, The Artisan (1927), which was performed with the New York Symphony Orchestra in 1929; and Undine, a one-act opera (1913); and This Day is Mine (1955). Perhaps her most ambitious project was a musical, The Love Wagon, which was produced at the Paper Mill Playhouse in Millburn, New Jersey in 1947 and 1950 (by then it had been renamed Waltz For Three). In 1926, she started her own publishing company, Harriet Ware, Inc. Ware was a long-time member of the Plainfield Musical Club, whose 50th anniversary program in 1942 was entirely of her compositions. A biographical entry from a review of the American Art Song genre, referred to her “solid, attractive writing,” and stated: “During the first two decades of the twentieth century, Harriet Ware stood at the forefront of American women composers…Though Ware’s style is totally conventional, her melodies have personality.”

Recent History

After the death of her husband in 1950, Ms. Ware sold the property in 1951 to Byron L. West, who in 1970 sold the property to Virginia Terrell, who owned the property until her death in 2007. Acknowledgement of the dwelling’s significance began in 1976, when it was identified in the Union County Historic Landmark Inventory; the 1983 City of Plainfield Survey of Historic Building Resources also noted its significance and identified it as among the oldest standing buildings in Plainfield. A letter of certification of eligibility for listing on the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places was issued by the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office in 1989; and in 2004, the property was designated a local landmark by resolution of the City Council. The property’s eligibility for listing on the New Jersey and National Registers under Criterion C was reaffirmed by the New Jersey Preservation Office by a letter dated December 5, 2008. The City of Plainfield intends to acquire the property, record a deed of preservation easement, stabilize the buildings on the property, then transfer the property to a 501(c)(3) that will preserve it as a historic site/museum/learning facility open to the public. The .43-acre property offers an opportunity to eventually link the historic site with


146 2014 Grant Application, Plainfield Planning Office.
adjoining municipal and county preserved lands, thereby expanding the potential uses and visitation of the preserved property. The City in 2014 applied for and received a Historic Preservation Grant from Union County that will be matched by the City of Plainfield for the purpose of preparing a Preservation Plan and stabilizing the buildings on the property. From a lack of maintenance over recent decades, the house is now in a severely deteriorated condition. It nevertheless possesses good potential to reveal information that will contribute to understanding the cultural origins and antecedents of what has been termed the East Jersey cottage.
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LATITUDE/LONGITUDE COORDINATES

40.631574, -74.386305

NARRATIVE BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

The nominated property consists of one lot in Plainfield City: tax block 921, lot 15.02. The boundary of the nominated property follows the south, west, and north property lines of the lot as depicted on the March 31, 2012 tax map that accompanies this nomination, with side lines extended to the centerline of Terrill Road (i.e., the municipal boundary) which forms the east property boundary for nomination purposes. The boundary of the nominated property begins at the southeast corner of block 921, lot 15.03 on the west side of Terrill Road, and proceeds southwest following the south boundary of that lot, then southeast along the east boundaries of Block 921, Lots 20 and 31 to the northwest boundary of Block 921, Lot 15.01, then northeast along the north boundary of Lot 15.01, to a corner at the Terrill Road right-of-way. From there the boundary continues to the centerline of the road and the municipal boundary, then northerly along the road and municipal boundary to the point where a straight-line continuation of the north side of lot 15.02 would intersection the municipal boundary. The boundary turns west along that continuation line to the southeast corner of Block 921, lot 15.03, the place of beginning.

BOUNDARY JUSTIFICATION

The boundary of the nominated property encompasses the lot that constitutes the remaining property associated with the Dolbeer-Ware House and a portion of the Terrill Road right-of-way to include the section of the dwelling that extends into the right-of-way.
PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION

The following information is the same for all photographs submitted with the nomination:

Name: Dolbeer-Ware House
Location: City of Plainfield, Union County, NJ
Photographer: Ann Parsekian, Dennis Bertland Associates
Date: October 2014
Electronic file Repository: Dennis Bertland Associates, Stockton, NJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>East elevation, view to west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>West elevation, view to east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>North elevation, view to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>North end of west block, view to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Room 101, view to northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Room 101, view to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Room 102, view to north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Room 102, view to southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Room 102, view to southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Room 105, view to northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Room 105, view to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Room 201, view to east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Room 207, view to west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Attic, view to west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Attic, view to east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>North elevation of barn, view to south</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dolbeer-Ware House
Union County, New Jersey
850 Terrill Rd, Plainfield, NJ 07023
40.631538, -74.36634
Block 921 Lot 15.02

Site Boundary:

Dolbeer-Ware House
Union County, New Jersey

Photo Identification Map

Photo # and Direction of View: 2

Note: Property was subdivided subsequent to this survey. Approximate side lines are indicated. The greenhouse, small shed, and barn appendage have been demolished.
First Floor Plan

The modern greenhouse appendage has been demolished.

Note: Due to site limitations, sketch maps are approximate and subject to verification.

Dolbeer-Ware House
Union County, New Jersey

Photo Identification Map

Photo # and Direction of View: 2>
Second Floor Plan
Note: Due to site limitations, sketch maps are approximate and subject to verification.

Dolbeer-Ware House
Union County, New Jersey

Photo Identification Map

Photo # and Direction of View: 2>
Attic Plan

Note: Due to site limitations, sketch maps are approximate and subject to verification.

Dolbeer-Ware House
Union County, New Jersey

Photo Identification Map

Photo # and Direction of View: 2
Figure 1: Detail of Plainfield vicinity, 1828 Gordons

Figure 2: Detail from “Map of Plainfield, NJ, 1832.

Dolbeer-Ware House
City of Plainfield, Union County, NJ


Dolbeer-Ware House
City of Plainfield, Union County, NJ

Figure 6: Detail of Terrill Road vicinity. *Plainfield & North Plainfield, N.J.*, New York: Landis & Hughes, 1899.
Figure 7: Late 19th-century photograph of Dolbeer-Ware House, City of Plainfield.

Figure 8: C. 1985 photograph of Dolbeer-Ware House, North Elevation. City of Plainfield.
Dolbeer-Ware House, Plainfield City, Union County
Photo 3

Dolbeer-Ware House, Plainfield City, Union County
Photo 4
Dolbeer-Ware House, Plainfield City, Union County
Photo 5

Dolbeer-Ware House, Plainfield City, Union County
Photo 6
Dolbeer-Ware House, Plainfield City, Union County
Photo 9

Dolbeer-Ware House, Plainfield City, Union County
Photo 10
Dolbeer-Ware House, Plainfield City, Union County
Photo 15

Dolbeer-Ware House, Plainfield City, Union County
Photo 16