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Background

This historic structure report details the history, current condition, and potential treatment and uses for the Housworth-Moseley Farm located in the Klondike community of southern Dekalb County, Georgia. (See Figure 1). While the site as a whole provides the framework, this document chiefly details the structure on the site referred to here as the Housworth-Moseley house.

In order to produce a document that accurately and systematically describes the past, present and potential future of the property, the project team conducted extensive analysis of the site and the buildings. Using tools such as photographs, measurements, plan drawings, elevation drawings, and written descriptions, the team developed a comprehensive study of the site.

This on-site research is supplemented by extensive historical material, everything from deed records to family letters and photographs. The richness of the historical material combined with the thorough study of the site itself provides a compelling view of settlement and development in this portion of Georgia, and by extension adds to the story of the American South and the nation as a whole.

In no small way, this report also illustrates the problems associated with identifying, documenting, and maintaining historic vernacular buildings. Give or take a few years, the house is approximately 150 years old. Of the outbuildings the dogtrot and the corn crib were built earlier, the grain bin
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is contemporary with the house, and the smokehouse was most likely built just after the Civil War.

Information detailing and describing rural farmsteads and vernacular architecture of this age is not as well documented as it might be for a more high-style structure, and the project team was obliged to range far a field to synthesize and explain some of the research findings.

The project team responsible for producing this Historic Structure Report consists of Georgia State University graduate students in the Heritage Preservation Program, and was enrolled in the fall, 2007, semester of Conservation of Historic Building Materials class. The project was supervised by co-instructors Richard Laub and Laura Drummond.

Executive Summary

The Housworth-Moseley house is an excellent example of vernacular architecture, and although the exterior was extensively remodeled in the late 1980s, the almost unaltered interior - unfinished pine floors, walls, and ceiling panels are a primary component of the site’s significance.

Because this structure was always used as a family residence, it is recommended that it retain a residential use. And with this in mind, the goal for treatment of the Housworth-Moseley house is sensitive rehabilitation. Because the historic exterior was almost completely replaced with the 1980s remodeling, it would be appropriate to repair or replace materials as necessary, but always keeping in mind the historic character of the structure.

Also, if the decision is ever made to replace the modern double hung windows, it is recommended that replacement windows be made using the one original nine-over-nine Window W6 as a template. This could be one way of returning some of the missing original exterior fabric to the house.

Treatment of the interior would include complete rehabilitation of the kitchen and bathroom; replacement of electrical, HVAC, and plumbing systems; and limited structural improvements to replace damaged or deteriorated material. Any work to the interior should be done in as sensitive a manner as possible so that the historic character of the interior is not compromised.
HISTORICAL SUMMARY

The Housworth-Mosley site is located at 7241 South Goddard Road, Lithonia, GA, in an area known as the Klondike community. (See Figure 2). This region has been largely rural for as long as it has been settled by Europeans,
but proximity to metropolitan Atlanta has brought the region into contact with the ripple effects of Atlanta’s burgeoning growth. Farmland and woodland are making way for roads and high-density housing development, and the site - particularly the house - becomes more of an anachronism and in added need of protection from development.

The Housworth-Moseley site has some measure of protection for its continued survival. The Klondike area has been designated a National Historic District, and the house has been identified as one of the oldest buildings in that district. The site is immediately south of Arabia Mountain, a granite peak that dominates the terrain, and is thus part of the Arabia Mountain Heritage Area. The alliance responsible for the heritage area has as its stated goal “the preservation and conservation of the natural, historic and recreational resources that surround the Arabia Mountain area.”

**Architectural Summary**

The Housworth - Moseley house is a north facing one story, wood-framed, end-gabled vernacular structure that currently includes 10 rooms - a sizable increase from its original three rooms. It was built in approximately 1843, and is typical of a house owned by a farmer and laborer of the antebellum and post-Civil War periods - the house is a simple, utilitarian structure that was built in response to specific needs with little consideration of architectural style or refinement of detail. The Housworth-Moseley house remained in the same family for more 150 years, and is in remarkably good condition for a building of its age.

Because a structure this old is prone to neglect and deterioration, the house is noteworthy for its overall integrity and soundness. It is the vernacular design and construction that largely defines the character of the Housworth - Moseley house. That, along with the fact that it is one of the few structures of its type remaining in the area, makes it an ideal candidate for preservation and rehabilitation.

Although the house has seen change since it was first built in the early 1840s its original footprint is largely intact. As the family who owned it grew and became (relatively) more prosperous over the years, rooms and
modern features such as electricity and indoor plumbing were added to the house. Some historic materials and features necessarily were lost as these additions were made, but the project team has been able to chart the chronology of the house and identify the historic materials and features that remain.

The document contains room-by-room or façade-by-façade descriptions of the architecture, materials and workmanship of the house and outbuildings, along with detailed assessments of the condition of these elements. Even though the structure is sound, however, the pages below illustrate the noticeable effects of time and weather, which in some cases are dramatic.

The team also has made recommendations for repairing and maintaining these different elements of the house. In most cases, the recommendations (summarized on Page 5 and detailed in Section 4) are made with an eye toward stabilization, repair and, where possible, preservation of the remaining historic elements.

**Purpose of HSR**

A historic structure report is a comprehensive document that provides the planning and research necessary to begin any major preservation, restoration or rehabilitation project. By focusing on the historic character of a structure, the HSR can identify the problem areas in the structure and describe the implications of various courses of action.

By chronicling the site over time, the HSR provides a unique developmental history that can be used to help future owners understand the evolution of the property. This understanding, in turn, can help shape and inform how the site should be modified in the future.

The document is divided into five parts. The first is the introduction, including information that places the site geographically, describes the process of preparing the report and summarizes the research findings.

The second part is historical. Here the reader will find a history of the region from earliest known human activity until today. The section also contains significant details on the family that built the site and lived here for much of its history. This family history is a vital supplement to the in-
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vestigation of the site itself because it provides information on how the site was used, as well as confirmation of various hypotheses made by the project team.

The section concludes with a chronology of site, including both the house and the various outbuildings.

The third part of the document is the most detailed. It contains an architectural description of every part of the house and outbuildings, along with an assessment of the current conditions.

The fourth part is a discussion of the future treatment and use of the site, which includes the project teams recommendations and opportunities for further study.

The report concludes with a number of appendices. Here the team has included relevant documents and records, along with a number of family recollections, photographs and letter excerpts. This appendix provides crucial context for the site and invigorates it as a place where people made their lives and raised their families.

Throughout, photographs and diagrams provide a key to understanding the report. Each section has photographs keyed to the text, and a master photo key is found in Appendix A. Other useful information such as the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and National Park Service Preservation Briefs, are included in the appendix or incorporated by reference.

Recommendations

In analyzing the site, the project team identified a number of areas that require intervention. Some of them can be performed by the owner, while others would require skilled labor. The house was remodeled in the late 1980s, and many of the updated features, particularly on the exterior, have not fared well.

The house is an excellent example of the type of home constructed here in the mid-nineteenth century. Its original purpose was as a dwelling, and the team’s suggestion is that it remain so.
For the outbuildings, preservation or rehabilitation is going to be difficult. One particular outbuilding, the corn crib, is a unique log construction, historic to the site, and should be preserved if at all practical. Some of the outbuildings have deteriorated significantly so that rehabilitation is not possible. In these cases, the team recommends reusing what materials can be salvaged.

The interior of the house contains many distinctive characteristics from its evolution, an authenticity that should be preserved. The planks and flooring have been unfinished throughout the lifespan of the house, and preserving as much of its historic character as possible will mean refraining from painting the walls and carpeting or tiling the floors.

The exterior may require new siding, and we recommend that the owners use in-kind materials should residing be part of the actual rehabilitation. Also, it should be noted here that the project team did not do a detailed inspection of the roof, and the owners may wish to have such an inspection made and consider the options presented to them.

The house will require new wiring, plumbing and HVAC systems, and it is the team’s recommendation that these systems be installed. And finally, any new construction should meet the Secretary of Interior’s Standards of Rehabilitation (see Appendix E) as well as the approval of the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation.
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Historical Background

Local History

Native Americans and Early White Settlement, 10,000 B.C.E. – 1860

The Housworth-Moseley House is located in the Klondike community of DeKalb County, Georgia, immediately south of Arabia Mountain. Archaeologists estimate that the earliest prehistoric occupants in Georgia roamed the state between 10,000 and 8,000 B.C.E. Between this time period and 1450 A.D., the prehistoric inhabitants of DeKalb County evolved from being nomadic hunter-gatherers to living a more sedentary lifestyle based on agriculture. Archaic people began settling in the Arabia Mountain area around 5,000 B.C.E along the Chattahoochee, South, and Yellow river valleys. Settlement in this area was “intimately connected to its geological resources.” By 3,000 B.C.E., the Soapstone Ridge area along the South River of what is now southern DeKalb County, was “one of the most important places of trade and human development in North America.”

Soapstone was used by prehistoric people to make bowls, small tools, carvings, pipes and ornaments, which all became important trading commodities. In fact, access to soapstone is believed to be “one basis for political power among Archaic people.” After 2,500 B.C.E. soapstone was replaced by pottery in the manufacture of bowls and other small tools. Subsequently, agricultural viability replaced proximity to soapstone as the ultimate factor in settlement patterns among prehistoric people in DeKalb County.

By the time European explorers reached the shores of the New World, the region that became DeKalb County was sparsely inhabited by Native Americans because the land was considered a buffer zone between the Creek and Cherokee Nations. Although officially part of the Creek Indian Territory, the area was used as a hunting ground by both tribes. Few permanent settlements remained in the region, however.

As a result of ever-encroaching white settlement in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries, the Creek Nation ceded a large tract of
its land to the state of Georgia in 1821. Dooly, Houston, Monroe, Henry and Fayette counties were carved out of this cession, and on December 9, 1822, DeKalb County was created out of parts of Henry, Fayette, and Gwinnett Counties.

A land lottery was held in 1821 by the State of Georgia to distribute to white settlers the land obtained from the Creek Indians. The new counties that had been formed out of this territory were divided into land districts measuring nine square miles each. Each district was then divided into land lots measuring 202 ½ acres each. John Knight of Emanuel County drew land lot 144, situated in the 16th District of Henry County. This land became part of southeastern DeKalb County and is the land parcel upon which the Housworth-Moseley home is located.

The new frontier county attracted settlers largely of English, Scots and Irish descent migrating either directly or indirectly from the Carolinas and Virginia. Families with German ancestry, including the Housworths, also immigrated to the area. An estimated “2,500 hardy souls” inhabited the new county by 1822.8 By 1830, the white population in DeKalb had increased to nearly 8,500, and approximately 1,500 slaves resided in the county. 9 The area around Arabia Mountain was settled in the 1820s and 1830s and “the Lyons, Goddards, Sims and Housworths were among the community’s first families.”10

For the most part, early settlers relied on subsistence agriculture to survive. They grew corn, wheat, oats, rye and apples in the rocky soil.11 Many settlers in the area that later became known as Klondike originally came in hopes of finding gold in the area. None was found, and residents turned to farming as their way of life.12 By mid-century, cotton had become the region’s primary crop,13 and by 1850, 84 households inhabited the Halsey District of DeKalb County, the census enumeration district in the area where the Housworth family settled.14

Only about 15 percent of the Halsey District households owned slaves, and fewer than 100 slaves inhabited the district.15 The house remains from this time period, and according to the Klondike National Register nomination is the only surviving antebellum home in Klondike.16
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The War, Reconstruction and Changes in Society, 1861-1941

The Civil War came to southeastern DeKalb County in the fall of 1864. According to descendents of John Milton Housworth, the owner of the Housworth-Moseley home during the conflict, “General Sherman’s troops were in the area of [the home] . . . on what is now South Goddard Road. In fact, they set up camp right next door to his house. The Yankees had been all around Arabia Mountain that fall and were gathering intelligence as well as foodstuffs.”

The Civil War slowed the growth of the Arabia Mountain area. However, after the war, industrial production from local sawmills helped reconstruct the community. Meanwhile, tenant farmers continued to cultivate cotton, which remained the chief crop until the boll weevil brought widespread destruction in the early twentieth century.

In the 1890s, the granite quarrying industry rapidly developed in the area. Some farmers began to divide their time between their homesteads and Arabia Mountain and other quarries around Lithonia. By the turn of the century, the increased demand for crushed stone “fueled the growth of the quarrying industry and brought economic prosperity to communities in the Arabia Mountain area.”

As a direct result of this prosperity, a post office was established at the corner of Klondike and South Goddard roads in 1898. The community and the road that cut through it were named Klondike to commemorate the 1896 gold strike near the Klondike River in the Yukon Territory of Canada.

In the following decades, the town saw the construction of a school, church, sawmill, cotton gin, several commercial buildings and more than 20 homes along Klondike and South Goddard roads. Many of the buildings constructed in the Arabia Mountain vicinity at the beginning of the twentieth century incorporated granite features into their construction. The Great Depression brought quarrying activities at Arabia Mountain to a halt, but they returned to the area for awhile after World War II.
PART 2: DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY

Changing Times for Farms and Farm Owners, 1941-present

Farming activities also began to stagnate during World War II. Alton Housworth, whose father had lived in the Housworth-Moseley house in the early 1900s, grew up on South Goddard Road in the 1930s and 1940s. In an oral interview conducted on 17 November 2007, Alton Housworth stated that people in the area quit farming and went to work at public jobs in 1941. Many in the community went to work at the Bell Bomber plant in Marietta or the shipyards in Savannah. According to Mr. Housworth, most people in the community did not come back to the farms after World War II. The government then began paying those farmers that remained to plant pine trees on their land which dramatically changed the area’s character.

As a result of languishing farm activities, the 1940s saw an increasing number of large tracts of farm land subdivided for infill housing. This trend accelerated as local roads were paved in the 1940s (Klondike Road was paved in 1945) and Interstate 20 was cut through DeKalb County just north of Arabia Mountain in the 1960s. Klondike and Arabia Mountain’s rural character soon became threatened by Atlanta’s suburban sprawl. Subdivision development was concentrated just north of Arabia Mountain in the 1970s. However, by the 1980s, suburban development reached Klondike’s door. The Roundtree Subdivision on South Goddard Road, which lies directly west of the Housworth-Moseley house, was plotted in 1985. Marvin Housworth, the great-grandson of John Milton Housworth, grew up on South Goddard Road in the late 1940s and early 1950s and has seen many changes to the community in his lifetime:

The demographics in Klondike have shifted dramatically since about 1970. Most of the children of the long time families live elsewhere . . . Many acres of former farmland, timberland, and pasture have been developed into subdivisions. The rural character has been supplanted by suburbia. In the 1950s, there were three country stores along Klondike Road. It was still possible for a farmer to find a syrup mill or a mill for grinding
corn in the community or nearby, leftovers from a time when they were more essential to the agrarian life. I doubt that the children growing up in Klondike today spend any time playing in creeks and chasing pop flies in cow pastures.20

In 1999, DeKalb County was home to approximately 610,000 residents. While the average population growth for the county between 1990 and 1999 was 1.1%, the part of the county around Arabia Mountain is growing at a faster rate than the rest of the DeKalb.21

Endnotes
1 National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form: “Historic Resources in the Arabia Mountain area of DeKalb County, Georgia,” p. 4.
5 Ibid, p. 15.
7 Ibid, p. 31-34.
8 Price, p. 85.
9 Ibid, p. 194.
10 “National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Klondike Historic District,” p. 11.
11 Ibid, p. 11.
12 ICON Architecture, inc., p. 17.
13 “National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Klondike Historic District,” p. 11.
16 National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Klondike Historic District”, p. 8
Family History

There were two objectives for the family history. First, the team attempted to identify living descendants who might provide oral or other history about the structure, land or family life, and second, the team sought to document ownership, residence or historic events related to the structure and land.

The first evidence obtained was an account of the family in a letter written by family members who related Civil War and Reconstruction period memories. (This letter will be referred to as the “Civil War Stories Letter.”) Further research was conducted in archival records, manuscript collections, family files and public records. Internet genealogy collections and selected records in local newspapers were also consulted, along with number of probate and other public records related to real and personal property ownership. The DeKalb County Courthouse fires of 1842 and 1916 destroyed some records that may have proved ownership.

The Housworth has lived on or owned this property for much of its history since the 1821 Georgia land Lottery, and the genealogy of the family identifies a number of relatives living then (and now) in the Klondike area of DeKalb County. Identifying living descendants of the Housworth family provided the following original sources of information:

- An interview with Alton Housworth, Jr.;
- A series of emails from Mr. Marvin Housworth; Jr.;
- A volume of family history shared by Mrs. Alton (Eleanor) Housworth.
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The Housworth family is the best known of the occupants of the Housworth-Moseley house and related lands. There is some evidence of the land being owned, through warranty deed or mortgage, by others. Specifically, these owners were:

- John Knight, the drawer and grantee of the original property in the 1821 Georgia land lottery;
- J. Almand, who may be John H. Almand. (ca. 1882);
- Thomas E. Broadnax (ca. 1883); and perhaps
- W.F. McDaniel (ca. 1902).

This summary addresses evidence found regarding the Housworth family and relationships to the land and home. Family members shown in

The Early Years: 1774 - 1860

The first member of this branch of the Housworth family to occupy the Housworth-Moseley House is Philip Housworth (ca. 1774 – 1880). According to most records, he was born in New York, orphaned and sent to South Carolina to be raised by a relative. There is also evidence that he lived in an orphanage in western South Carolina. (Note: the term “orphan” at the time referred to a minor whose parent or parents might be absent or unable to raise a child, as well as to a child whose parents were dead.) The surname is also spelled “Houseworth” during this era.

Documenting this era is accomplished by using public records such as the U. S. Federal Population Census (in future, referred to as the Census) and Georgia public records. One of the first records is the 1820 Census, where Philip Housworth appears as the head of household in the Greenville District of South Carolina. Using genealogical evidence, other residents of the home could have included Hannah (spouse) and their children (Michael, Jermina, Abraham, John James, Susannah and Mahala). Hannah was the daughter of Abraham and Margaret (Wright) Hollingsworth, a family that would also settle in the Klondike area of DeKalb County.

The Georgia Trust notes Philip living in Georgia by 1822. There is also documentation that Philip resided in Georgia by 1827. In the 1827 Georgia land lottery, Philip was a drawer for land in Lee County. He lived in the
Talley’s area of what was then Newton County. His son, Michael, also living in the Talley’s area, drew land in Troup County.

In the 1830 Census, two Housworth families are enumerated. Philip and his son “Abram” (an alternate form of Abraham) are noted as heads of households in two separate homes. There is little other information about the family during this decade.

By 1840, Philip and his wife Hannah appear to be living alone. Three sons (Michael, Abraham and John) are enumerated as heads of their own households. At some point before 1846, Phillip acquired land in lot144 originally drawn by John Knight in the 1821 land lottery. Abraham purchased land in lot145 from Hugh Mitchell, another drawer in the 1821 land lottery.

The 1850 Census sheds more light on the family and their lifestyle. Here Philip and his sons live in the same area. Philip owned approximately $2,000 in real property representing 40 acres of “improved” land and 700 acres of “unimproved” land. He also owned 12 slaves. One of them, a blacksmith named Daniel, was bought from the Warren estate in 1852. This data indicates that Philip and his family were then working beyond a subsistence level, producing some cash crops and needing slaves to help tend the land. Michael owned one slave, a six year old female. Abraham owns three slaves, presumably a small family. Both likely benefited from the parent’s ownership of a larger number of slaves.

An abstract for a deed for land lot 144 notes the transaction of land from Alexander Housworth to Abraham Housworth in 1851. (This research found no other mention of an Alexander Housworth in the area. However, there is a Louis Alexander Housworth of New York and Ohio, who may be related to the DeKalb Housworth family groups.)

According to the 1855 DeKalb County Tax Digest, the family held more than 1,084 acres of land in Georgia. Michael is shown as being taxed for more than 540 acres in land lot 144, designated as the “Philip’s” area of DeKalb County (Militia District 487). This appears to include acreage he acquired from his brother Abraham in 1851. According to this same tax digest, Philip held approximately 614 acres in DeKalb’s District 11.
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At some point between 1850 and 1860, Abraham and his family migrated to Upshur County, Texas via Alabama. John James Housworth and family moved to what is now Carroll County, Georgia. This leaves Philip and Michael (father and son) as the principal homeowners of lots 144 and 145 – what are now associated with the Housworth lands in the Klondike area.

The 1860 Census shows more details about the Housworths and other families in the area. While census enumeration maps do not provide details to identify specific Georgia lots, it is possible to identify Housworth households in the 16th Land District. The households enumerated in the Barnes district include:

- Philip Housworth (the patriarch) aged 83, with his wife, Hannah (aged 82). In this household, you also find George Warren (age 21) and Susan Talley (age 19). Philip is a farmer with real property valued at $2,500 and personal property estimated at $13,000. (Household #1039)

- Michael Housworth (Philip’s son) aged 61, with his spouse, Lucy (aged 53) and son, Philip (age 20) He owns land valued at $2,000. Michael and his son Philip are noted as “farmers.” (Household #1025)

- John Housworth, aged 24 with his wife, Mary J. (aged 25). He is also noted as a farmer but possesses no real property. Given this information and family history, this is likely John Milton Housworth. (Household # 1029)

The 1860 Slave Population Census for this period notes there are four slave homes on the property of Philip Housworth. The 1860 Nonpopulation Census or “Farm Schedule” notes the families are farmers.
The War, Reconstruction and Changes in Society: 1861 - 1899

There is more information about the family, especially in oral traditions spanning this period. The “Civil War Stories Letter” recounts certain family lore, much of which can be related to local and family history:

- John Milton Housworth, lived in the Housworth-Moseley house during the Civil War era. He served in Company F of Phillip’s Legion of Georgia. Tradition states he was often away from his colleagues, perhaps finding supplies and livestock to support the Confederate cause.

- Mary J. Prather Housworth, child of a neighboring Prather family and the wife of John Milton Housworth, died and was buried with her infant at Bethany Baptist Church in Conyers in August, 1864. Her death and that of her child (a twin) is consistent not only with the risk of maternal and infant death, but also the increased circulation of infectious diseases (measles, smallpox) in the immediate area during her pregnancy. Her survivor includes the twin infant, John J. W. Housworth.

- An older woman lived in the home. She stayed in bed, feigning illness, to keep the Northern troops from completely foraging the house and taking money and property hidden in the bed’s mattress. This could be either Hannah or Lucy Housworth, since either would have been at an advanced age at the time.

- Stories of an encampment of Union soldiers in the area are a family tradition. However, there is no written evidence other than the above-mentioned letter about the size of the encampment or actual location. However, the letter reports finding artifacts near the area during the twentieth century.
After the war, John Milton Housworth received his pardon for involvement. It appears he returned home and resumed a life working on the farm. He also married his sister-in-law, Lou E. Prather.

More Housworth families are found in the Klondike and Atlanta area by 1870. In the Klondike area, the Housworth households include:

- John M. Housworth, age 38, owning $440 in property and is noted as a farmer. Household members include Louisa (Lou E.), aged 38; Alina, female child aged 7, John J., age 5; and Walter, aged 9 1/2 years. (Household # 488)
- Michael Housworth, age 70, owning $700 in real property. Also noted as a farmer. His household consists of Lucy (age 63), Philip (age 30), the family of Sarah Terry, and a single male, Sandford Jenkins. Philip and Sandford Jenkins are shown as “farm laborers.” (Household #422)
- Elizabeth Housworth, aged 24, with a male child, John. (Household #446).

Other Housworth families are found in the area in 1870. They use the surname “Houseworth” or “Housworth” and are noted as “Black.” These are most likely the former slaves of the Housworth families.

In late 1870, Philip Housworth, the founder of the DeKalb lines, died. John Milton Housworth, his grandson, became the administrator of his estate in 1871. Philip Housworth died without a will, and no evidence has been found regarding division of lot144 to his heirs. By 1880, the primary family group remaining in the area is that of John Milton Housworth. His father, Michael, died in October, 1880, and is not listed on the U.S. Census for that year. John Milton’s household includes:

- J. M. Housworth, aged 44 with his wife, Louise (Louise) Housworth, age 46. There children include Almer, age 18; John, age 16; Walter, age 10, Homer, age 8. John Milton’s brother Philip (age 41), sister L. J. Burgess (age 33), nephew Dora (age 5) are enumerated as members of the household.
In this decade, the parcels in lot 144 changed hands. John Milton Housworth deeded 67 acres of land to John H. Almand in 1882. John H. Almand in turn indentured this acreage to Thomas E. Broadnax in 1889. It is not known if either Almand or Broadnax occupied the house.

There is no extant 1890 Census data. Only a few records of the era that survived the DeKalb County Courthouse fires of 1842 and 1916. As such, the family’s history and relationship to the land and house is found only in family traditions and oral history until the turn of the twentieth century.

**Into the Modern Era: 1900 – 1930**

The Housworth family expanded at the turn of the twentieth century. Traditional family lifestyles were soon to change. This period is marked as one of transition for the family and the area.

The 1900 DeKalb County Tax Digest noted that Homer T. Housworth owned 149 acres in Lots 144 and 145. Walter E. Housworth owned 42 acres in lot 144 while John. J. W. (‘Buddy’) Housworth was taxed for 75 acres included in lot 144. In a subsequent year, Homer would be listed as owning taxable property, but no real estate. It appears Homer’s land was transferred to John J. W. Housworth before the 1902 Tax Digest was recorded.

The principal members of the family begin to acquire and divide property along what is now Goddard Road. Some members of the family moved to other areas of Georgia, but older members of the family remained in the Klondike area households of their kin. In 1909, Equitable Securities executed a deed for approximately 58
acres of land to Walter E. Housworth. Anna Louisa Housworth was born in 1917 and would go on to own the land and house in lot144.

The 1930 Census is the most recent available to the public. In this Census, several Housworth families live on Klondike-Conyers Road. All own their land. These households include John. J. W. (Buddy) Housworth, who occupied the house now known as 7011 South Goddard Road. (“Buddy” is believed to have lived in the original house as the child of John Milton and Lou Prather Housworth.) The family of William Alton Housworth is also found on this census.

Walter E. Housworth and his family occupied the “home place.” The family, described in the 1930 Census, included his wife (Lula), sons (Edwin, John, and William) and his daughters (Alice, Lillie B, and Annie L.).

Changing Times: 1931-2000

Until this time, most of the records indicate a reliance on farm goods and livestock for subsistence, along with some crops that could be sold for cash. With the Depression and World War II, changes would occur. Male Housworth family members would work outside the farm in local quarries or in manufacturing/textile plants, and female family members would work outside the home, in textile and war industries.

The 1940 DeKalb County Tax Digest would indicate an “A. G. Housworth” owned acreage in the district including land in lot144.

In 1957, the sons of Walter E. Housworth petitioned for letters of administration with the DeKalb County Probate Court, which led to distribution of land in the 11th and 16th districts to Walter E. Housworth’s heirs: Ruben, Howard, William Alton, Edwin P. (Jr.), Annie Lou (Moore and Burr), Alice Morine (Park) and Lillie Belle (Moore and Burr). This included land containing the 7011 South Goddard Road home.

Howard Housworth, for the sum of $1.00, transferred his interest in the land to his sisters and brothers in 1971. In November 1973, the remaining heirs transferred their interest in the land to Annie Lou H. Moseley. She, according to oral history, was the last Housworth to live in the home.
A 1985 Affidavit of Possession deposed by Mr. Alton Housworth, Jr. reflects on the land, the ownership and the family ties. This document notes that Mr. Housworth:

"...has been familiar with the history of the possession of said property for over a period of 40 years....and said property has been continuously used and occupied...by owners (including) grandfather, Walter W. Housworth lived there until his death in 1956. Then by his children (my father, aunts and uncles)..."

"...said possession has been open notorious, continuous, exclusive, and uninterrupted through said period of time...

"...My grandfather farmed the land, raised turkeys on the land and kept a mule and cows on the land."

At the eve of the 21st century, Housworth families continued their long-standing practice of attending camp meetings at Smyrna Presbyterian Church in nearby Rockdale County. G. Lonnie Housworth would go on to compile two books about his memories of the area.

Mrs. Annie Lou Housworth Moseley died in 1997, leaving her heirs to sell the land to the current owner. Her death would end 180 years of the Housworth family as residents of the home and owners of the land.

**Chronology of Development and Use**

This section of the historic structure report summarizes the physical construction, modification, and use of the Housworth-Moseley Site. The report will cover both the surrounding outbuildings and the structure known as the Housworth-Moseley House. The text is based on historical documentation, oral history provided by Housworth descendants Marvin and Alton Housworth and Claire (Moseley) Kison, as well as observation of the existing structures. Because the investigation was non-invasive, and because materials were not analyzed in a laboratory, additional information may remain hidden behind original and modern interior finishes. Further investigation would allow a refinement of the conclusions found in this...
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report. In addition, a limited archaeological investigation was conducted. See Appendix F for a discussion of the site’s archaeological potential.

There was limited historical documentation for the development of the Housworth-Moseley Farm and House; deed records rarely discuss the structures on the property being deeded. The earliest photograph dates to the mid-1980s, but it does show the condition of the House as it appeared before the late 1980s remodeling discussed later in this section. Two factors prevent determining an absolute chain of title – property transfers were not always recorded at the county courthouse, and some that were recorded were destroyed in a fire that burned the DeKalb County Courthouse in the late nineteenth century. Interviews and other records, however, provide a reasonably accurate chain of title. In an interview in November 2007, Alton Housworth, Jr. (whose father was raised in the house) provided the following information:

“It is not known for sure, but it is believed that Abraham Housworth or his brother John deeded the house and the property surrounding it to Michael Housworth, their brother, before leaving the Klondike area to settle elsewhere. By the time of the Civil War John Milton Housworth, the son of Michael, was occupying the house, and at some point by the 1870s had obtained ownership of the property, and at his death in 1901 ownership transferred to his son Walter Edwin Housworth. At the death of Walter E. Housworth in 1956 the
PART 2: DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY

house and property were jointly held by his children until 1973 when the house and approximately 7 acres were deeded to Anna Lou (Housworth) Moseley his youngest daughter. Anna Moseley owned the house and property until her death in 1997. At this time, her three daughters jointly owned the property until it was too sold to the current owner, Ms. Linda Reid, in 2004."

This property and house was owned by the Housworth family or their descendents for approximately 160 years.

Housworth-Moseley Structure

Date of Construction

In the same interview, Alton Housworth said that, through research by his cousin Marvin and family tradition, the family believes the house was built in the early 1840s by Abraham or John Housworth, and that it was deeded to Michael Housworth sometime in the 1850s. This is corroborated by a deed entry from November 17, 1852, transferring land lot 144 (house and current property are a part of this land lot) from Abraham Housworth to Michael Housworth. Also, by using Moir’s formula for dating glass and a loose pane of glass from the one remaining original window, the team dated the construction of the house to 1843, plus or minus seven years. This means the window, and in turn the house, can securely be dated between 1836 and 1850. (See Figure 123 on Page 103 for names and locations of rooms,
doors and windows; also see Photo Keys in Appendix A for orientation of all photographs to the property. For a full discussion of the historic window, see Appendix B).

The nature of the building materials and methods of construction in the original sections of the house also suggest an antebellum construction date. Evidence supporting this theory includes the use of cut nails, floor sills and joists with hand hewn, reciprocal sawn, and circular sawn timbers, transitional brace frame construction and circular sawn studs.

**Materials**

Pine was used throughout the house, though oak or chestnut may have been used in parts of the floor framing and the original wood shingle roof. The original exterior clapboards, wall studs, tongue and groove floorboards, wallboards, and ceiling boards (paneling) are all made of pine. It is likely that the builder of the Housworth-Moseley House cut his own timbers and carried them to the sawmill. It is possible that the tongue and groove flooring and paneling also used timber cut by the builder, but it is more likely that this material, along with the two panel doors, hinges and nails, were bought from a local lumber company. The roof shingles were most likely cut on the property; Alton Housworth (born 1932) can remember his grandfather Walter Edwin Housworth cutting and preparing replacement shingles for the house.

**Finishes**

Rare for houses of this type, there is no evidence of any finish ever being applied to the inside of the structure - no paint, varnish, or wallpaper of any kind. Even the floors show no evidence of ever being finished. All interior wood surfaces are raw pine that has acquired a mellow patina over their long years of exposure to their environment.

Based on a conversation with previous owner Claire Kison, the kitchen floor was covered in the twentieth century first with linoleum and then with vinyl. Currently, Rooms 101, 104, and 106 (See Figure 123) have a vinyl covering on top of the original pine flooring. None of the floors have ever been painted.
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Both Alton Housworth and Claire Kison have said that the exterior of the structure was never painted either. Even after the 1987-1988 remodeling undertaken when Anna Lou Moseley owned the house, the replaced clapboards were not painted in order to maintain the long established character of the house. This remodeling is discussed in detail below.

Utilities

Until the early twentieth century, this house did not have any modern utilities. Electricity which was acquired in the late 1920s or early 1930s, and that was generated by a 6-volt Delco water powered generator fed by the creek below the house. Ten 6-volt batteries in series powered the radio and one light bulb that was located in Room 109 (the kitchen). In 1939, probably as part of the rural electrification program of the Franklin Roosevelt administration, Snapping Shoals Electric Co-Op began to provide power in this area. At this point they converted from their battery system to that provided by the electric co-op.

Running water, drawn from an electric-powered well, did not come until 1930s or 40s, and this was only run to the kitchen. The structure did not receive indoor plumbing until the late 1980s remodeling.

Also during the 1980s remodeling, natural gas was piped into the house, updated electric wiring was installed, and a forced air HVAC system was installed.

Original Construction

The original Housworth-Moseley House was a single-story, hall and parlor structure (Rooms 102 and 104) with a separate kitchen (Room 109) and a shared, open (dog trot) breeze way. It is typical of vernacular architecture of its time — it was a simple, unadorned structure common to a rural farming community. (For chronology of floor plans, see Figures 9, 10, 12, and 13). It had an open crawlspace and sat on top of a combination of stone and wood piers.

The original structure had a wood shingle roof that was maintained until approximately the 1950s. Alton Housworth remembers both a mixture
of wood shingles and tin, but the shingles eventually were replaced with tin roofing.

The dog trot – a name used to refer to a covered, open space outdoors between two rooms or buildings – is represented by Rooms 101 and 106. There was a common roof above Room 109 and the dog trot that was connected to the roof system of the main structure. Evidence inside the attic suggests that the two roof systems were always connected - there are no nail holes on the roof decking of the main structure where the kitchen roof system ties into the main structure roof over Rooms 102 and 104. This indicates there was never any shingles applied to this area of the main roof. This could happen only if the two roof systems had always been integral to each other.

Traditionally, the parlor (Room 104), the smaller of the two rooms, functioned variously as a bedroom, guest chamber, and formal reception room, and the hall (Room 102), somewhat larger, combined the functions of dining room, work area, and informal living space. Because this house did not use the attic space for sleeping accommodations, these two rooms were most likely always used as bedrooms.

From the beginning, this structure probably had a shed roofed porch along its north wall, now shortened (by the addition of Room 105) and enclosed. Porches were an essential feature of houses before the advent of air conditioning. They were places to cool off in hot weather and to do chores when it rained. They were usually one of the most often used areas of the house.

Although hall and parlor houses usually had a chimney at each gable end, there is no evidence of a chimney located on the west wall of Room 104. Thus, the only two rooms heated in this house were Rooms 102 and 109.
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There is no documentary evidence for alterations to the original house, but there is physical evidence that suggests a number of changes were made over time. Family history either substantiates the physical evidence or helps to establish time frames for the changes.

The first alteration to the structure was the enclosure of the open dog trot to create Room 106. The west wall with a window was added at the back, and the east wall was built to include Door D3. (See Figure 10; Door D3 is the one that leads from the open foyer to Room 106). The original
exterior clapboards still remain on the north wall of this room, and an exterior window for Room 104 was in filled with matching clapboards. The outline of the window can still be seen.

There was a small open porch, on the east side, that allowed access to Rooms 102, 106, and 109 with granite steps that led up to this porch at approximately the same location as Door D1. Over time, this porch itself went through a number of stages – open, half-wall, half-wall with screen – until it reached its final fully enclosed configuration with the late 1980s remodeling.
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The approximate period for the creation of Room 106 can be fixed by family oral history. According to Alton Housworth, one of his relatives hid the family valuables under the mattress of a bed in this room during the Union Army’s march through the area in 1864. If the oral history is accurate, then Room 106 was built early in the life of the house.

Historic Expansion

There were two additions made to this house - a gable-end pitched roof addition (Room 105) on the north side of the structure, and a shed roofed back porch on the west wall of Room 109. There is no documentation relevant to these expansions that would help indicate when they were added to the house. (See Figure 12).

Room 105

Based on a statement made by Anna Lou Moseley in a taped interview made in August of 1987, this room was used as the boys’ bedroom. Because her eldest brother was born in 1904, this room probably was built by her grandfather, John Milton Housworth, between 1870 and 1900, the approximate years of his ownership. The method of floor frame construction (a hand hewn sill joined to the existing main sill with wooden pegs and the use of butt cog joints to attach the floor joist) corroborates a building date prior to the twentieth century.
Although this room was probably built in the last half of the nineteenth century, the interior tongue and groove wall and ceiling boards were not installed until the 1940s. Both Anna Lou Moseley (born 1917) and Alton Housworth (born 1932) remember this room having exposed studs and an open attic loft. Claire Kison (born 1953), on the other hand, remembers only the existing tongue and groove paneling. This explains why the wall board and ceiling board in this room are of consistent width and are blind nailed using modern wire nails.

Finally, in at least first quarter of the twentieth century, this structure had an L-shaped open front porch on the north side of the building connecting Rooms 102 and 105. Claire Kison remembers her mother, Anna Lou Moseley, describing this porch, but she said does not remember it her-
self. To accommodate the L-shape, the porch could not have been as deep as the modern-day structure, and it is likely that it was built at the same time that Room 105 was added to the structure.

**Back Porch**

The original back porch no longer exists, because it was removed during the late 1980s remodeling. When it was built is not known, but it is likely that it was added during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, or possibly very early twentieth century. Both Annie Lou Moseley and Alton Housworth described this porch in her August, 1987, audio interview.

A step led down onto the porch from kitchen Door D4. The north end was always enclosed and used as a food storage area, but the south end was open and was used to store water from the spring. Like the smaller east
porch (now Room 101) this porch evolved over time, and at first its south end was completely open and exposed, then a half wall was built, and finally a half wall with screening above. This last configuration can just be seen in the photograph.

**Modern Alterations and Additions**

In 1987 and 1988, the house was updated and stabilized through a large-scale remodeling project. (See Figure 13). With few exceptions, all of these alterations and additions affected primarily the exterior to the house; the original interior was not altered appreciably by this project.

Most noticeable was the removal of the stone and timber piers supporting the foundation sills and their replacement with concrete masonry units (CMUs). This alteration helped level and stabilize the structure. Other alterations include:

- Replacing the exterior clapboards;
- Replacing the tin roof with asphalt shingles;
- Replacing the original historic exterior windows;
- Adding new exterior doors;
- Enclosing the existing north front porch to create Room 103;
- Enclosing the east entry porch to create Room 101
- Removing the smaller back porch to build Rooms 107 and 110.

The only other major alteration that took place during this period was the removal of the original chimney on the south façade of the building off of Room 109. It had reached a state of deterioration that would no longer allow it to remain intact, and the existing chimney was installed in its place.

Other alterations included running natural gas to the house, upgrading the plumbing to include a bathroom, adding a forced-air HVAC unit, and bringing the electrical system up to code.
Outbuildings

Dating the outbuildings on the Housworth-Moseley Site is difficult because materials were reused—cut nails are often found interspersed with wire nails, and additions were made to some of the buildings, which altered entire sides and removed historic evidence. These concerns notwithstanding, the construction methods and types of materials used are the keys to understanding the evolution of the home site. (See Figure 23 on Page 43 for locations of the outbuildings).

Judging by construction methods, the corn crib (see Figure 14) and the dogtrot (on an adjoining property; see Figure 23 and Appendix D) are likely the oldest structures on and associated with the site today. The corn crib is located southwest of the main house. According to oral interviews, the dogtrot was historically a part of the Housworth-Moseley Farm. The dogtrot is likely the oldest structure associated with the site. It consists of two log pens covered by a shared gable roof that becomes a shed on the east side. The logs forming the pens are substantial and are joined by V-notches. (See Figure 15.)

The construction of the corn crib is similar, though the logs are not quite as substantial, indicating that it was likely built around the same time.

No exact date has been identified for these structures, but they may have been constructed as early as the 1840s when the land came into the family’s possession.

The mortise and tenon joints on the frame of the grain shed (see Figure 16) indicate that it was likely built some time after the dogtrot and corn crib, probably about the time that the original house was constructed on the site, since their construction methods are similar.
The smokehouse (see Figure 17) is a newer construction, but it is pre-twentieth century as evidenced by the preponderance of type-B cut nails in the siding. According to Alton Housworth, the building dates to at least the Civil War. The circular saw marks on the siding confirm a mid-nineteenth century date. It is likely that the building has changed somewhat, and there is evidence of the Housworth family purchasing a large quantity of nails from a local supplier in the 1880s, and this may be a good clue as to the date of these changes.

The final historic building is the livestock pen, which is difficult to date because it shows an evolution of time and materials. According to Alton Housworth, the structure was largely an afterthought, built of necessity, an assertion supported by the change in design from the building’s vertical siding on three sides to the horizontal siding on the front. The large number of wire nails in the structure indicate that the livestock pen was among the last structures built on the site.
The three remaining structures on the site are much newer and date to the modern era. The mobile home (Figure 18), was, according to oral history reports, added to the site in the late 1960s or early 1970s to make up for the lack of a bathroom in the main house at the time. The final two buildings are later than that. The metal storage shed likely dates to the last quarter of the twentieth century, and a pumphouse for a modern well – built from CMUs – was likely built in the 1980s when the CMUhouse foundation was installed.
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**Timeline**

This timeline was prepared to help the team identify information about the house and lands associated with the DeKalb Housworth family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>People and Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Philip Housworth, progenitor of DeKalb County Housworth families, born in New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Philip Housworth and family appears in Greenville, SC Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Land Lottery of Georgia grants property in DeKalb District 16. Lot 144 won by John Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>DeKalb County established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Land Lottery fortunate drawers include Philip Housworth and Michael Housworth of Talleys, Newton County, GA. This establishes the family’s presence in Georgia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Philip Housworth has migrated to DeKalb County Georgia. Is listed as head of household in 1830 census. His son, “Abram,” lives nearby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Heads of Housworth households in DeKalb include Philip, and his sons John, Abraham, and “Michal.” These households live in Milita District 487 or the area called “Phillips.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1843</td>
<td>Housworth - Moseley House is built possibly by Abraham Housworth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1st Georgia Agricultural Fair held in area now known as Stone Mountain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>The 1850 Federal Census is the first to list names of all free persons in U.S. households. Philip Housworth shown as owning $2,000 personal property and living in the Halsley area of DeKalb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is estimated that sometime during this decade the Housworth-Moseley House undergoes its first alteration – the open dog trot breezeway is enclosed creating Room 106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Abraham Housworth deeds most of land lot 144 to Michael Housworth his brother. This transfer would most likely include the Housworth Moseley House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>John Milton Housworth is born to Michael Houseworth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descendants of Abraham Housworth are migrating to Carroll County, Georgia, and John James Housworth family branch moves to Upshur County, Texas via Alabama.

1860 Michael Housworth appears in Census and owns $2,000 in real estate.

John Milton Housworth (aged 25) appears in same census with his wife.

Census data notes there are 4 slave houses on land of Phillip Housworth (father to Michael Housworth and grandfather to John Milton Housworth).

Phillip has $2,500 in real property and $15,000 in personal property.

1863 Smallpox epidemic in DeKalb County

1864 Mary Jane (Prather) Housworth, wife of John Milton Housworth dies of causes related to childbirth and delivery of twins. One infant (female) dies. The male twin survives. This child is named John James William “Buddy” Housworth.

1867 Michael Housworth deeds 58 ¼ acres of land in lot 144 to John Milton Housworth his son. The Housworth - Moseley house is part of this transfer, and John Milton resides in the house and begins to raise a family.

Ca.1869 John Milton Housworth remarries. His second wife is Lou E. Prather, the sister of Mary Jane Prather.

1869 Walter Edwin Housworth is born to John Milton and Lou (Prather) Housworth.

1870 African-American families with surname “Houseworth”, appear in Census records. This spelling distinguishes them from other Housworth families/slaveholders.

1872 Lucy Oglesby Housworth, wife of Michael Housworth, dies.

1880 “J.M. Housworth,” aged 44, shown as a farmer living in Phillips District. Family tradition notes he and others sought to keep land and buy back lands lost after Civil War. His brother, Robert, shown as living in the household.

1880 Michael Housworth dies intestate.

1882 John M. Housworth deeds 67 acres of land lot 144 to John H. Almand

1889 John H. Almand sells 67 acres of land lot 144 to Thomas E. Broadnax

1900 By the turn of the twentieth century, the Housworth - Moseley House has experienced its first set of additions. Sometime between 1870 and 1900 Room 105 and the first back porch are added to the structure.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>John Milton Housworth dies and Walter Edwin Housworth assumes ownership of the house and farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>R. W. (Richard W.) Tucker grants 44 acres of land lot (unknown) to W. E. Housworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>America enters World War I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Anna Louisa (“Annie Lou”) Housworth is born. She will go on to own the Housworth property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Sometime in the late 1920s or early 1930s the Walter Edmund Housworth family begins to generate its own electricity with a 6 V DC water powered Delco generator. With the aid of tea and sixfold storage batteries the Housworths are able to operate a radio in one electric light in Room 109 the kitchen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Fall of the stock market and beginning of period known as the Great Depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>“Buddy” Housworth lives in the Phillips area of Klondike. He is identified as a farmer owning Farm #46 in the 1930 Federal Agricultural census. Walter E. Housworth, his half-brother lives nearby and owns Farm #49. William A(lton). Housworth, son of Walter E. owns Farm #50. Walter E. is noted as owning a radio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Snapping Shoals Electric Co-Op, through the Rural Electrification Program of the 30s, runs electric power to the Klondike area, and the Housworth-Moseley House is electrified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1941 – The nation enters World War II. Many Housworth family members find work in military and textile industries that develop in Atlanta area. Sometime in the 40s or 50s an electric powered water well is dug and the property is plumbed for water. No longer do they have to draw water from the spring at the bottom of the hill. But, the house still does not have an indoor toilet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>By the 1950s, the wood shingle roof has been replaced with tin metal material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>W. E. Housworth dies. The house and property are jolly haled by his heirs. His living heirs are: Ruben, Howard, Edwin and W.A. Housworth as well as Annie Lou Moseley, Alice Morine Park and Lillie Belle Simms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A number of Housworths are listed in local city directories, county tax digests and newspaper accounts as living in Klondike area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Alton Housworth, Jr. of Lithonia signs Affidavit of Possession. It notes land parcel (that includes land lot 144) has been in possession of and use by family, including his grandfather (Walter E. Housworth) and after his death, by this father, uncles and aunts. He notes his father, aunts and uncles formed a limited partnership in 1983 to hold the land. Prior to this the property was sold to Goddard Investments (ca. 1972) which became Foundation Development. Title being traded to Monteagle, Inc. which will develop Roundtree subdivision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>A large-scale stabilization and remodeling program is started on the Housworth - Moseley House. The original historic exterior is greatly altered by the addition of a CMU foundation, replacement clapboard siding, replacement modern windows, the enclosure of rooms 103 and 101, and the removal of the historic back porch and its replacement with rooms 107 and 110. Utilities are upgraded at this time to include rewiring, the addition of a bathroom, and a forced air HVAC system. Only minor changes are made to the interior retaining its historic fabric and character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Anna Louisa Housworth Moseley dies. According to family history, she was the last owner/resident of the home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Cynthia Moseley, as Executrix for estate of Annie Louisa Rebecca Housworth Moseley transfers ownership to Elizabeth A. Moore, Cynthia J. Moseley, and Claire Jordan. These are daughters of Annie Louisa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Elizabeth A. Moore, Cynthia Moseley and Claire Jordan grant land in lot 144 to Linda J. Reid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Lillie Belle Housworth dies. She may have been the last surviving Housworth who was raised in the house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART 3: PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

Site

The Housworth-Moseley house is located at 7241 South Goddard Road in the Arabia Mountain community of DeKalb County, Georgia and is situated on approximately 7.4 acres. (See Figure 2). The site has eight existing structures and one historically associated structure on a neighboring site. Additionally, there are five known structures that are historically associated with the property that are no longer extant. For the geospatial arrangement of each of these buildings, refer to Figure 23 on Page 41. The buildings presently on site include the main house, a salt house/storage shed, a corn crib, a raised grain bin, a livestock pen, a mobile home, a metal storage shed and a pump house. A barn in the style of a dogtrot is on the neighboring property to the west and is historically associated with the property. Among the buildings no longer existing are a wagon and buggy barn, a chicken house, a hog pen, a privy and an ancillary farm structure.

The property itself can be divided into two general portions, namely the southern half consisting of second growth hardwoods and several copses of undergrowth and the northern part consisting of sparse patches of trees and an open lawn. A farm road system existed on the property supplying access to several of the farm structures and fields, the remains of which can still be seen winding through the property (See Figure 23 on Page 41). The present unpaved driveway connects to this farm road system. There

Figure 19. View of the pathway that leads south to the clearing and the creek, part of the original farm road system used to reach the fields and sorghum boiler.

Figure 20. View of clearing to the south of the main house and north of the creek.
is terracing throughout the property which served multiple purposes. In the northern half terracing was used to establish a kitchen garden and a small fruit orchard.

The southern half of terracing was used to establish a fencing structure for a hog pasture and provide easier access to lands on the northern slope of the creek valley.

There is a clearing behind the property’s structures which is accessed by the farm road system that splits off into two directions, one leading west and taking a bend to the south at the base and the other leading south west. (See Figures 19 and 20). The clearing borders the creek and the spring head that feeds into it. On the opposite side of the creek is where a sorghum cane press and boiler have been constructed.

There are two industrial features known to have existed on the site. An extant sorghum syrup manufacturing site is located south of the creek. (See Figure 21). It consists of an boiler, a mill and spring head.

There was also a blacksmithing area consisting of an unprotected firebox, bellows, and anvil to the southeast of house, on the edge of the first terrace. This site is in ruins; the anvil and bellows no longer exist and the firebox is in ruins. (See Figure 22).
Housworth-Moseley House

Foundation

The historic foundation was a combined stone and wood pier construction typically found in the South, but only one stone pier remains. It is located at the convergence of rooms 102, 103, 104, and 105.

According to Claire Kison, a previous owner, the house needed leveling, and a foundation of CMUs was installed in the late 1980s around the perimeter with supporting piers on the interior. There are two wood access doors to the crawlspace, one beneath Room 105 and the other beneath Room 110. (See Figure 123 on Page 97 for a current floor plan of the house).

There are four grill vents, three on the west side and one on the north side. The vents are not the same height as the portions of the concrete masonry units they replace, so the excess space is filled with loose brick (See Figures 24 and 25).

Structural System

The house features two types of construction – historic brace frame and the more modern platform-frame construction. In the original structure and historic addition (See Figures 9 and 10), the house is a brace frame.
building, constructed using cut nails and hand hewn, reciprocal, and circular sawn sills and floor joist, and circular sawn wall studs and rafters. The sills, in this area, are lapped and pegged at the corners, and the dimensions of the lumber used are typical of the early to mid 19th century. In the modern alteration and addition, modern dimensional lumber, wire nails, and construction methods were used to build the structures.

The foundation sills, in the original and historic section, are heavy timbers (a carryover from the older method of timber frame construction) which are mortised to receive the corner post and studs and notched to receive the floor joist using a butt cog joint. The sill dimensions range from 8 1/2” square down to approximately 6” square and the original floor joist are generally 2” x 8” (actual dimensions) on 20 to 24 inch centers.

The foundation sills for this house are not long continuous runs, but were constructed as separate boxed frame assemblies that were then attached to each other to form the building. Each frame is made up of the outer sills and the inner joist.

The original section of the house was constructed using three separate frame assemblies, forming the original L-shaped structure. Rooms 102 and 104 were constructed above the single largest box assembly; Room 109 was constructed above its own frame, and the frame assembly under rooms 101 and 106 bridge the other two box assemblies.

Room 105 (the historic addition) sits upon its own assembly as does modern alteration, Room 103. The last two rooms, 110 and 107 (a modern addition) share the last frame assembly.

Most of the wall framing could not be examined except in the attic at the Gable ends. But the baseboard in Room 104 - a part of the original sec-
tion of the house - was removed, and that section of wall was composed of rough-cut 2” x 4” (actual dimensions) studs mortised into the foundation sills. (See Figure 26).

Framing each side of the window openings were 4” x 6” studs also mortised into the sill. It can be surmised that each of the window openings are similarly framed in the original sections of the house.

The framing was stiffened with diagonal cross bracing from the corner studs down to the sill.

The studs throughout the house were centered approximately every 24 inches. This is based on observing the nailing points of the wallboards throughout the house.

**Roof**

The one-story house features a cross-gable roof over the main original structure with a shed roof over Room 103 in the northeast corner and a metal shed roof over Rooms 107 and 110 in the southwest corner. The gabled roof is covered with asphalt shingles, laid in a common lap pattern, which appear to be in good condition and were laid as part of the late 1980s remodeling.

The shed roof, over Room 103, is covered with four courses of rolled asphalt roofing material, a different construction method compared to the shingles mentioned above.

Here, the roll roofing material was used, and the seams between the rolls do not appear to be as secure as the common lap or as secure as might be expected from an overlapping roll roof construction. (See Figure 27).

Additions on the top of the roof include a lightning rod
near the top of the ridgeline on the west side and another just behind the chimney on the east side. There is an unused stovepipe over Room 109 and another pipe over Room 107 that is the plumbing stack vent.

The 2” x 4” rafters and 2” x 5” ceiling joist (actual dimensions) are rough cut lumber laid on approximately 24” centers. The roof is not framed with a ridge board, instead the rafters are butt jointed and nailed at the ridge. The opposite end of the rafters rest directly onto the soffit nailing plate (sitting on top of the overhanging rafters) and are toe nailed with cut nails. The roof does not have a solid sheathing, but is composed of random width, 1” thick edge to edge circular sawn lumber decking laid with a gap between each piece of decking. This is typical of a roof that was originally covered with wooden shingles; the open gap allowed air to reach the underside of the shingles aiding drying, and minimizing warp.

There is no visual evidence of active insect or water damage to the interior roof area, but there is a large nest of shredded paper or installation indicating the presence of squirrels or some other animal.

**Exterior**

**Exterior Windows**

There are seven windows on the east side, none of them historic. Windows W3, W4 and W5 are double hung six-over-six. (See Figure 28; for window locations, see Figure 123 on Page 97). Window W2 is a stationary two bay one-over-one, and windows W7 and W8 are stationary one-over-one. (See Figure 29). Window W1 appears to be of the same type as W4 and W5, though an air-conditioning unit has been installed in place of three of the six lights on the bottom.
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On the north face, a prominent set of windows dominate the exterior of Room 103 facing South Goddard Road. (See Figure 30). Heavy wooden muntins separate the panes of glass that stretch across the façade. Its construction is similar to that of Windows W7 and W8. It is a five bay one-over-one configuration. A second window on this side of the house in Room 105 is the same style as the six-over-six windows on the east façade. Neither of these windows is historic.

On the west side, windows W11, W12, W13 and W14 are the same type of six-over-six, single hung windows like the other non-historic ones found on the house. However, Window W14 has a distinctive tongue-and-groove sill unlike any observed elsewhere on the structure. Window W15 is similar to windows W2, W7, W8, and W9 but it is a three bay one-over-one configuration.

On the south face, windows W16 and W17 are the same six-over-six, double hung non-historic windows.

Exterior Doors

The wood entry doors D1 and D10 are relatively modern additions to the house and share the same configuration. (Door D5 on the south façade is also identical; see Figure 31).

The single doors have nine panels, three across and three down, which increase in length from top to bottom. The top rail has a curvilinear shape on its bottom side. Each of the other three rails is rectangular in shape. The central panel of each door has a distinctive set of three carved wooden dowels held together by two small, carved rails attached to the sides of the panel. Each door has a metal knob and lock. While Door D10 has a protective screen door, D1 does not.
The south side of the building has one entry Door D5 into Room 110. The door configuration matches that of Door D1 and has a metal screen door mostly attached. Six wooden steps with attached handrails lead to this entry door. Unlike the steps leading to Door D10, those on the south side lack risers—they are treads only.

**Façade**

The entire house is covered with open-grain unpainted half-inch clapboard siding with 4 ½” to 5” inch facing. The clapboards were installed during the 1988 modifications.

The main entrances to the house are on the east side, one into Room 101 and another into Room 103. There is a relatively new deck constructed outside Door D1 extending flush to the southeast corner of Room 102 (Refer to phase 4 plan on page 24). The deck measures approximately 11’, 10” from east to west and 11’, 2” from north to south. According to an oral history from Rose Marie Pickett a deck of the same configuration had existed previously. Decks are not a historic feature of homes in Georgia, however, so the previous deck cannot be considered a historic feature of the house. In an oral interview on November 17 2007, Alton Housworth said that he remembers stone steps leading up to each exterior door when he was growing up on South Goddard Road in the 1930s and 1940s. A series of three wood steps leads to the door outside Room 103.

The north façade of the house has no entry. A wooden vent cuts into the attic space near the top of the gable on the north façade. Thick wooden surrounds frame eight louvered slats on the top and sides of the feature. The bottom of the vent lacks a prominent rail.

The gable on the west façade has a similar vent. An electrical box and dryer vent are affixed to the northwest corner of Room 107. The west side lacks an entry door.

**Chimneys**

The chimney on the east side is the remaining historic feature of the house’s exterior. (See Figure 32). The chimney, which measures 6 feet in width, is mainly constructed of coursed ashlar granite cushioned by
lime mortar. The topmost six feet have been noticeably replaced with coursed ashlar granite, held together with Portland cement.

The chimney narrows midway up the wall in a distinctive six-tier stair step pattern, which begins on a line even with the cornice returns. The lower two courses project from the base of the chimney in stair step fashion also.

The current chimney construction on the south façade is not historic. However, a chimney would have serviced Room 109 throughout the structure’s history. The granite rubble is likely historic material that was used to reconstruct the chimney after the original’s collapse. (See Figures 33 and 34). According to Alton Housworth the original chimney began leaning away from house when he was a child in the 1930s. He estimates that the gap between the chimney and the house was as much as six inches before the structure finally collapsed in the 1950s.

Granite rubble from the original structure lies around the base of the current configuration. The historic granite material is affixed to concrete masonry units (CMU’s) with Portland cement in a random rubble pattern. The cement is flush with the granite veneer near the bottom of the chimney. However, beginning about midway up the chimney, it appears that a layer of cement was applied to the CMU’s and the rubble was
stuck to it. The cement is not flush with the veneer and noticeable gaps appear between the irregularly cut pieces of granite. In some places, the underlying CMUs, which are the load-bearing members of the chimney, are visible. Unlike the chimney on the east side of the structure, this reconstructed version lacks distinctive steps. It measures approximately 5” x 4 ½” wide. The inside flue is made of terra-cotta blocks assembled with Portland cement mortar.

**Interior**

**Historic Doors**

There are two different sets of historic doors associated with this house; all date to the 19th century.

In the first set are the more elaborate doors which were a part of the Hall and Parlor main structure composed of rooms 104 and 102. Doors in this group are D7, D8, and in the loose and damaged door that is currently stored in Room 105. Based on measurements of the door and the hinge spacing, this door belongs to the currently open door frame leading from Room 102 into Room 101. These doors are rail and stile, two-panel doors with un-molded straight edge components. The panels are fielded in the back allowing them to fit into cut grooves in the rails and styles. The styles and rails are then joined with through mortise and tenon joints, and are held together by wooden pegs. (See Figure 35). The other set of historic doors are found in rooms 106, and 109. They are associated with rooms of lesser importance than those found in the main structure, and are of a much simpler design. (See Figure 36). This set of
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historic doors are composed of D2, D3, and D4. All of these doors are made of random with tongue and groove held together by two battens on the door’s back sidse. The horizontal battens are secured with nails from both sides of the door. The battens are beveled on four sides to give a slight decorative effect.

Vertical two-panel doors are features of the Greek Revival style and are consistent with a mid-nineteenth century construction date.

Room 101

The floor in Room 101 is not original. It is replacement rough-cut, circular sawn, straight edge lumber. The original flooring was tongue and groove similar to what is in Room 106. A remnant of this original flooring extends just past the west wall and into this room. The floor is covered with loose vinyl roll flooring. (See Figure 37).

The wall boards in this room are a mixture of original, historic, and new replacement unfinished pine. On the north wall, is original exterior clapboard siding. On the west and south walls are random width tongue and groove paneling, and on the east wall new clapboard siding with a 5-inch reveal has been installed to duplicate that found on the north wall. The ceiling is also tongue and groove wallboards.

Door D2 has an applied molding to its door jam, and both this door and the door opening between room102 have the original drip cap molding above the door that was present when this room was an open breezeway.

All of the walls and ceiling are attached with cut nails with the exception of the new wall material on the east wall where wire nails were used.

Window W2 and Door D1 are not historic to the house.
Room 102

All of the floor, wall, and ceiling boards in this room appear to be historic to the structure.

The floors in this room are 6 ½” tongue and groove pine with blind nailing. There is a plain square edged 6 ½” inch base board throughout the room.

Both the walls and the ceiling are unfinished pine tongue and groove paneling. The walls are random width ranging from 10 ½ inches to 16 inches, and the ceiling boards ran approximately 10 inches wide. All of the material in this room is attached using cut nails.

There are three non-historic replacement windows (W3, W4 and W5) located in this room. Windows W4 and W5 are located on each side of the fireplace on the east wall. They are six-over-six double hung windows. Surrounding the fireplace is a simple painted wooden mantel. The fireplace appears to be original to the structure, and is made of random coursed granite ashlar with a lime and clay mortar. The flue is unlined. The wallboards on this wall are not continuous; they are broken into three vertical columns with the center column corresponding to the width of the fireplace mantel.

There are four electrical outlets, four forced air registers, a heating and cooling thermostat, one phone jack and a ceiling fan with lights in this room.

Room 102 also contains one of the unique features of the house, a window that dates from the time of the original construction. For a complete discussion of the window, identified as Window W6 on the plan, as well as its significance, see Appendix B.

Room 103

This area was originally an open porch that was converted to an enclosed room with the late 1980s renovation. The floor in this room is 3 1/4 inch tongue and groove pine attached with hidden wire nails.

The wall coverings in this room are a mixture of historic and new clapboard siding. The siding found on south and west walls are original to the
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1840s house and are attached with cut nails. It is important to retain these clapboards as a reference when replacing the exterior wall clapboards. The siding on the north and east walls are new material attached with wire nails.

All of the exterior windows and Door D10 are not historic to the structure. Windows W7, W8, and W9 are the same as Window W2 in Room 101.

There are four electrical outlets, one ceramic wall light fixture (placed by Door D8 as if for an entryway on an outside porch), and one ceiling fan in this room.

Door D8 is one of the original historic exterior doors for this structure. (See Figure 38).

Room 104

The floor, wall, and ceiling boards in this room match those found in Room 102, and all appear to be historic to the structure.

The floors in this room are 6 ½" tongue and groove pine with blind nailing. They are oriented in the same direction as those found in Room 103 but are broken at the door frame. They are contiguous to the rooms that they are in; rooms 103 and 104 did not share a common floor covering. There is a plain square edged 5 ½” baseboard throughout the room.

Both the walls and the ceiling are unfinished pine tongue and groove paneling. The walls are random width ranging from 10 ½ to 16 inches wide, and the ceiling boards ran approximately 10 inches wide. All of the material in this room is attached using cut nails. On the east wall, to the right of the door, and reaching a height of approximately 5 feet there are new 11 1/4 inch (actual dimensions) tongue and groove wallboards attached with wire nails.

On the north wall is evidence of an original exterior window. The framing is exposed and visible with no evidence of ever having been covered.
There are five electrical outlets, one phone jack, two forced air registers and one modern ceiling fan with lights in this room.

**Room 105**

This room is a historic but not part of the original construction. The flooring is 3-inch tongue and groove pine, showing little damage or wear. It appears to be new and may be laid on top of the original flooring. The pine tongue and groove is consistent with that used in the new addition for rooms 107 and 110 and was most likely installed at that time.

The wallboards in this room are a consistent 5-inch tongue and groove pine that are blind nailed with wire nails. There are both circular saw and plane marks evident on these wallboards.

The ceiling boards vary in width between 8 ¼” to 9 ¼” wide, and are not laid in a continuous run across the ceiling; there are a number of straight line breaks.

There are two modern six-over-six double hung windows in this room consistent with the other non-historic double hung windows in his house.

There are five electrical outlets, and one phone jack in this room.

**Room 106**

This room was created by one of the historic alterations to this structure - the open breezeway was enclosed creating this room and a small entry porch on the east side of the breezeway.

The floor in this room has a vinyl roll covering over the original 3 inch tongue and groove floorboards, and there’s a 5 ½-inch base board that runs the perimeter of this room.

It has similar tongue and groove wallboards like in Room 109 with paneling of varying widths, all averaging about 11”. The east wall of this room is tied directly into the north wall of Room 109, but it is not attached to the south wall of Room 104 –there is approximately a half inch gap between the two walls. They clapboard wall covering on the north wall is historic and original to the house.
When the breezeway was enclosed the siding was not removed, and could be used as a template if the exterior siding is ever replaced. There is evidence of an exterior window on the west wall. The window was converted to a doorway, and a filler board was installed above the door to enclose the remnants of the window opening. There is also evidence of an exterior window for Room 104 on the north wall of this room, which as stated previously was originally an exterior wall. The window opening was enclosed by simply inserting clapboards into the opening. They align with the horizontal runs, but they are not blended vertically by staggering the board ends - they outline the window perfectly.

This room contains a working sink made from a converted buffet. There is only one electrical outlet in this room, and the wiring for the overhead light is faulty.

Access into the attic is by a drop down ceiling ladder located in this room.

**Room 107**

This room is a new addition to the structure that was added with the late 1980s remodeling. This room houses a toilet and a stand-up shower—both contemporary. It also contains washer and dryer hook-ups on its north wall.

The floor boards in this room are 3 1/8-inch pine tongue and groove that is blind nailed with modern wire nails. And the wallboards are 11 ¼-inch pine tongue and groove paneling.

There is one six-over-six non-historic double hung window on the west wall.

**Room 108**

Room 108 is a small closet in the northeast corner of Room 107 and it contains the gas hot water heater.

**Room 109**

This room was one of the three original rooms of the 1840s Hall and Parlor structure, and throughout the life of this building was used as a kitchen.
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The pine tongue and groove floorboards are 3 ½” wide, and are not consistent with the 6 ½” widths found in rooms 102 and 104. This may indicate that these floorboards have been replaced at some point in the life of the structure. They show a great amount of wear, indicating a higher amount of foot traffic in and through this area. There is a small 8” x 8” square hole cut in the floor in the southeast corner of this room. Alton Houseworth called this a cat hole. Also in this corner are three ghosts on the floor, including one left wood burning stove, which was in place as late as 1987 when this picture was taken. (See Figure 39). The wallboards in this room are random width (9 3/4” to 16 1/4”) pine, but are a mixture of tongue and groove and straight edge boards.

The wallboards on the north and west walls are both tongue and groove paneling, with those on the north wall attached with square headed, cut nails and those on the west wall attached with wire nails. The wallboards on the south and east wall are straight edge pine attached with wire nails. The ceiling boards are random 7” to 14 ½”-wide, straight-edge pine attached with wire nails.

The cabinets in the room appear to date from the 1970s, but it’s not clear if they were installed at that time, or if they were simply older cabinets installed during the 1980s remodeling. There is a stove and refrigerator that date from approximately the same time.

The windows in this room are non-historic and match the other six-over-six, double-hung windows found throughout the house. Both board and batten doors D2 and D4 are historic and original to the 19th century structure. Door D2 is most likely original to the 1840’s structure, and Door D4 (made with wire nails) may have been added when the original back porch was built on to the house. It is possible that the doorway was cut at that time, and this door was built for it.
The chimney in this room is not original. The historic chimney had fallen over at some point, Alton Housworth said, and this chimney was constructed in its place, probably from the remnants of the earlier chimney.

It is a cinderblock chimney with a granite face veneer and a terra-cotta lining. The south wall that surrounds this fireplace mouth is divided into three separate columns of paneling, one directly above and the same width as the fireplace. The other two are on each side. There is a small wooden mantel above the granite face.

There are five electrical outlets, one forced air register and one ceiling fan with flights in this room. Finally an opening for the pipe from the kitchen stove is still present in the southeast corner of the room. A remnant of the pipe is visible on the roof above.

Room 110

This room and Room 107 were both built as part of the late 1980s remodeling, they replaced a pre-existing back porch that was removed at this time.

The flooring is new 3 1/8” pine tongue and groove, and like Room 107 the wall and ceiling boards are a consistent 11 ¾ “ pine tongue and groove paneling.

There are two windows in this room - one six-over-six double hung window on the south wall and a three-bay, one-over-one window (non-operable) on the west wall. All appear to be new. (See Figure 40).

There are four outlets, two forced air vents, and one ceiling fan with lights in this room.
Conditions Assessment
Housworth-Moseley House
Sill and Floor system
Room 102 & 104

The area under Rooms 102 and 104 has no distinguishable division in the floor structural system, which was constructed as the original house. The area under Room 102 is not accessible. The ground is graded in such a way that there is only room for the central heating duct-work to fit between the rigid foam board insulation nailed to the joists and the ground.

There is moisture accumulation on the concrete masonry unit piers supporting the floor and on the foundation wall that forms the southern boundary of the area.

The majority of the rigid foam board insulation is attached to the floor joists still, which means it is still insulating Room 102 and parts of Room 104. (See Figure 41). The area between the floor boards and the insulation boards however, is a likely area for moisture to be trapped, leading to water damage, rot and mold. The stone foundation of the original chimney is somewhat visible on the eastern boundary of this area.

Splitting of the major support beams and sill is...
a cause for concern in this area as well. There are signs of splitting on the sill and the support beam that runs north to south in this area. The support beam that runs east to west and forms the southern boundary of this area also shows signs of splitting. (See Figure 42). The splitting is the result of age and of an inadequate support system underneath, which is provided by concrete masonry unit piers and foundation walls. (See Figure 43).

There are two vents set in the foundation wall in this area as well as the door which allows access to the space and all three allow moisture to move outside, which is good for the wood. The majority of this area houses heating duct-work and pipes, so not much of the condition of the floor joists and flooring is visible. There is also some evidence, although it is no longer active, of wood boring insects on the joists in this area.

**Room 103**

White rot, dry rot and mold are the main concerns in this area. The floor joists under Room 103 are in poor condition, with at least four of the joists showing some signs of rot or mold. The floor laid on these joists also shows severe signs of rot. The rot is a result of water damage, although the source of the water is not evident. Where there are not patches of white rot or mold, there is water damage. (See figure 44).

It is believed that a portion of this damage is a product of when Room 103 was an open porch. Insect damage, caused either by termites or carpenter ants, is another problem in the support system under Room 103. The majority of the damage is on the eastern side of the load-bearing beam that runs north to south and serves as the western boundary of this section.
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The infestation is dormant or no longer present as there are no signs of active infestation. (See Figure 45).

A second problem with the support system is on the eastern side of this section; a plank running from north to south on the east side of this area is braced underneath the floor joists. The plank is supported by two piers of smaller stones at each of two points on the plank. The stones are not stable enough provide substantial support if any excessive weight was placed on the floor above. (See Figure 46).

The structure has been continuously underpinned with concrete masonry units. The original sill of this section, as well as the sill for the entire house, sits on the concrete masonry units which are laid in a cement footing. These foundation walls form the northern and eastern boundary of this area. Underneath Room 103, the dirt has begun to wash away from the cement footing on both the eastern and northern walls. The concrete masonry units also show signs of rising damp. (See Figure 47).

Ventilation underneath the house is present but not sufficient. There is no vent set in this section of the foundation; the closest one is on the northern foundation wall but at a midpoint of the section that forms the northern boundary of the area under Room 103. There is no way for excess moisture to escape, resulting in rotting wood, rising damp in the concrete masonry units and generally moist conditions throughout the underside of the house.
Room 105

Insect damage is the primary cause of concern for this area. There are no signs of active infestation, but the damage done from when the infestation was active is substantial in some parts. The majority of the damage is in the northeast corner of this section, which is a continuance of the damage seen beneath Room 103. The support beam separating the areas underneath Rooms 103 and 105 has extensive damage and at least two of the joists butt cattled into this beam show major signs of deterioration, particularly on the tenon section. (See Figure 48).

The southern boundary of this area is marked by a rough, log beam that has been squared on three sides and pegged to the original, hand-hewn support beam running east to west, with wooden pegs. (See Figure 49). Both the main support beam and the log beam appear in good condition and both are resting on the concrete masonry unit foundation that serves as the western boundary of this area. (See Figure 50).

There was an attempt to add additional strength to the support beam that forms the boundary between Rooms 103 and 105. A piece of wood was joined to the beam between the second and third floor joists from the north because the support beam...
behind this board is splitting or has split just below the mortise section of the beam. (See Figure 51).

The visible section of the support beam between the first and second floor joists has already split and two pieces of wood have been nailed to the support beam on the northern side of the first floor joist; these are holding the insect damaged joist in place and one of the boards is also wedged between the floor joist and the support beam to bridge the gap between the joint. There are also signs of water damage on the support beam between the second and third joists and some between the third and fourth floor joists.

The cement footing of the foundation is exposed on the northern wall, a result of water washing away the surrounding dirt. Rising damp is evident on both the northern and western foundation walls. The sill that is resting on the western foundation wall is beginning to split in some places. This is due either to age or a poor support system provided by the foundation wall. The concrete masonry unit piers that support the beam between Rooms 103 and 105 are stacks of solid concrete blocks and standard concrete masonry units. The solid block at the top of the second pier has a crack running from top to bottom, which is a sign that there is too much pressure being applied to the pier. (See Figure 52).
Rooms 101, 106-110

The concrete masonry unit foundation of the house in this section is in good condition; however, its construction is the source of numerous issues. There is evidence of rising damp and standing water in the southwestern corner beneath Room 109. There is also evidence of rising damp along many areas of the foundation. The ultimate issue is the lack of ventilation beneath the house which is leading to an excessively moist environment. (See Figure 53). The joists running beneath Rooms 101 and 106 have been cut at the east end and sistered (See Figure 54), which suggests it is a repair of collective damage from over the years when Room 101 was open to the outside. The repair work of the joists and sill are in fair condition and presumably date to the 1980's renovation. (See Figure 55).

The only issue of joist damage in the southern half of the house is beneath Room 109 at the juncture of a joist with the western sill. The butt coggled joint at this point suffers from water damage and mold, which has spread on the sill. Although the joist connection is compromised, the damage appears to be historic and the source has been addressed possibly from the historic structural additions. (See Figure 56). Throughout the area beneath Rooms 101, 106 and 109, 104, and 102, there is visible evidence of wood boring insects that are no longer active. The damage to the sills and joists from these boring insects is minimal.
Exterior

East Façade

Woodpecker damage is evident under the eave from the southeast corner of the building to over the Door D1. The soffit underneath the gable is pierced with woodpecker damage as well. Woodpeckers have damaged the fascia board above windows W2, W3 and W7 as well. Woodpecker damage is symptomatic of insect infestation. (See Figure 57; Elevation 3, Page 96).

The structure lacks a proper rain water disposal system. The adverse results are particularly noticeable on the siding above the deck. The clapboards were wet to the touch upon investigation despite the fact that it had not rained at the site in several days. The clapboards immediately above the deck are rotting because rainwater is splashing back against them from the deck. This is a long-standing problem caused by the previous deck configuration. The current deck continues to exacerbate the problem. The clapboards have deteriorated significantly in some areas including to the lower left of Door D1. A large chunk of the wooden siding is missing, exposing the insulation underneath. (See Figure 58). The moist microclimate around the deck also promotes lichen growth. In general, the lack of a sufficient water disposal system has also led to organic growth on the clapboards. Green organic growth was
PART 3: PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

observed under Window W1. In addition, mold was observed on the fascia board above Window W3. (See Figure 59). Mold is a precursor to more serious fungi and was observed in numerous areas around the exterior of the house.

In general, the siding is in poor condition. Besides the organic growth and moisture problems, the siding suffers from general deterioration.

Because the siding was never regularly sealed or painted, two decades of exposure to the elements have caused the wood to cup, crook, and twist. In addition, to the upper right side of Door D1, a section of clapboard is missing. Scores of nails are coming loose to the point of near extraction. The nails are no longer holding the clapboards in place. Instead, they are precariously mounted by adjacent clapboards. One example of where this situation is occurring is to the left of Window W4. (See Figure 60). Numerous clapboards around the house are noticeably split and checked.

General deterioration of wooden window features is also evident. One of the muntins is split in Window W2. The muntins in Window W4 have deteriorated significantly. The sill of Window W5 has also experienced weather-related deterioration, and a thick mold is evident.

The wooden entry Door D1 suffers from moisture damage. A water line caused by rainwater splash back from the deck is apparent on the lower portion of the door. The finish has also been removed by its exposure to the elements. Door D10, on the other hand, is in good condition because
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it has been protected by a screen door. The metal screen door around Door D10, however, is coming loose. The hinge is in disrepair, and the bottom panel is rusting.

The historic chimney on the east façade is in good condition. However, it is out of plumb; it follows the line of the east wall of Room 102 which is also out of plumb. Also, vegetation, which retains moisture next to the surface, is growing out of the bottom projecting courses. (See Figure 62). In general, the mortar is in good condition, but small spaces are evident on the primary façade. Larger spaces are evident between the north side of the chimney and the clapboards. The mortar on the top, reconstructed part of the chimney is in poorer condition than that which seals the historic part.

North Façade

The north façade suffers from general deterioration. Lichens are growing on the sill of Window W10. (See Figure 63; Elevation 1. Page 95). Organic growth was also observed on the sill of Window W5 and the foundation underneath this window is covered with lichens and other small plants and grasses. The ledge of the easternmost cornice return is yet another habitat for lichens on the north façade. The siding on the north façade is also

**Figure 61.** Close-up of split muntin on Window W2.

**Figure 62.** Close-up of the bottom projecting courses on the historic chimney. The moss and other plant material are perfect water traps and can threaten the integrity of the stone and mortar.

**Figure 63.** View of sill on Window W10. The extensive lichen growth is typical of many of the exposed surfaces on the exterior.
covered in numerous places with mold and other organic growth. The house’s inability to effectively shed water is the cause of such growth. In addition, moisture is weakening the siding. The clapboards along the north side of Room 107 were particularly wet to the touch upon investigation, and this prolonged dampness is causing the wood to warp and split. The subsill of Window W9 is likewise wet, so much so that it’s spongy to the touch even though, as mentioned elsewhere, there had been no rain in the area for several days.

The muntins of Window W10 have also cracked and broken apart.

Animals and insects have attacked the north façade as well. (See Figures 64 and 65). Hornets have nested in the corner between rooms 103 and 105, while the soffit of the westernmost cornice return has been repeatedly punctured by woodpeckers.

Two additional problems were observed on the north side of the house. A rectangular hole exists in the foundation at the base of the siding on the east side of the projecting bedroom, Room 105. The hole has been temporarily filled with three pieces of brick. However, the brick is not secure and is easily displaced by the slightest touch. The dryer vent on the north side of Room 107 was haphazardly attached to the structure with a red adhesive that was applied unevenly and has stained the surrounding clapboards.
West Façade

The general damage caused by insects and weather that are evident on other sides of the house are present on the west side as well. The distinctive boreholes of carpenter bees are evident in the cornice and soffit on the left side of the gable, as well as above the center pane of Window W15. Damage from what appears to be carpenter ant galleries is evident under the cornice return on the right side of the gable. (See Elevation 4, Page 97).

As on the other sides, the siding is in generally poor condition, with the same warping, loose nails, splitting and checking that are found on the other sides. For example, below Window W12, just above the foundation, the siding is split and completely separated from the side of the house, exposing the insulation below. Just above the top right corner of Window W12, the siding board is severely split. (See Figure 66).

At several places along this side of the house, there is evidence of some type of sealant, perhaps a wood putty, that was used in an unsuccessful attempt to seal the gaps between adjacent clapboards.

At the top of the gable, there is a noticeable gap where the fascia boards do not meet flush with each other. At the angle of the cornice return on the left side of the gable, the boards have shrunk and created a gap.

The cornice return on the right side of the gable is in poor condition at the angle where it joins the gable. The fascia boards there appear to be deteriorated. A board that extends from the angle of the cornice return south above the metal roof of Rooms 107 and 110 has been cemented into place. The use of cement will inhibit the wood’s ability to expand and contract, further contributing to its deterioration.
There are four missing panes in Window W11, which exposes Room 105 to the elements, to animal and insect intrusions and creates a security problem for the house. (See Figure 67).

Window W12 exhibits a general deterioration of the muntins and mold growth along the right side.

The doors into the foundation are generally in good shape, although the southernmost of the two appears to be too large for the opening. Because the door is too large, the hasp that would be used to lock the door has been bent around the edge. Combined with the size of the door, this prevents the door from closing properly, and the owners are relying on a rock to keep the door closed. This also provides a security problem for the house and allows animals and insects access to the house. (See Figure 68).

Bricks have been used to fill in the space between the foundation vents and the CMUs on the foundation. These bricks are loose, and the mortar between the CMUs has deteriorated in some spots.

The opening for the electrical box is too large for the box itself, which creates yet another opening for weather, animals and insects into the house.

The leading edges of the metal roof above Rooms 107 and 110 provide a bit of an overhang and thus more protection for the structure from rainwater, but the edge is beginning to bend and tear. This is particularly evident above Window W14.
South Façade

The condition of the siding on this façade is the same as on the other sides. Nails are nearly extracted, individual boards are warped, loose, or both, and many are split. Black mold covers much of the siding, as well as the window frame, rail and stile. (See Elevation 2, Page 95).

The steps leading to Door D5 are in poor condition. (See Figure 69). The some of the treads feel spongy from moisture, and the handrail and handrail supports on both sides are coming loose. The handrail on the left of the stairway in fact is detached from the wall of the house.

The screen door at Door D5 is detached from the frame at the top hinge, and the screen itself is torn and holed. The door is bent and doesn’t close properly.

To the right of the steps leading to the door, a leaking faucet has saturated the ground. (See Figure 70). The wall and foundation form an angle at that point where Room 110 is attached to the larger Room 109, and the moisture from the faucet has created a microclimate that has caused rising damp in the CMUs on the foundation and yet more damp siding.

The foundation elsewhere seems to be in good condition, though there is some rising damp, especially on the part of the foundation between the chimney and the southwest corner, and there are spots where repointing will be necessary. One CMU to the left of the stairway and below Window W16 has a hole about 1.5 inches in diameter. (See Figure 71).
As noted earlier, the chimney on this side of the house served the kitchen (Room 109) and is not historic in its current construction, although the stones likely are from the original construction.

Overall the chimney appears to be in good condition, but the workmanship creates a potential safety hazard. From a point midway up the chimney to the top, a layer of Portland cement was applied to the CMUs forming the frame of the chimney, and pieces of loose granite were essentially glued into place. Because the joints are not flush with the front of the stone veneer, the stones will eventually come loose and fall, either as spalling or in whole pieces if the joint deteriorates.

On the wall between the top of Door D5 and Window W16, a junction box for an electrical fixture has been installed, though the fixture is not in place. The box is uncovered, and though the un-insulated tips of the wires are protected by wire nuts, the exposure of this junction box to the elements creates a safety hazard. The plastic wire nuts could deteriorate, creating the lethal potential for water to come in contact with a live electrical wire.

**Interior**

**Room 101**

The floor of Room 101, a previously outdoor porch, is unfinished and in fair condition. The only area of concern is that there are larger than normal gaps forming between the boards of rough-cut, straight-edge lumber. (See Figure 72). There is evidence that
the current floor replaced a tongue-and-groove floor as one remaining set of joined boards borders the western wall. (See Figure 73). The floor is covered in a wood-patterned rolled vinyl that is not adhered to the wood.

The walls in this room are covered in two styles of wood paneling. The eastern and northern walls are covered in clapboard panels similar to those found on the exterior of the house while the eastern and southern walls are covered in a flat wood paneling. None of the wood has a protective finish, although the eastern and southern walls show a patina from age. There are also small gaps forming between the panels on the eastern and southern walls, a result of shrinkage that cannot be seen on the northern and western walls because of the style of wood paneling they are covered in.

There are three doors and one window in Room 101; there was a fourth door on the northern wall of the room, between Rooms 101 and 102, that is no longer present evidenced by the hardware still remaining on the jamb and the drip cap above the frame. Door D1, which leads to the deck on the western façade, shows signs of water staining on the bottom rail and the threshold shows similar evidence of water; the threshold has staining and pieces have cracked off, leaving a gap between the floor and the threshold. (See Figure 74). Window W2, a four-light picture window, shows minor water staining on the muntins and sill as a result of failing or missing glazing.
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The ceiling of Room 101 is covered in tongue-in-groove boards that have acquired a patina similar to the southern and eastern walls. There is evidence of water staining in the southwest and southeast corners of the ceiling, which carries downward to the surrounding walls. (See Figure 75).

Room 102

The floor of Room 102, one of the two original rooms in the house, is unfinished and small gaps are forming between the boards. There are signs of termite damage on several boards with the majority of the damage concentrated in the northeast corner; one floorboard is eaten to the point that it sounds hollow. (See Figure 76). The floors in the northeast corner also have indications of water damage, with rot and staining being the obvious indications. There are also multiple floor-boards surrounding the fireplace hearth that are loose.

No protective finish was ever applied to the walls. All walls are covered in flat, tongue-in-groove panels. Water damage and water staining is present on several walls, with most damage occurring on the eastern and southern walls and around the exterior windows. The water damage on the eastern wall is concentrated above the fireplace mantel, with staining and bowing of the wood. (See Figure 77).

The panels above the mantel also show signs of rot and mold because of the continued presene of water in the area. The panels above the mantel...
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have also been replaced, as they are narrower than the boards to either side.

The southern wall has large amounts of water damage on the topmost panels, particularly in the south-east corner and above Window W3.

At least two boards below the north-east exterior window, W5, have been damaged by water and pieces have fallen off, revealing paper-backed, rolled insulation between the studs, an obvious later addition. (See Figure 78).

Small gaps have begun to form between all wall paneling, an indication of settling and wood shrinkage.

The three exterior windows in Room 102 show signs of water damage, mold and rot due to lack of proper glazing. All rot and mold is concentrated on the muntins and on the sills; damage to the sills is concentrated near the bottom rail. These three exterior windows are replacements as there is infill wood above the inside casing and below the apron. The one original window, W6, has been nailed in place. The window panes all lack a substantial amount of glazing. There are three doorways leading to Room 102.

There is no door in the doorframe of the southern wall; the door is currently being stored in Room 105 and shows serious signs of rot and large portions of the lower panels and rail are missing. As this door would have faced the exterior, the damage was caused by water and exposure to weather. The header of the door frame leading into Room 101 shows previous insect damage; there are bore marks and sections of the wood are missing. Part of the header is cracked off either due to the insect damage or water damage. (See Figure 79).
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The door leading to Room 103, D8, is in good condition with no visible signs of water damage or rot. There is evidence on the north side of the door that D8 was at one time an exterior door, due to evidence of slight wood erosion. The door leading to Room 104 is also in good condition and this would be expected as this was an interior door. The fireplace is in fair condition. The mantel shows no signs of major damage other than an accumulation of dust. The chimney flue is dirty and has no lining.

The stacked stone also appears to lack a mortar. The hearth has Portland cement repairs on top of the original mortar.

The ceiling is covered in wood panels that have no protective finish but have accumulated a patina from age. There is previous water damage in several spots on the ceiling; most is in the southeast corner, near W3. Small gaps have formed between the ceiling panels. There is also a hole on the last panel running parallel to the southern wall; the insulation used in the attic space is exposed. The cause of the hole is unknown, but could be a man-made hole or the result of a woodpecker or insect damage.

Room 103

Room 103 is in very poor condition. There is water damage throughout the room and most is localized to the north wall near Window W9. The floor lacks any type of protective finish and suffers greatly from water damage. The floor has severe signs of rot, water damage and mold and has begun to fall apart. (See Figure 80). Three floorboards have already cracked and fallen through, forming an opening into the crawlspace. Water damage
to the sill supporting the outside wall is also visible where the floorboards have fallen in.

All walls are covered in clapboards like the exterior siding and all lack a protective finish, displaying signs of water damage with a concentration on the western and northern walls. The northern wall has water damage around W9 and the molding at the top of the wall has large amounts of rot, mold and water damage. (See Figure 81). The western wall has numerous water stains, the majority of which surrounds D9. (See Figure 82).

Some water damage is also present along the bottom clapboards of the western wall and a portion of the bottom clapboard has cracked off. The clapboard on the south wall is believed to be the northern exterior of the original house and is in poor condition toward the eastern edge; it has major signs of wear as well as cracks and splitting of the material. The south wall also has evidence of mold along the upper section, where the ceiling meets the wall. Gaps have formed between the clapboard siding on all four walls.

All windows in Room 103 have failing glazing. The improper glazing on the three exterior windows is causing rot, water damage and mold on the muntins and sills. (See Figure 83).

The picture window, W9, has the largest amount of water damage. D9 and D10 have signs of water damage; there is staining and rot at the base of
PART 3: PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

both. D8 is in good condition however, the casing has signs of insect damage at the base of the west side. (See Figure 84).

The threshold of D10 has large amounts of water damage; there are water stains and rot has caused the edge of the threshold to deteriorate, leaving a gap between it and the floor. The drip caps above W6 and D8 have both cracked and parts have fallen off. The drip cap above D9 is the only complete drip cap remaining in this room; it is in fair condition but shows minor signs of water damage.

The ceiling is covered in tongue-in-groove panels that have no protective finish but do show signs of patina. The ceiling however, has severe water damage. The majority of the water damage is on the third and fourth boards from the northern wall. There are water stains, mold and copious amounts of rot on these boards. (See Figure 85). The location of water damage to the ceiling suggests that it is the source of the water damage to the floor near the north wall. There are gaps forming between the panels on the ceiling. Cracking is also a problem on the ceiling panels, with most occurring in the southwest corner.

Figure 84. Detail of insect damage to frame of Door D8 on western side. Also visible is the section of clapboard on the western wall of Room 103 that has cracked off.

Figure 85. View of water damage, rot and mold present on the ceiling panels of Room 103; possible source of water damage to floor of Room 103.
Room 104

Room 104 is the second room of the original house. The floor is covered in wood-patterned rolled vinyl which is in poor condition; large sections of the rolled vinyl have been ripped off, exposing the original, unfinished wood floor below. The floor boards lack a protective finish and have evidence of insect damage and cracking. There are also small gaps forming between the floorboards. On the north wall, a baseboard has been pulled away from the wall, exposing the framing and some of the flooring. (See Figure 86). The walls are covered in flat, wood panels with no protective finish. The eastern wall, to the south of Door D7, has several replaced boards; these boards are obvious replacements as they lack the level of patina of the surrounding boards. There are numerous replaced wallboards seen throughout the room. All wallboards have some gaps between the panels, a sign of shrinkage. Several panels on the south wall are also loose.

Both windows in Room 104 are double-hung and replacements of the original windows, as there is infill wood above the inside casing and below the apron. Both windows have failing glazing around all panes which has caused water damage. Water damage is present on the muntins and sills, with damage to the sill concentrated near the bottom rail.

The ceiling is covered in wood panels. There a small gaps between several of the panels. Signs of water damage are present on multiple boards with a concentration in the northwest corner. The water damage in the
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Room 105

The wooden floorboards in Room 105 lack a protective finish. The floors also have small gaps forming between the boards. There is evidence of bird droppings on several boards, which can cause staining to the wood.

The walls are covered in flat panels that have patina. There are small gaps forming between all the boards, a sign of shrinkage. There is a large indication of settling in the southeast corner of the room, behind D9; the panels in this corner are sloping downward and hanging at an angle.

On the west wall, there is a mud dauber’s nest next to the phone jack. (See Figure 88). There is also evidence of water staining on several wall panels, particularly around the exterior windows.

There are two double-hung windows in this room, both of which have been replaced. There are wood in-fills above the inside casing and below the apron. Window W11 has four missing panes of glass, which allows both animals, particularly birds, and insects into the house. This is also a prime location for water and other weather elements to enter the house.

Both windows have signs of water damage and rot due to improper and failing glazing. The damage is concentrated on the muntins and sills; the damage to the sills is primarily where the bottom rail of the window meets the sill.
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The bottom of Door D9 has been cut at an angle so that it can open into the room; the current floor is at a different level from the floor of Room 103. (See Figure 89).

The ceiling is covered in wood panels. There is evidence of previous water damage on the ceiling; staining is the most obvious indication. The water damage to the ceiling panels is primarily located in the center of the room. (See Figure 90).

Room 106

The floor of Room 106 is covered in a stone-patterned, rolled vinyl. Other than dirt and debris, the vinyl appears to be in good condition although it is not properly secured along all walls. There is no evidence of the condition of the wood subfloor beneath.

Three of the four walls are covered in flat, wood panels. The northern wall, which would have been the southern exterior wall of the original house, is covered in clapboards. All walls lack a protective finish, although the eastern, western and southern walls appear to have a patina from age. All flat wall panels show signs of shrinkage; shrinkage has created large gaps, to the point of revealing the tongue and groove elements of the panels on the southern and western walls, between all boards. There is evidence of water staining on the northwest and southwest corner panels. (See Figure 91). There is also some sort of glue or filler that has been placed between several panels on the western
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wall, to the north of the door opening; this has caused a stain on the surrounding wood. (See Figure 92). There is one existing door and evidence of two previous openings in Room 106. D3 appears to be in fair condition. The opening leading to Room 107 has replaced what may have been an exterior window or door, as there is infill wood above the frame. (See Figure 93). There is also evidence of a third door or a window on the northern wall; several panels have been added to fill the opening. The panels that have replaced the previous opening line up with the horizontal run of the surrounding panels of the wall.

The ceiling is covered in wood panels that have no protective finish. There is a hinged opening in the ceiling of this room that provides access to the attic space. Small amounts of water staining/damage are present in the southwest and northwest corners of the ceiling which continues to the walls below.

**Room 107**

The floor of Room 107 is covered in unfinished wood. There are patches of water damage and rot in several locations, particularly near fixtures/utilities that utilize water, such as the hot water heater in Room 108 and the toilet on the western wall. Floorboards surrounding the toilet appear to be deteriorating due to a loose gasket or washer in the toilet. (See Figure 94). There is mold on several boards bordering the southern wall of Room 108.

The walls are covered in flat, wood panels that lack a protective finish and the level of patina of other rooms. Small gaps have formed between all
panels. There is also evidence of soot and fire damage on the top panels of the northern wall and those covering the western and southern walls of Room 108. Window W14 on the western wall is in good condition. There is slight evidence of water damage on the muntins and sill due to failing glazing, but damage is not extensive. The ceiling is covered in wood panels that lack any protective finish. There is evidence of fire damage on multiple ceiling boards surrounding Room 108. (See Figure 95).

**Room 108**

Room 108 is a closet in Room 107 that houses the hot water heater and a pipe for the HVAC unit. The floor consists of unfinished wood boards that are in very poor condition. There is extensive water damage and rot present on the floorboards that are visible. The wood has begun to deteriorate and warp because of the continued presence of water. (See Figure 96).

The walls are covered in thin sheets of plywood with grooves. The topmost section of the wood on the northern wall of the closet shows signs of fire and water damage; there is soot as well as mold and white rot. (See Figure 97).
The wood panels on the western wall show no signs of the fire damage present on either of the adjacent walls, suggesting that these panels have been replaced. (See Figure 98).

The ceiling is covered in wood panels, all of which have either fire or water damage. The boards on the western half of the ceiling are so damaged by fire that they are black; moving eastward the boards show less signs of fire damage but more signs of water damage and rot. There is a newer, hollow core door with no knob on the southern wall of the room; a small door consisting primarily of a vent is on the lower third of the southern wall as well, providing access to the valves of the hot-water heater.

Room 109

The floor of Room 109 is unfinished and shows signs of extensive wear. The floorboards however, are still lying tightly together and there are few gaps between the boards. In the southwest corner is a ghost mark of the stove that was once in this location (See Figure 99). There is also evidence of a repair made to secure a loose board; glue or caulk surrounds one board in front of the fireplace hearth and there are small amounts of the same material on a few other boards. (See Figure 100).

The walls are covered in flat wood panels that have no protective coating, but that do have evidence of a patina. Several panels
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have water stains from the lack of a protective finish, with most occurring on the western wall south of D4 and on the lower panels of the southern wall east of the fireplace. Small gaps have formed between most boards. The panels above the fireplace mantel do not match the surrounding boards; the boards are different widths, have varying degrees of patina and at least one appears to be circular sawn. (See Figure 101). Several panels on the wall to the east of the fireplace show evidence of a wall mounted candle or lamp being present at some time as there is a burn pattern in the shape of a flame. (See Figure 102). The top panel of the east wall has evidence of smoke and water damage; there is soot and some staining present along the top edge of the board. The northwest corner also has evidence of water damage, with minor staining and mold apparent.

An air conditioning unit has been installed in Window W1. W1 is also a replacement window, as there is infill wood to the south of the current window, suggesting the current window is in a different location or narrower than the historic window it replaced. There are minor signs of water staining on the muntins of both W1 and W17 due to failing glazing.

In general, both windows are in good condition and appear to be of newer construction as compared to the other windows in the house. Both
D2 and D4 are in good condition.

The ceiling is covered in unfinished wood panels that have a patina from age. There is a gap between the top of the wall and the edge of the ceiling on the eastern wall where the insulation from the attic is visible. (See Figure 103). This area also has evidence of smoke damage from the stove that was once in this area. A piece of plywood has been nailed to the ceiling on the second and third rows of panels, covering the hole where the stove pipe once exited to the roof. (See Figure 104).

The panels immediately surrounding the hole for the stove pipe have large amounts of smoke damage with soot and staining being obvious signs of the damage. The northwest corner of the room also has evidence of water damage, with staining and small amounts of mold present.

**Room 110**

The floor of Room 110 is unfinished wood and in good condition; the material is newer than any of the other wooden floors in the house and there are no gaps between the boards. The walls are flat, wood panels with no protective covering. There are small gaps between all the panels, but the material is in good condition. Evidence of water damage is apparent above D4, with staining, mold and the early stages of rot present on the topmost panel of the wall and some damage present on the eastern ceiling panel. (See Figure 105). Door D5 has minor water staining on the bottom rail and is in generally good condition. (See Figure 106). Both W15 and W16 have evidence of water staining from the failing/lack of glazing, with
most damage present on the muntins and sill. The ceiling of Room 110 is covered in unfinished wood panels that are in good condition; there are gaps between all the boards.

Outbuildings

The Dogtrot

While not located on the property in question today, the dogtrot is historically associated with the property. (See Appendix D). The building consists of two log pens joined by V-notched cuts at the log ends so they fit together tightly. The pens are connected by a roof system with a dog-trot between the two pens. The roof frame is pegged to the log constructions. Above the pens, a loft area runs the length of the building.

According to Alton Housworth, the loft was accessed via scuttle holes in the loft floor above each of the log pens and doors on each end at the gable. Today the area is accessed by means of an exterior stairway on the south wall, and the scuttle holes are no longer visible.

It is likely that this structure was the first one to be built on the original farmstead. Its construction and design give it two separate rooms connected by a dogtrot which leads to a large covered shed area. It is likely that the structure may have served as the original dwelling on the site while the adjacent homestead was constructed. Once the homestead was completed, the Dogtrot was, according to oral interviews with Alton Housworth, used as a stable for draft animals—an assertion that is supported by the existence of the hayloft above both log pens. Further evidence for this use of the property is found in the feed troughs found on the east wall in each pen.

While the Dogtrot is in good condition, and there are few signs of structural issues or damage, the structure is no longer part of the property, the land it sits on having been sold off prior to the current owner purchasing
The Corn Crib

The corn crib situated to the southwest of the main house. The corn crib, like the dogtrot, is mainly a log construction whereby the logs are attached by V-notch joints on the log ends. The building presently rests on cut granite piers placed at the four corners. The stones appear in excellent condition, and show little weather damage (See Figure 107). It is likely that these piers were placed more recently as substitutes as the original piers aged and failed. Additionally, large ant mounds fill the gap underneath the structure between the granite blocks. The interior of the structure is about half-full of decayed corn cobs such that an examination of the flooring is impossible.

The eastern wall of the structure is largely covered by corrugated sheet metal panels arranged in a patchwork pattern. The purpose for the panels is unknown at present but they were likely added to protect that side of the structure from damage or as an outer barrier to keep vermin from entering the structure via the gaps in the log construction.

An alternate explanation was offered by Alton Housworth, who stated that there had been a hog pen either attached to that same wall or near it and that the panels were to keep swine and mud out of the corn supply.

Underneath the paneling, the majority of the timbers appear to be in a reasonable condition for their age and circumstances, though there is minor evidence of water damaged likely caused by water dripping behind the panels and becoming trapped between the logs and the metal covering and some evidence of termite damage.
The rear or southern wall of the corn crib is virtually inaccessible due to a dense thicket behind the structure obscuring its view from the farm road some 20 feet south of the structure, and preventing access to the rear of the structure via the east or west sides. Additionally, a large tree stands immediately next to the southeast corner of the structure, while another tree has fallen against the south wall and lies upon the roof of the structure heading northwest towards the center of the west wall. The fallen tree is rotting and relatively little or no damage was done to the structure as a result of supporting the weight of the dead tree. The rear wall is covered in non-overlapping horizontal planking.

The western wall of the structure, like the southern wall, is relatively obscured by vegetation, though the thicket is much lighter than that to the rear of the structure. Again, like on other sides of the building, the west wall shows evidence of modification as horizontal planks were attached to the lower portions of the wall.

As will the south and east walls, the purpose for these modifications is unknown, though the siding was likely added to help keep wildlife out. The west wall is most notable for the structural damage on that side of the building. The most visible damage on the wall is a sizeable hole in the wall halfway up near the southwest corner (See Figure 108).

Additionally, the west wall demonstrates that the moderate termite damage on the other three walls is a major issue to the structure’s survivability—the western wall shows major termite damage near the roofline and on wall timbers themselves. Additionally, the roofline shows evidence of fire damage to the rafter ends and the roof sheathing (See Figure 109). Evidence of water damage is also present around the roofline.

The front or northern wall of the corn crib contains the only planned opening in the structure in the form of two foot square door located in the

Figure 108. View of the hole in the west wall of the corn crib. Note the termite damage, as well as the siding attached to the bottom of the structure.
center of the wall. Of the visible and accessible walls, the north wall is arguably in the best condition, though it does show evidence of termite damage on the lower logs. Indeed the front is unique in that it is the only wall which does not have planking installed over the logs. Additionally, the front wall best demonstrates the decorative adornments attached to the structure over time—namely a row of bottle caps nailed to the wall about head high. Bottle caps are also attached to the south wall but at a lower level and are not well viewed in their entirety due to the close vegetation. (See Figure 110).

The roof on the corn crib is supported by a superstructure which rises two to three feet above the log pen on the east wall and slopes down to level of the logs on the western wall. An examination of the interior reveals that the roof is an added superstructure.

It has supports which begin as posts at the roof level, but which feather-down as they extend down the interior walls of the structure. (See Figure 111). This form is likely not original to the structure, though the building has existed in this form for many years according to Mr. Housworth. The roof itself is covered with corrugated sheet metal and is no longer water-tight.

Figure 109. Evidence of fire damage to the eave of the west wall of the corn crib.

Figure 110. Detail of the bottlecap decorations on the corn crib. The caps have been added to two sides of the structure.

Figure 111. Interior of the corn crib. Note the remains of corn filling the structure, but also note the feathered post attached in the corner to the left. It is likely that this was added later as a support to raise the roof of the structure.
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## The Grain Shed

This building is among the oldest structures on the site and its construction is likely concurrent to that of the house based on the framing of each structure. The building’s north and south walls measure some 95” across, while the east and west walls measure some 80”. The north wall is approximately 80” high while the south wall much shorter, measuring some 62 ½” tall. The side walls vary according to the slope of the roof. The shed roof itself is modern; A careful analysis reveals that the rafters have been replaced, evidence of which is found in the gaps left when the original framing members were removed and replaced with modern dimensional lumber, leaving gaps in the fascia.

An examination of edges reveals that the roofing substrate is modern particle board while the roofing material is asphalt shingles. The building sits on granite piers placed at the corners such that the floor of the structure is two feet above ground in places.

The framing of the building is of high quality mortise and tenon construction with pegs reinforcing the joints. Unlike common construction practices, however, the frame of the structure is actually on the outside of the building.

The framing forms an exoskeleton of sorts where the wall planks are actually attached on the interior surfaces of the framing members. The wall boards are arranged horizontally and do not overlap. There is no siding attached to the outside of the structure. The construction method provided for a solid bin to hold the grain. The placement of the siding inside the framing was effected to prevent the weight of the stored grain from pushing against the siding and detaching it from the frame.

Perhaps the most intriguing feature of the building is its lack of a door or access opening. Indeed, the only opening to the structure is a small squared off hole in the east wall near the south corner. Historically, the building had a hinged roof which was attached at the north wall. At present there is a metal pipe at the corner of the north wall which may have been used as a hinge. On the south wall, just under the roofline, there is a metal loop attached to the structure which served as part of the lock for the
structure. Additionally, a ladder was attached on the south wall by nailing wooden strips between framing members. (See Figures 112 and 113).

The building is in relatively good condition. There is evidence that the building was taken care of by previous owners. There is some moderate termite damage to the structure, and this is largely contained to the lower extremities, specifically the northeast corner. There is some evidence of damage caused by vegetation. Much of this is likely due to the overgrowth of vines on the north wall and around the northwest corner. It appears that the previous owners of the site took care to kill these vines—likely by chemical means as the remains of the vegetation remains attached to the structure.

There is vegetation close to the structure on the north wall in the form of a small coppice. Additionally there is a relatively young tree growing less than one foot away from the south wall which actually impacts the new roof. For a building with an estimated age of 130 years or more, this outbuilding is excellent shape.

In order to fully examine the structure, a loose board was found on the south wall and was gently removed providing access to the interior of the structure. The interior revealed a cache of historical items, but their use is certainly open to debate. Inside was found, one ladle attached to a long stick, a circular disc with an opening and a flange in the center. One side of the disc had been folded up so that it formed a straight edge on the otherwise circular object. Underneath, a small, continuous bead had
been added about midway on the radius of the disc, almost like a lip one would expect to find on a lid. Strewn about the floor of the building were several decayed corn cobs. In the northwest corner, the floorboards had been cut away and revealed a kerosene can underneath the building, along with a length of chain and a modern shovel. These artifacts have yet to be fully explained though many theories abound as to their connection to the building.

The “Smokehouse”

The “smokehouse” measures some 142” wide by 194” long. The building faces east, with the long walls running east-west and a door on the east wall. A gable roof tops the structure. On the eastern wall, the gable actually projects nearly one and one half feet beyond the wall creating a covered entrance to the building. The height the structure to the projection is approximately 115 inches, and the height from the sill to the peak of the gable is 190 inches. The building is constructed of small timbers, but does not evidence the craftsmanship present in the main house or Grain Shed. (See Figure 114). The roof itself is relatively new and is made of asphalt shingles laid over new particle board sheathing which sits directly on top of the historic decking. The historic decking indicates that the original roof was probably wooden shakes. A chicken nesting boxes has been added to the south wall.

The interior of the structure has a raised wooden floor. The building is largely one big open space with no major divisions. There is a divider about three feet from the south wall which extends from the west wall, but it does not continue across the structure. Small shelves have been added in the corners of the east wall and planking

Figure 114. The framing of the “smokehouse”. The framing is substantial, though it does not evidence the attention to detail demonstrated in other buildings. Also visible are several patches of white rot on the interior of the siding.
Figure 115. A cut nail used as a hook to hang salted meats.

Figure 116. A hook attached to a beam used to hang salted meats according to Mr. Alton Housworth.

has been added across the rafters in places creating a lofted storage area, in addition to the lofted gable storage space.

Traditionally, this building has been called a “smokehouse” by neighbors and former owners, however it is clearly too large and improperly designed to be a smokehouse as it has a wooden floor and no evidence of a chimney.

Mr. Housworth indicated that the building was indeed used as storage site for meat. The meat, however, was salted rather than smoked. Additionally, he indicated that the area behind the partition to the south was used to store lard cans full of sorghum syrup manufactured at the mill and boiler by the creek. Mr. Housworth also recited a family story about Sherman’s soldiers confiscating the contents of the “smokehouse” including the salt used to cure the meats, and the family being forced to rake the dirt from beneath the structure to get salt to preserve what little livestock the soldiers left behind. (See Figures 115 and 116).

The building is in good condition, although it does evidence some issues with termite damage and deterioration due to age. On the interior of the north wall there is some black rot on the planking but it is small and patchy indicating the beginning of a water problem, or a water problem in the past. Lending further credence to the suspicion of a water problem is the fact that the flooring along the north side of the structure is rather spongy and sags greatly and is unsafe to walk upon. This may be caused by a failure of the floor joists or water damage. The flooring shows no visible signs of water damage, but the underside of the boards and the framing cannot be viewed due to the lack of space un-
derneath the structure. The flooring is attached with wire nails indicating that it may not be original to the structure and was replaced in the past. Perhaps the most pressing issue with the structure, other than the floor, concerns the frame. On the east wall at the north corner, the sill north of the floor has detached from the subsill, causing the wall to separate from the main framing members. No damage or rot is evident here, and the cause of the separation is not known.

The exterior surfaces of the building show a great deal of weathering and the grain of the vertical wood siding is ridging. The boards themselves confuse the dating of the structure due to the mixture of cut nails and wire nails. It is likely, however, that the wire nails were added later as reinforcing as the wood siding aged and likely began to warp and curl. This supposition is confirmed by the circular saw marks on the siding. The eastern wall shows evidence of warping on several boards. The western wall shows evidence of large sections of the siding being replaced; nearly half of the area of that particular wall has been replaced. (See Figure 117).

The replacement boards are very similar to the original siding, though they have not discolored or aged to the same condition as the rest of the boards. Indeed, they are a light grey while the remainder of the siding is a rough grey/brown color. The worst damage on the structure is actually caused by the chicken boxes on the south wall.

The chicken nesting boxes show evidence of major termite and water damage. They occupy a majority of the length of the wall and are mounted about waist high, on cleats nailed directly to the siding and supported in front by several posts. The boxes have a shed roof made of sheet metal. The eastern half of the chicken boxes has actually detached from the “smokehouse” and has collapsed from termite and water damage. The roof on this addition was improperly installed as no flashing is in place to prevent water from draining behind the boxes along the side of the building. The siding on the south wall evidences considerable water damage around
the chicken nesting boxes as a result. (See Figures 118 and 119).

**The Livestock Pen**

The last historic building on the property is the livestock pen. The pen is perhaps the most inaccessible structure on the site, located adjacent to the southwest corner of the corn crib at the edge of the dense thicket on the opposite side of the farm road which runs down towards the creek and the cane mill and boiler. The building is situated nearly on the property line, being some two feet away from the present fencing at its closest point. The building faces south-southwest and is approximately 177 inches wide by some 122 inches deep. A shed roof completes the structure which is some 83 inches high at the front and 61 inches high at the rear. Style-wise, the framing of the livestock pen matches that of the “smokehouse”. The front is sided with gapped horizontal siding, while the remaining sides are covered in vertical siding similar to that on the “smokehouse” though the boards are narrower. Based on the large preponderance of wire nails, the building was probably built last, though it may have existed previously in an unfinished form.

The structure itself is divided into two rooms via wooden fence on the inside. Each room has its own door. (See Figures 120 and 121). The doors themselves mirror each other being divided by the main framing member in the center of the wall, which also acts as the support for the fence-divider. According to neighbors the structure was used as a pen for newborn calves while the dogtrot, which is at most 20 yards away to the northwest, was used to house mature cows.

The calf pen is in near ruinous condition. The eastern room evidences large quantities of termite damage along the rafter and sill. There is also considerable water damage on the rear wall, including white rot on the
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sill. (See Figure 122). The structure’s central rafter has collapsed at the rear joint largely due to water damage. As a result the roof sags greatly and actually dislodged some of the rails on the dividing fence. Aside from the sagging roof, the western side of the building is actually in fair condition. While many of the framing members are damaged, most of the siding is in excellent condition, particularly the siding on south and west walls. Much of the damage to the structure is largely due to neglect and an accumulation of trash and leaves behind the building.

Figure 120. The right room or stall of the livestock pen.

Figure 121. The Left room of the livestock pen.

Figure 122. Detail of the water damage causing white and black rot at the roofline of the right stall in the livestock pen.
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Introduction

This section of the historic structure report is intended to outline a treatment plan for the Housworth-Moseley House and Farm that causes minimal adverse effect to the structure and its surrounding buildings.

The National Park Services describes rehabilitation as “the act of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.” For the Housworth-Moseley House, rehabilitation is the most appropriate method of preservation.

The house is a unique example of wood frame construction from the mid-1800s. Its original purpose was residential, and it should continue to be used in this fashion for the future owners. Sensitive rehabilitation is the recommended option for this house in order to make it marketable as a residential structure while at the same time preserving its almost unaltered historic interior features.

Recommendations for Treatment and Use

Property

The property is significant to the history and character of the home and is important to preserve. The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (No. 2)says that “the historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.” (See Appendix E).

In the case of this property, there are many character defining features on the property that need to be preserved such as the farm roads, the terraced land, the spring, the walk across the spring, and the sorghum boiler (chimney), the front lawn and the original setback of the structure.
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If new construction takes place on the land, such as an addition to the existing structure, a new driveway, or a new residence, this construction should meet the standards — they include recommendations for rehabilitation of new additions, roofs, windows, structural systems, site, and setting. In addition to referencing the Standards, the approval of the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation is also necessary for any changes to the structure or site.

For the outbuildings, preservation or rehabilitation may be difficult. There are three main outbuildings on the property; the corn crib, the calf pen the grain storage building. (See Figure 23 on Page 41). Recommendations for their rehabilitation are described below. Other structures or features on the property that warrant preservation are the farm roads, the terracing, the stream, the walk across the spring, and the sorghum boiler (chimney), the front lawn and the original setback of the structure. These features need to be maintained in order to preserve the property as a whole.

Some features on the property that do not warrant preservation and should be removed immediately are the trailer home and the aluminum storage shed. Besides being in very bad condition, these items are not historic and are not original to the property.

Interior

The interior of this home, although simple, is one of the character defining features of the home, and its authenticity should be preserved. The home is finished on the interior with wood planks, the oldest of them ranging from 15” to 19” wide. In order to preserve this feature, no paint or flooring materials should be used in the home. Also to preserve the home, the relationship of spaces within the structure should be preserved.

For rehabilitation of the home, new wiring, plumbing and HVAC systems will need to be installed. Included is a floor plan that suggests the use of each space in relation to their original purposes. (See Figure123).
Outbuildings

The outbuildings remaining on the site vary greatly in their condition based on their age and construction. If the site were to be preserved and opened as a museum or interpretive site, preserving each of the buildings as part of the overall system of interpreting the site would be imperative. Since turning the house into a museum is unlikely, no one solution can be generated to treat the group as a whole; each building must be approached on its own.

The livestock pen

Of all the buildings, the livestock pen is in the worst condition. The center rafter has buckled from water damage and from the weight of supporting the mass of vegetation and other debris on the roof. Some framing elements demonstrate termite and water damage. While the building is a total loss, some of the material may be salvaged.

The corn crib

Like the livestock pen, the corn crib demonstrates a great deal of deterioration. The corn crib, however, can be saved. While there is moderate termite damage, much of this appears to be evidence of a past problem, not a current one and is limited to several specific areas on the structure. The water damage, however, is an ongoing issue.

Indeed the amount of water damage to the roof and the condition of the walls make this structure unusable in its present condition. While there are many problems, repairing the roof will put an end to most of the water issues and the damaged logs can be replaced with new ones. Additionally, removing the vegetation near the structure will help slow the process of decay.

The grain shed

The grain shed is a unique structure and shows little damage that might place the building in danger of collapse. There is a fair amount of damage to the elements close to the ground, but this deterioration can be arrested.
and the structure preserved.

Removing the vegetation around the structure and cleaning out the area beneath it will largely remove those elements that place the lower portion in danger. Also, the foundation can be shored up with granite blocks gathered from the site – such repair may prove useful in areas where termites have damaged the mortice and tenon joints.

The roof should be returned to a hinged system to provide access to the interior, though that system does not have to be as complex as the counter-weighted system Mr. Alton Houseworth said had been used.

The ‘smokehouse’

The structure referred to as the “smokehouse” can likewise be preserved. Elements which place the structure in danger such as the decaying chicken nesting boxes on the south wall should be removed and the water damage and other issues addressed accordingly. The framing should be inspected and repairs made where necessary.

The water problems should diminish once the nesting box addition has been removed, though the damage caused by water and termites will remain. These issues should be addressed as circumstances dictate after a full examination of the damage once the addition has been removed. The damage may warrant replacement of part of the siding. Any such repairs should be made with in-kind materials.

The main issue in preserving the shed is the flooring. The support system for the flooring is failing in the center of the room causing the floor to sag greatly. The floor boards themselves should be removed and the support system either replaced or repaired as necessary and the floorboards then reinstalled. Once these issues are addressed, the building can be used for any conceivable use which does not irreversibly damage the structure.

Modern outbuildings

The more modern buildings pose unique questions. The mobile home and the aluminum storage shed are the detritus of more recent occupation and actually detract from the value of the remaining structures by encum-
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bering the historical layout of the property and potentially covering features of the landscape that may be of use in any effort to fully explore the site and its agricultural history. These buildings should be removed from the property in order to preserve the historical layout of the site.

The pump house for a modern drilled well. The building represents the construction methods of the era in which it was built, and its fate should be left to discretion of future owners of the site.

In general terms, present and future owners of the property can use the outbuildings for any purpose they deem fit, providing that use does not irreversibly damage the structures or harm their historical form. The sustainability of the outbuildings is directly related to the amount of care and attention devoted to them. A complete restoration of these structures is not mandatory, however. Future owners should approach their preservation as an integral part of preserving the site and its rural landscape. In addition to general inspections of building conditions, properly caring for the outbuildings would include regular termite inspections and treatments similar to those warranted in any house. Additionally, it may also be advisable to apply wood preservatives to the structures to prevent future decay.

Housworth-Moseley House

Sill and Floor Structural System

Room 102

This area appears to be in good condition. Additional air vents need to be installed along the foundation to help with cross ventilation and remove excess water from the area.

The ground in all accessible portions of the crawlspace, below this room and others, should be covered with plastic sheeting to provide a moisture barrier between the ground and the house.
Room 103

All joists with rot and insect damage should be inspected to make sure they are still stable and do not need to be replaced. The sill on the northern wall should also be inspected, as it shows signs of water damage and may be rotting. The floorboards need to be replaced or repaired as needed; these repairs do not have to be in kind as they would not be visible. Inspections should also be done to ensure that there are no longer insects in the wood. The plank that is supporting the joists on the eastern end should receive extra stabilization or some other bracing method should be installed. At least two more vents should be installed to help with cross-ventilation and help with evaporation of the water that is washing away the dirt surrounding the foundation.

Room 104

The cracks that have formed on the sill and support beams should be filled or repaired. The support system, mainly the foundation and concrete masonry unit piers, should be inspected to make sure they are providing enough support, as poor support may be the cause of the cracking.

Room 105

All wood should be inspected to ensure that there is no longer an insect infestation. Once the wood has been inspected, then repairs should be made to all wood that had insect damage and boards with extensive damage, particularly those on the north wall that have extensive damage to the tenon section of the joint. The concrete masonry unit pier that supports the beam between Rooms 103 and 105 needs to be inspected as it shows signs of cracking. The cement footing of the foundation wall needs to be back-filled with dirt.

Rooms 106-110

The foundation should have at least double the vents at present installed so as to create suitable cross ventilation to assist in evaporation below
the house. The damaged joist seen connected to the western sill beneath Room 109 should be sistered or partially replaced. The remaining conditions such as insect damage and repaired joists do not pose a problem structurally at this time.

**Exterior**

**Drainage**

The most significant recommendation for the exterior of the house is the addition of half-round gutters, downspouts and splash blocks to channel water away from the house. As noted throughout the conditions assessment, water has created the major problems with the exterior, and this water removal system, combined with appropriate grading around the foundation, will help prevent problems from recurring.

Rework the surface grade around the house to facilitate rapid rainwater runoff away from the house.

**Siding**

Because the siding is in such poor condition, the best course is to replace it. If the owners wish to preserve the characteristic look and feel of the house, wood siding will be the most likely option, though the replacement should be treated and sealed. Other siding options are available, of course, which would make installation and maintenance easier, though the character of the house may be compromised.

Woodpeckers and various insects have caused significant damage to the fascia and soffits around the house. These wooden features should be replaced with similar to simultaneously retain the character of the house and prevent moisture penetration into the structure.

**Historic Chimney**

Repoint the historic masonry chimney where the mortar is deteriorating particularly between the north side of the chimney and the clapboards. Use a mortar of the same color, texture and type as the historic lime mortar.
The upper six feet of the chimney needs repair as well. Use of Portland cement is compatible with this non-historic part of the chimney. Loose stones should be reseated, missing stones replaced and all repointed with contemporary material.

The plant material growing from the projecting courses at the base of the chimney has the potential for damaging the stone and mortar either from water retention, root growth or both. This plant material should be removed and the soil they grow in cleaned out to prevent future growth.

**South Side Chimney**

Repoint the reconstructed chimney on the south façade with Portland cement, the material used in its assembly. Fill in the gaps in the upper half of the structure to secure the rubble attached to the CMU’s and to create a more uniform appearance in the feature.

**Decks and Stairs**

The deck outside Door D1 is contemporary, though there is anecdotal evidence of a similar structure existing before this was built. The deck is in excellent condition, especially compared to the rest of the exterior. There is no reason to remove it, since it adds a feature that enhances livability and leisure use of the house, though it may need to be dismantled temporarily to replace the siding at that part of the house. When reinstalled, the owners should install a railing to prevent falls.

The stairs outside Door D5 and Door D10 are shoddy in materials and workmanship, and the stairs at D5 in particular suffer from the same weather problems as the siding. The steps and railings at D5 should be replaced with new wood, and risers should be added to the steps. The whole construction should be more securely attached to the side of the house. As with any exterior wood that will be replaced, the rails, steps and risers should all be treated and sealed against the elements.

The steps at D10 are in better condition, but still need to be replaced with treated and sealed lumber, and risers added. Handrails should be added for convenience and safety.
Doors

Door D1 needs to be cleaned with a fine spray water wash, allowed to dry out completely, and restained to provide a protective coat against the elements. New screen doors should be installed on all three entrances into the house.

Windows

Replace the four missing window panes on Window W11 immediately to prevent the house from becoming infested and to deter possible vandals. Remove the lichens and mold from the window surrounds. Repair the deteriorated muntins on windows W2, W4 and W12. The sub sill at Window W9 is spongy with moisture and will need to be replaced.

The windows present a special problem. The rails, stiles, surrounds and muntins are all made of the same untreated wood as other exterior elements, and thus suffer from the same problems of exposure, moisture, mold and lichen. Replacement windows of a character similar to the replacement siding may be difficult to find, yet repairing the existing windows may be cost prohibitive. Even so, it would be more expensive to repair the existing windows. The damages windows should be replaced with windows that mimic the historic Window W6.

CMU Exterior Foundation

Remove the lichens and other plant growth from the foundation at the northeast corner of the building. Secure the bricks that have been inserted into the gaps below the vents in the foundation walls. Trim the wooden door to the crawlspace under Window W15 and attach a new hasp so that the door can be closed securely. Repoint the deteriorated Portland cement between the CMUs in the foundation walls where necessary and fill the hole in the CMU on the south facade of the building.

Roof
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A close inspection of the roof was not possible during either site visit. The roof should be inspected thoroughly to ascertain the general condition of the roofing material. Particular attention should be paid to the metal roof over rooms 107 and 110, where damage to the overhanging portion was noted in the conditions assessment. In addition, the area of this roof near the gable where a wooden board has been cemented into place should be carefully scrutinized.

Interior

Attic

This area requires a general clean up. There are old boards and molding stored on top of the ceiling joist, there are active wasp nest, and there is evidence of animal nesting material in different locations of this area. A general search needs to be made and the egress points for both animals and insects need to be found, secured, and closed, and all debris needs to be removed.

Room 101

The rolled vinyl flooring should be removed and the wooden floor beneath repaired or replaced. If repair is the decision, then all floorboards should be inspected for stability and then cleaned with the gentlest means possible. The floor should then receive a clear protective coating. Replacement should be done in kind, according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation; replacement could be done with tongue and groove boards similar to those found in Rooms 102 and 105. W2 should receive new glazing and all water damaged wood should be cleaned and repaired. Some form of clear protective coating should also be applied to the window to prevent further damage after repairs. D1 should be cleaned to remove water staining and a clear protective coating should be applied.
to prevent any future damage; reconditioning is a second option as D1 is not a historic door. Water staining and damage to the southeast and southwest corners of Room 101 should be cleaned and repaired with the gentlest means possible.

Room 102

The first concern should be to find the source of water that is damaging the wood in Room 102. After the source of the water problem has been identified, it should be repaired to insure that it does not cause any further damage. There should also be a thorough inspection to ensure that there is not active insect infestation. If there are signs that insect infestation is still present, proper steps should be taken to remove the insects and insure they do not return, but this should be done in such a manner so as not to damage any materials in the room.

The floors in Room 102 should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove excess dirt and debris and then they should all receive a clear protective finish. The boards that have water and termite damage should be repaired whenever possible and if they are too deteriorated, they should be replaced in kind according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The floorboards that are loose, particularly those surrounding the fireplace hearth, should be secured.

The walls should also be cleaned with the gentlest means possible. All boards that have been damaged by water should be cleaned whenever possible to remove mold and rot. The boards that are more damaged than others, such as those above the fireplace, should be inspected to see if they are still sound enough for reuse and then repaired before receiving a protective coating. The wall boards that have begun to deteriorate, like those below Window W5, should be repaired if possible. The studs and wood behind the wallboards should also be inspected for possible water or insect damage. The insulation that has been added to the walls should be checked to make sure that it is still effective; when replacement is necessary it should be done with a material that will not cause damage to the surrounding wood. Wall boards that are not reusable should be replaced in
Windows W3, W4, and W5 have been replaced, but Window W6 is original to the house, and there are two options for treatment. The first option is to manufacture three new windows to match the original design and replace the replacement windows. The second option is to re-glaze the three exterior windows to prevent further water damage and repair and re-glaze the original window with comparable materials. If the decision is to re-glaze the windows rather than replace them, then all water damaged wood should be repaired, cleaned and treated with a protective coating. All windows should be inspected to make sure they are in proper working order, ensuring that no water is able to leak through the jamb and all parts are secured properly. Also, if the windows are not replaced, then the infill wood above the top trim and below the apron should be replaced in kind to match the surrounding wood panels.

The doors should all be cleaned and inspected to make sure they are in proper working order; loose screws and nails should be tightened and all hardware should be checked to make sure it will not cause damage to the surrounding wood or deteriorate, causing the door to fail or fall and cause damage to the flooring or walls. The door leading into Room 101, which is in very poor condition, should be repaired if possible or a replacement should be made with in kind materials. The casing for this door should also be repaired; the insect or water damage that has caused pieces to crack off should be treated. All doors should be checked for possible insect damage, cracks and water damage and the proper treatment for each should be employed; this would mean infill or patchwork for cracks and cleaning and repair for water or insect damage. All exterior doors should receive a clear protective coating once they have been inspected and treated for damage.

The fireplace flue should be inspected and cleaned by a licensed professional. Also, a screen should be installed at the top of the flue, to prevent animals from entering the house through the chimney. The Portland cement that has been applied to the hearth should be removed and necessary repairs should be done with a mortar that is similar to the original mortar. The wood mantel should be cleaned and checked for any neces-
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sary repairs.

The ceiling panels should all be cleaned and studied to ensure that the water damage is not too extensive. Where water damage has occurred, the boards should be cleaned and repaired wherever possible and replaced with in kind materials only when absolutely necessary. The panel that has a hole of unknown origin should be inspected to find the source of the damage and then repaired.

All repairs and replacements, which should occur only when absolutely necessary, should be done in kind and according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Room 103

The first order of business in this room is to identify and repair the source for the water damage. Since the majority of the damage is coming from above, the roof should be the first place that is inspected. Once the source of the water has been identified and repaired, then repairs to other areas can be performed.

The flooring will need extensive repairs, especially on the northern wall. The floor should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove any dirt or debris. The floorboards that have serious rot and water damage will likely need to be replaced; the boards that have cracked, split and lost portions will definitely need to be replaced. All replacements should be done with comparable materials. The entire floor should be inspected to determine the extent of the water damage and because rot and water damage can be seen on the floor joist and sill below this room, the water damage is extensive. The cracks and rot that do not require replacement wood should be repaired to be as un-noticeable as possible. Once all repairs and replacements have been made, then the floor should receive a clear protective coating.

The walls all need to be cleaned to remove dirt and water stains. The rot and water damage on the walls should also be cleaned and inspected. The clapboard on the western wall, particularly the bottom plank on the southern side of Door D9, will need to be repaired. Depending on the
extent of the water damage to the western wall, some boards may need to be replaced, and this should be done with in kind materials. The trim at the top of the northern wall, above the picture window, will need extensive repairs or will need to be replaced, depending on what is revealed after the rot and water damage are inspected. The wallboards surrounding the picture window will also need extensive repairs or replacement. The southern wall will need repairs to fill in cracks and make sure the clapboards are secure. The mold that has formed at the top of the southern wall should be cleaned and any damage caused by the mold should be repaired. All clapboards should also be inspected to make sure they are secure.

The windows all need to be re-glazed. The water damage to the muntins and sills should be cleaned and repaired. A protective coating should be applied to all windows once the necessary repairs have been made. Door D10 should be cleaned and water damage should be assessed. The water stains should be removed and the wood should be inspected to determine if repairs are necessary. The sill at the threshold of Door D10 should be replaced with in kind material, as much of the bottom portion has rotted away, leaving a gap between the sill and the floor. The casing around Door D8 needs to be repaired to address the insect damage that has deteriorated the lower section on the western side of the trim. This should be done with in kind material after the wood is inspected to ensure there is no further risk of infestation.

The ceiling panels should all be cleaned and all rot and water damage should be removed or cleaned. The third and fourth ceiling boards will likely need to be replaced because of the extent of the water damage and rot. The panels near the southern wall that have begun to crack should be patched or filled in.

Room 104

The source of water causing damage to the northwest corner should be found and repaired; a thorough inspection of the attic space and roof above would be the likely place to start since the water is coming from above.
The vinyl flooring should be removed and all floorboards should be cleaned to remove any adhesive residue. The floorboards should all be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove any dirt or debris. Cracks should be patched or repaired and all floorboards should be inspected to ensure they are sound. For boards that have water or insect damage, the source of the problem should be identified and treated. The baseboard that has come away from the wall should be reattached to prevent any debris, water or insects from getting into the wall behind.

The boards on the western wall that have been replaced are similar enough to the surrounding panels that they can be left alone. The boards on the southern wall that are loose should be secured more tightly and inspected to make sure they are not loose because of some unseen damage, such as insects or rot. In the northwest corner, where water damage has occurred on almost all the wallboards, the wood should be cleaned and repaired. Where the water damage is extensive and replacement is necessary, this should be done with in kind materials.

There are two options for treatment of windows W12 and W13 in this room, the same two options available for the exterior windows in Room 102. New windows can be manufactured to match the original dimensions and design of Window W6 or the existing windows can be re-glazed and repaired. If re-glazing and repair is the choice, then the water damage to the muntins and sill should be cleaned and repaired. All jambs and moving parts should be inspected to make sure they are in proper working order and the entire window should be treated with a protective coating. Also, if the windows are not replaced, the wood that has been filled in above the casing and below the apron should be replaced to match the surrounding wood, with in kind materials. The door jamb should be inspected to ensure that the hardware is secure and in proper working order.

The water damage that has occurred on the ceiling in the northwest corner should be treated; boards that have been damaged should be cleaned and repaired and only replaced when necessary and done with in kind ma-
All ceiling panels should be inspected for water damage and cleaned and repaired where necessary.

**Room 105**

The source of the water damage that is evident on the ceiling should be located and fixed. The foundation beams and support system under this room should also be inspected to address the settling issue in the southeast corner; stabilization of the piers below may be necessary.

The floor boards should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove and dirt or debris. The spots where bird droppings were located should be checked to make sure no staining or damage has occurred to the wood. If there is any cracking, water or insect damage present after cleaning, then each condition should be addressed with proper care; this would entail repairing and filling cracks, checking for active infestation and repairing any insect damage and cleaning and repairing any water damage. All floorboards should receive a clear protective coating.

The wallboards should all be cleaned with the gentlest means possible. The mud-dauber’s nest near the phone jack should be carefully removed and the area beneath the nest should be inspected for damage; if there is damage present, it should be repaired. The wallboards that have fallen at an angle on the southern wall due to settling should be repositioned so that they are in line with the surrounding panels. The water damage that is visible on the boards surrounding the windows should be cleaned and repaired. If for some reason replacement is necessary, then it should be done with in kind materials.

The windows in Room 105, like those in Rooms 102 and 104, have been replaced and as such, can be treated in either of the two manners that the other replaced windows can be treated; the windows can be replaced with windows manufactured to match the original design or they can be re-glazed and repaired. If the windows are to be repaired rather than replaced then there is one additional step that must be taken to repair Win-
The missing panes of glass should be replaced to match the existing panes as much as possible. Once the panes have been replaced, then the windows should be re-glazed and cleaned. The water damage should be treated by cleaning the affected areas and repairing any rot that may have occurred. Once all repairs have been made, the window jambs and all moving parts should be inspected to make sure they are in working order and the window should be checked to make sure all areas are water-tight and secure. The areas above the trim and below the apron, where there is in-fill wood, should be re-filled to make the repairs match the surrounding wood as much as possible. The door should be cleaned and repaired to remove signs or water damage, rot and mold. The cracks that have formed at the top of the door should be filled or patched. The hardware should be inspected to make sure it is secure and that the door will remain in working order.

The ceiling should be cleaned. The areas where there is water damage should be repaired and if replacement is necessary, it should be done with comparable material.

**Room 106**

The floor can be treated in two manners, either the current vinyl flooring can be removed or it can be repaired. If the vinyl is left on, then the sections of the flooring that have begun to pull up should be secured. If the vinyl is to be removed, then the floor beneath should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible and then the floorboards should be inspected for any damage that was not present while the wood was covered. Once the floor has been cleaned, inspected and all damage has been treated, then the floor should receive a clear protective coating.

The walls should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove any water damage. The gaps between the panels on the western wall that have been filled with glue or caulk should be cleaned and the filler should be removed with the gentlest means possible. The gaps that have formed between the wall panels can be left as is; they panels can also be numbered, removed and then reattached leaving a gap at the base of the wall. The gap
at the base should be filled with an in kind wood or a baseboard similar to those found in Rooms 102, 104 and 105.

The source of water damage that has stained the ceiling panels should be identified and treated. The stains that have occurred on the ceiling and wall panels should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible and then treated to prevent further damage.

The fixtures in both Room 106 and Room 107 should at least be cleaned or, where necessary, replaced.

**Room 107**

The floor needs to be cleaned with the gentlest means possible and all areas that have water damage need to be treated. The area around the toilet that has severe signs of rot should be inspected to ensure that the floorboards do not need to be completely replaced. If replacement is found to be necessary, then this should be done with in kind material. The floorboards near Room 108 that show signs of rot should be inspected as well to determine if replacement is necessary; if replacement is necessary, then it should be done in kind.

The walls should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove any dirt. The panels to the west of Room 108 that have evidence of fire damage should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible and inspected to make sure that no extensive damage has occurred. If repair is found to be necessary, then it should be done with in kind materials.

The ceiling panels to the west of Room 108 that have evidence of fire damage should be inspected to determine the extent of the damage; if replacement is found to be necessary it should be done with in kind materials. The panels surround the southern wall of Room 108 that have some signs of water damage should be inspected and repaired or replaced where necessary; replacement should be done only when necessary and should be done with in kind materials.

Window W14 should be cleaned to remove and water and mold damage on the muntins and sill. The window should be reglazed to prevent further water damage.
Room 108

The floor needs to be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to determine the extent of water damage and rot. Once the extent of damage has been determined then repair and replacement should be preformed. When replacement is deemed necessary, then it may be done with the best materials possible, as this room is not visible.

The walls should all be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove any fire and water damage. Cleaning will reveal the extent of fire and water damage and identify if repairs or replacement are necessary. Where replacement is necessary, this can be done with the best material possible as this is not a visible room.

The ceiling in Room 108 should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove any water and fire damage. Once the extent of damage has been determined, then repairs and replacement should be performed. Complete replacement is an option if it is deemed necessary as this room is not visible.

Room 109

The floor of Room 109 should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible remove any dirt or debris. The boards in front of the fireplace hearth that have been repaired with caulk or glue should be thoroughly cleaned to remove the filler material and a proper repair should be done; a replacement made with in kind material would be the best option. The floor should receive a clear protective coating to protect the materials.

The walls should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove any water staining and damage. The area to the east of the fireplace should receive particular attention as it shows signs of scorching.

The windows should be cleaned to remove and water damage and the glazing should be repaired to prevent further water damage. The air conditioning unit that has been installed in W1 should be removed and the surrounding wood should be inspected for damage. As there is evidence of a previous window of different dimensions, but the configuration is
unknown, the current window should continue to be used. The infill wood
to the south of W1 should be replaced with in kind material to make it as
unnoticeable as possible.

The ceiling panels on the eastern wall should be cleaned with the
gentlest means possible to remove any smoke and water damage. Repair
should be done wherever necessary, but if replacement is necessary, then
it should be done with in kind materials. The hole that has been left by
the removal of the stove should be filled or covered with in kind materials
rather than a piece of plywood. The gap that is present between the ceiling
panels and wall panels on the eastern wall should be filled with an in kind
material, possibly by inserting a molding similar to the simple baseboard
found in other rooms of the house.

Room 110

The floor should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove
any dirt or debris. The wall panels above D4 that show signs of water dam-
age should be cleaned with the gentlest means possible to remove the dam-
age and then inspected to determine the extent of damage; repair should
be done if necessary and replacement should be done only if necessary
and then done with in kind materials and according to the Secretary of the
Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Both windows should be cleaned to
remove water damage from the failing glazing and then new glazing should
be added to prevent future damage. D5 should be cleaned to remove water
staining and then it should receive a protective coating to prevent future
damage.

Miscellaneous

Fill the hole behind the electrical box on the west façade to prevent
moisture, insect and animal penetration, and either close up the junction
box on the south side or install a fixture to prevent an electrical fire.

Remove all wasp nests from the house.
Prioritized Non-Routine Maintenance Checklist

These items, listed in order of importance, should be completed as soon as possible. Neglecting these items will significantly hasten the deterioration of the structure

- Replace missing window panes
- Install gutters, downspouts, and splashblocks
- Repair foundation
- Install new clapboards on exterior and add new insulation
- Install plastic sheeting in the crawlspace
- Replace fascia and soffits damaged by birds and insects
- Repair floor in Room 103
- Update or repair electrical fixtures inside the house
- Replace HVAC system

Routine Maintenance Checklist

Weekly Maintenance
- Mow grass (during late spring to early fall)
- Sweep porch and steps
- Clean interior

Monthly Maintenance
- Weed, rake and tidy garden areas
- Inspect exterior and make note of maintenance issues
- Inspect windows for cracks and breaks; replace as necessary

Annual Maintenance
- Clean gutters and downspouts (twice a year, spring and fall)
- Clean off debris from flat roof and shed roof (twice a year, spring
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- Clean windows
- Service HVAC system (twice a year at least, spring and fall)
- Replant garden areas as necessary (fall)
- Inspect roof and repair/replace loose shingles if necessary
- Identify and repoint areas where areas on chimney mortar has crumbled at the joints between stones
- Control for pests

As-needed maintenance

- Replace roof (every 15-20 years depending on durability)
- Repaint interior and exterior (every 5-7 years or as needed)
- Replace rotted or missing wood on exterior
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Window, W6, is believed to be the only surviving original window in the house. One loose pane of glass from Window W6 was measured, taking several measurements around the edges, which averaged to 1.55mm in thickness. The product of Moir’s formula suggests the glass of this window was produced in 1843. The accepted standard deviation for the formula is seven years, which means the date of window manufacture can be dated between 1836 and 1850.

The thickness of flat window glass slowly and steadily increased as the cylinder method of manufacturing was refined prior to machine manufacturing of glass in the early twentieth century. Subsequently, flat window glass from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries can be closely dated by using formulae utilizing the average thickness measurements. Randall Moir’s formula is accepted as providing the most consistently accurate results in the southeastern United States. (Moir 1987)

**Moir’s Formula**

\[
\text{Date of Manufacture} = 84.22 \times (\text{Mean Thickness in mm.}) + 1712.7.
\]

Window W6 averaged 1.55 mm in thickness. Applying Moir’s formula,
then, the date was determined as follows:

\[ 84.22(1.55) + 1712.7 = 1,843.21 \]

The result of this calculation was rounded and converted to a date to yield the year 1843.

Source:
Several industrial features found on the south side of the creek, suggest unequivocally that cane sorghum was produced on the Housworth-Moseley site. The earliest record of cane production comes from an 1880 document concerning the purchase of farm goods among which was cane.

A sorghum boiler constructed of dry-laid fieldstones is the central visible element of the production process. The date of this structure is uncertain, however, further research on the portion of railroad track acting as the lintel for the chimney, may prove useful. Currently the boiler sets in a near ruinous state with some of the stones being dislodged and the tray area silted up.

Another sorghum production artifact found approximately 40 feet to the southeast of the boiler, is the Chattanooga Plow Company cane mill. This cane mill was patented on November 25, 1890 by the Chattanooga Plow Company and was continuously produced until 1919, when the company was purchased by International Harvester.

Up the hill, approximately 30 feet south from the boiler, a small disused farm road appears to terminate and was probably created for transporting cane products. This combination of a purpose-built access road, cane mill, and boiler provides an outstanding representation of the turn of the nineteenth century small scale sorghum industry.

**Description**

According to Alton Housworth, Jr. the termination point of the access road was the original location of the cane mill. The mill was constructed for continuous operation with a pipe connecting the mill spout to the gravity flow evaporation trays on the boiler.

For more information regarding the history and production of cane sorghum, see the 1912 Farmer’s Bulletin 477 published by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Near the boiler, toward the northwest, is located a spring head. This feature is circular in plan, and lined with fieldstones and rubble stones without mortar. The stone lining continues toward the north as a small channel which connects the spring head to the creek.
A historic pump mechanism is present in the spring head; however, no information was gained from this artifact. According to Alton Housworth, Jr., this spring head feature was the main source of water for the house.

**Conditions Assessment**

The sorghum cane boiler is in fair condition. The primary issues to be addressed are the factors contributing to the boiler walls leaning. The collection of large amounts of forest debris swells the interior portion of the boiler. A small tree assists in supporting the northern wall from tipping completely. Numerous stones toward the eastern portion of the boiler have fallen over.

The spring head is in good condition in general. The main threat to the spring head is the foliage growing from the joints of the walls. There is also a fair amount of forest debris which has accumulated in the spring and channel.

**Recommendations**

It is suggested that the cane boiler and the spring head are stabilized and rehabilitated. Given the unique condition of this sorghum production assemblage, every effort should be made to keep all features together in a lasting state. The cane boiler should have its stone walls re-lain and the intrusive tree cut down.

The interior of the boiler should have the forest debris removed. During the process of rehabilitating the boiler it would prove advantageous to have an archaeological investigation of the site, to excavate the interior and around the boiler. Several fragments of historic bottles were noticed during
the conditions assessment and further investigation of artifacts might assist in dating the construction and use of the boiler.

All foliage growing in the joints of the boiler and spring head should be removed in a sensitive manner. The cane mill should be kept with the assemblage and stored to prevent degradation.
The dogtrot is probably the first structure built on the Housworth-Moseley site and probably served as the original home while the adjacent structure, the subject of this study, was being built.

Once the homestead was completed, the Dogtrot was, according to oral interviews with Alton Housworth, used as a stable for draft animals—an assertion that is supported by the existence of the hayloft above both log pens. Further evidence for this use of the property is found in the feed troughs found on the east wall in each pen.

**Figure D-1 (above) and Figure D-2.** Figure D-1 shows the dogtrot, a structure original to the site and now on an adjacent property east of the Housworth-Moseley site. Figure D-2 shows a detail of the roof support system. The loft was accessed via scuttle holes in the loft floor above each of the log pens and doors on each end at the gable.
The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
The Housworth-Moseley site has the potential to yield information on the development of the historic and potentially prehistoric occupation of the region. The project area is located in the southeastern corner of DeKalb County, Georgia, near the Midland Slope section of the Piedmont physiological province.

The historic archaeological resources of the site should provide information on existing structures and historic landscape usage. Based upon the present existence of many original nineteenth-century outbuildings, the lack of reconstruction activity on the site supports the possibility that features, such as privies, remain undisturbed. For more information about the arrangement of existing and known previous structures, view the complete site map in Appendix C.

Little is known about the slave activity on the site, and there is a possibility of unknown residential structures. Records show the Housworth family purchased a slave in 1852, who was a blacksmith. Excavations in the area known to have been used for blacksmithing in the twentieth century, might prove the existence of a longer tradition on the property.

There is also a possibility the dogtrot structure on the neighboring property was used as a temporary residence by the family prior to construction of the current house. The implementation of test units around the dogtrot should yield information if it has been used as a residence for either the family or for slaves.

Although the site possesses numerous areas of significant slope, there is enough area present that might yield prehistoric sites. The area along the creek and the gently sloping sections south of the creek and the vicinity around the house, provide the highest probability zones of prehistoric activity. Due to the extensive Native American activity in this region further study is suggested.

Field methods suggested include systematic surface and subsurface investigations consisting of short interval shovel testing, metal detector survey, and formal test unit excavations. Due to the anticipated construction of a house on the southern portion of the lot along with an access road, the areas to be impacted are uncertain at this time.
potential information which might be gained from this site is significant. In particular issues relating to small plantation activity could be answered by excavation of the Housworth-Moseley site. Four key questions should be investigated by means of excavation.

1. How did the spatial arrangement of the plantation change through time? How does it compare to other plantations in the region?
2. What dietary patterns are evident from the privies? How does this pattern change over time? How does it compare to the patterns of the surrounding region?
3. What can be implied about the slave/master relationship at the Housworth site? Did slaves live on the site or were they quartered off the site?
4. What socioeconomic conditions are indicated by artifacts on the site? How does this change over time and does it correspond with the documented history of the family?
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