



VIRGINIA
DIVISION OF HISTORIC LANDMARKS
HISTORIC DISTRICT/BRIEF
SURVEY FORM

File no. 76-390-016

Negative no(s).

Reviewed by D. Edwards

City/Town/Village/Hamlet
Street address or route number 11601 Hickory Hill Dr.
Historic name
County Prince William
U.S.G.S. Quad
Common name Independent Hill
Bill Goodman Cabin
Present use Dwelling
Original use Log cabin (summer) at Lake Jackson
Building Style Log cabin
Building Date(s) ca. 1935

I. Construction Materials

☐ wood frame

☐ brick

bond: ☐ English
☐ Flemish
☐ _____-course American
☐ stretcher
☐ other _____

☐ stone

☐ random rubble

☐ coursed rubble

☐ ashlar

☐ dressed

☐ rock-faced

☒ log:

☐ squared

☐ unsquared

notching:

☐ V-notch

☐ half dovetail

☒ saddle

☐ full dovetail

☐ square

☐ diamond

☐ concrete block

☐ terra cotta

☐ steel frame

☐ other _____

2. Cladding Material

☐ weatherboard

☐ vertical siding

☐ board & batten

☐ shingle:

☐ wood

☐ asbestos

☐ asphalt

☐ bricktex

☐ other _____

☐ composition siding

☐ stucco

☐ aluminum or vinyl siding

☐ cast iron

☐ sheet metal

☐ enameled metal

☐ glass

3. Stories (number) 1

☐ low basement

☒ raised basement

4. Bays (number): front _____

side (church) 3

☐ symmetrical

☒ asymmetrical

5. Roof Type

☐ shed

☐ hipped

☐ parapet?

☐ pyramidal?

☒ gable

☐ mansard

☐ pediment?

☐ false mansard

☐ parapet?

☐ gambrel

☐ clipped end?

☐ flat

☐ cross gable?

☐ parapet?

☐ central front gable?

☐ roof not visible

☐ other _____

6. Roofing Material

☒ shingle

☒ composition (asphalt, asbestos, etc.)

☐ wood

☐ metal

☐ standing seam

☐ corrugated

☐ pressed tin (simulated shingles)

☐ tile

☐ pantile

☐ flat

☐ glazed

☐ slate

☐ not visible

7. Dormers (number): front _____

side _____

☐ gable

☐ pediment?

☐ shed

☐ hipped

8. Primary Porch

style _____

stories 1

levels 1

bays _____

materials wood

description and decorative details

9. General supplementary description and decoration:

Exterior stone fireplace, some 6-paned windows and some 2-paned.

10. Major additions and alterations:

most windows replaced with single panes, early porch closed in w/wood, windows & glass doors. Underneath enclosed for carport

11. Outbuildings:

12. Landscape Features:

sloping -- stone walls of river cobbles.

13. Significance:


one of early cabins in Cornwell Tract at Lake Jackson. It has maintained its integrity.

Surveyed by:

Mary Ellen Bushey

Date:

10/7/92






Figure 35: Proposed Manassas Bypass, Southern Section Showing Lake Jackson and Lake Jackson House (76-72)

Source: U.S.G.S. Independent Hill, VA, 7.5 Minute Quad.




Figure 45

Lake Jackson proposed Historic District (Lion and Cornwell Tracts) with buildings.

#16 (76-390-016)



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Hugh C. Miller, Director

Department of Historic Resources

221 Governor Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

TDD: (804) 786-1934
Telephone: (804) 786-3143
FAX: (804) 225-4261

31 August 1993

Earl T. Robb
Virginia Department of Transportation
1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Re: Proposed Manassas Bypass
Prince William County
FHWA-VA-EIS-79-03-DS
VDOT Project No. 6234-076-F11, PE101
VDHR File No. 90-0911-F

Dear Mr. Robb:

We appreciated the opportunity to review several documents submitted to our agency for the above referenced project. These include two supplemental survey reports, the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS), and a letter from the Virginia Commonwealth University Archaeological Research Center (7-6-93) concerning effect determinations.

Supplemental Survey Documentation

For the northern segment of the undertaking, we concur with your consultant's recommendation that structures 76-168, 76-169, and 76-170 be considered not eligible for National Register listing. Also, we concur with your consultant's recommendation that evaluation (Phase II) study is warranted to determine the National Register eligibility of sites 44PW623 and 44PW579.

For the segment of the undertaking between Independent Hill and Lake Jackson, we concur with your consultant's recommendation that evaluation (Phase II study) is warranted for the Barnes House (76-156). Further, we concur with your consultant's recommendation that the following resources be considered not eligible for National Register listing: 76-154, 76-155, 76-157, 76-158, 76-159, 76-160, 76-161, 76-162, 76-163, 76-164, 76-165, 76-166, and 44PW626.

VCUARC Letter of July 6, 1993

We concur with your consultant's determination that the undertaking will have an adverse effect on the following historic properties: Bloom Hill (76-149), Bradley (76-70), the Lake Jackson Historic District (76-390), and the Manassas Battlefield. Resources affected on the Manassas Battlefield include The Manassas National Battlefield Park (76-271), Pageland I (76-138), and Pageland II (76-137).

DSEIS


We appreciate the efforts made at this stage of environmental analysis to reduce the adverse effects on Bradley, Bloom Hill, Pageland I, and Pageland II. We encourage your agency and the FHWA, however, to reconsider the following project alternatives which, in our opinion, would eliminate the adverse effects of the undertaking on historic properties. We urge that the interchanges with Routes 649 and 673 be eliminated or relocated

elsewhere. Such an alternative would eliminate the adverse effect at Bradley and would reduce the adverse effect at Bloom Hill below the level advocated in the DSEIS. For the Manassas Battlefield area, we recommend that Alternative 3 be reconsidered which would terminate the project at I-66 and would avoid most of the resources on the battlefield (including Pageland I, Pageland II, and the Manassas National Battlefield Park). Reconsideration of Alternative 3 should also include comparison to a modified Selected Alternative which would include closure of existing Route 234 through the park to partially mitigate the effect of the undertaking on that historic property.

We look forward to reviewing the evaluation of the Barnes House (76-156) and sites 44PW623 and 44PW579. If access to the archaeological sites continues to be denied, then provisions for evaluation and treatment can be included in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). The MOA also could include provisions for completion of survey efforts in other portions of the area of potential effect where access was denied as identified in the Phase I survey document (April 1992). Please recognize, however, that preparation of an MOA at this time would be premature and should be deferred until the alternatives recommended above can be given full consideration.

We look forward to providing further assistance to the VDOT and the FHWA on this undertaking. If you have any questions concerning our comments, please contact Elizabeth Hoge or Antony Opperman of our staff.

Sincerely,



H. Bryan Mitchell
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: James M. Tumlin, Federal Highway Administration
Don Klima, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Robert Stanton, National Park Service
Kenneth E. Apschnikat, Manassas National Battlefield Park
Virginia Commonwealth University