

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

**DRAFT**

# National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form*. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. **Place additional certification comments, entries, and narrative items on continuation sheets if needed (NPS Form 10-900a).**

## 1. Name of Property

historic name Village of Southampton Historic District Expansion

other names/site number \_\_\_\_\_

name of related multiple property

listing \_\_\_\_\_

## Location

street &

number \_\_\_\_\_

city or Southampton

town \_\_\_\_\_

state NY

code \_\_\_\_\_

county Suffolk

code \_\_\_\_\_

zip code \_\_\_\_\_

not for

publication

vicinity

## 3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,

I hereby certify that this X nomination \_\_\_\_\_ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

In my opinion, the property X meets \_\_\_\_\_ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:

    national     statewide     local

Signature of certifying official/Title

Date

State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

In my opinion, the property     meets \_\_\_\_\_ does not meet the National Register criteria.

Signature of commenting official

Date

Title

State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

DRAFT

Name of Property

County and State

#### 4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

☐ entered in the National Register

☐ determined eligible for the National Register

☐ determined not eligible for the National Register

☐ removed from the National Register

☐ other (explain:)

Signature of the Keeper

Date of Action

#### 5. Classification

##### Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	private
<input type="checkbox"/>	public - Local
<input type="checkbox"/>	public - State
<input type="checkbox"/>	public - Federal

##### Category of Property

(Check only **one** box.)

<input type="checkbox"/>	building(s)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	district
<input type="checkbox"/>	site
<input type="checkbox"/>	structure
<input type="checkbox"/>	object

##### Number of Resources within Property

(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

Contributing	Noncontributing	
462	135	buildings
0	0	sites
0	0	structures
0	0	objects
462	135	<b>Total</b>

##### Name of related multiple property listing

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

n/a

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

n/a

#### 6. Function or Use

##### Historic Functions

(Enter categories from instructions.)

DOMESTIC/single dwellings

COMMERCE/business, restaurant

GOVERNMENT/fire station

EDUCATION/school

RELIGION/religious facilities/church

HEALTHCARE/hospital

##### Current Functions

(Enter categories from instructions.)

DOMESTIC/single dwellings

COMMERCE/business/restaurant

GOVERNMENT/fire station

EDUCATION/school

RELIGION/religious facilities/church

HEALTHCARE/hospital

DRAFT

Name of Property

County and State

---

## 7. Description

---

### Architectural Classification

(Enter categories from instructions.)

LATE VICTORIAN/Gothic Revival, Queen Anne,

Italianate, Shingle Style

LATE 19<sup>TH</sup> & 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY REVIVALS/

Colonial Revival, Craftsman/Bungalow,

Tudor Revival

MODERN MOVEMENT/Cape Cod, Ranch Style

### Materials

(Enter categories from instructions.)

foundation: Concrete, brick, stone

walls: Wood, stucco, brick, synthetics

roof: Asphalt shingle, metal, tile

other: N/A

DRAFT

Name of Property

County and State

---

### **Narrative Description**

(Describe the historic and current physical appearance of the property. Explain contributing and noncontributing resources if necessary. Begin with a **summary paragraph** that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, setting, size, and significant features.)

#### **Summary Paragraph**

The Southampton Village Historic District Boundary Expansion represents an increase in the geographic extent of the Southampton Village Historic District, listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1988, and first expanded in 1992. This expansion is a result of a Reconnaissance Level Historic Resources Survey undertaken in 2022-2023 by the Village of Southampton in the north and south areas of the village. Due to the similarity of the development history as well as the similarity in architectural character, it was determined that these areas were indistinct from and comparable to the existing district. Areas in the northeast section of the village were also determined as potentially contributing; however, it was determined to focus on the northwest and south areas of the village first.

Currently, the Southampton Village Historic District consists of a cohesive and contiguous primarily residential area of Suffolk County that also includes a number of religious, municipal, and commercial buildings. This area illustrates a concerted period of development between 1662 and 1935, documenting the history and architecture of the district in those years and generally encompassing the earliest surviving buildings in the district up to and including 1935. Contributing resources encompassed a broad range of architectural styles within this period.

The new period of significance for the Southampton Village Historic District continues into 1954 and includes the expanded areas to the northwest and south, as well as a re-evaluation of the formerly non-contributing buildings and the previously undocumented buildings within the existing district for eligibility under the new period of significance.

---

### **Narrative Description**

#### **Neighborhood Characteristics: Location, Plan, and Nearby Landmarks**

The expanded area of the Southampton Historic District is located to the northwest and south of the current district. The topography in these areas is generally level. The expanded area is primarily organized on a regular grid street plan. The grid is oriented in alignment on a cardinal axis; streets run north-south or east-west. The exception to the grid is Toylsome Lane. This street is curvilinear and creates a bend at the south end of the expanded district. The largest portion of the expanded area, the southern portion, is located along the southeast border of the existing district. It is bounded by the north side of Cameron Street to the north and South Main Street to the west. The boundary then cuts across the north end of Little Plains Road south to Lewis Street and east to the west side of Old Town Road. It then travels south to include both sides of Toylsome Lane as well as Toylsome Place. The smaller portion of the expanded area, the northwest portion, is located along the northern border of the existing district. It begins at the northwest corner of Henry Street at Howell Street and runs east to Halsey Street, encompassing both sides of Halsey Street down south to Hill Street as well as the western section of Cooper Street and all of Armande Street. This section is bordered to the west by Moses Lane between Hill and Pelham Street.

The nominated expansion area is predominantly residential with some municipal and public buildings, church, and commercial buildings.

DRAFT

Name of Property

County and State

## **Streetscape Character and Integrity**

All the streets in the expanded district are one-lane, two-way streets except Windmill Lane (northerly) and Nugent Street (easterly); these streets are located in the northern portion of the district. All streets are paved with asphalt. East-west and north-south streets in the expanded district do not have uniform curbs or sidewalks. Partial concrete walkways occur but are not consistently found. Most streetscapes are defined by closely spaced houses and shallow and relatively even street setbacks and mature landscaping. Rows of curbside trees, many contemporary with the initial development of the neighborhoods, line the streets within the expansion area. Garages and driveways are common in the expanded district but not universal.

Most properties in the expanded district retain substantial integrity and contribute to the character of the streetscape; its contiguous location to the existing district, period of development, and similarity in architecture were the primary factors in determining the expanded district's boundaries. While few properties are entirely unaltered, most retain enough of their original character that they continue to contribute to the significance of the district. Changes that weaken the integrity of individual properties, but that in most cases do not substantially detract from the integrity of the district, include some instances of siding replacement, window replacement, or incompatible changes to porches, such as replacement of original rails or supports with new wood or PVC. In a few cases, these changes are so extensive that the property's historic character is essentially lost; these buildings are listed as non-contributing.

In some cases, alterations made within the expanded district's period of significance have achieved their own significance and are not considered detrimental to the property's integrity. This is most often the case where wood porches were replaced in-kind with wood porches or enclosed in the early-to-mid-twentieth century; some of these features have their own integrity of design and today, having been in place for well over fifty years, are considered part of the historic character of the house. The house at 57 Cameron Street (contributing) is a good example.

## **Architectural Style and Type**

Buildings in the expanded historic district vary in architectural character, this reflects the long period in which the Village of Southampton developed, during which architectural fashions and building techniques changed considerably. The most consistent architectural feature is height, with most buildings being one-to-two-and-a-half-stories tall. Most display regular fenestration and are vertically oriented. Buildings are generally in continuous rows along both sides of the streets. The character of the built environment of the expanded district is very similar. It contains a mix of mostly residential and a small amount of interspersed commercial buildings from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. The southern part of the expanded district contains the oldest buildings, constructed between the 1850s and early 1950s. Buildings in the northwest part of the district were built primarily between 1910 and the early 1950s. With the exception of late twentieth/early twenty-first century infill, most buildings in the district remain largely true to original nineteenth to mid-twentieth-century design.

Buildings in the expanded district reflect a range of popular architectural styles from the late nineteenth century such as the Italianate, to the Minimal Traditional style of the early 1950s. There are a couple of styles represented in the expanded district that were popular in the late Victorian era such as the Queen Anne and

**DRAFT**

Name of Property

County and State

Shingle Style. Early-to-mid-century styles found in the district are the Tudor Revival, Colonial Revival, Dutch Colonial Revival, American Foursquare, and Craftsman/Bungalow. Styles in the district are discussed in more detail in Section 8, under Architecture.

While the overall integrity of the district is high, most buildings reflect some level of alteration and change. The majority of buildings that were present during the period of significance (1662-1954) are still present and recognizable. Common alterations include porch enclosures, window replacement either in original openings or in openings altered to accommodate standard replacement units, and replacement siding.

### **Integrity and Contributing/Non-Contributing Methodology**

As a summer community, a certain degree of alteration and changes have been made to most buildings. Some have had materials installed with lower maintenance in mind. The following criteria were used to evaluate the contributing and non-contributing status of properties in the district:

- **Date:** the building must have been constructed during the period of significance (1662-1954). Buildings constructed after the period of significance are considered non-contributing.
- **Location:** the building must be in its original location or must have been moved to its present site during the period of significance.

In addition, the building must retain enough integrity of design, workmanship, materials, and feeling to convey its historic appearance and significance in the context of the district according to the following:

#### **Form:**

- The original form of a building must be legible. Alterations to a building that do not obscure its historic form and footprint are acceptable and considered contributing. Additions that significantly change or obscure the historic form are noncontributing with one exception: commercial buildings sometimes display a hybrid character – as in a residence converted to a store. If these changes have taken place during the period of significance, they are considered to contribute to the district under the theme of commerce.

#### **Exterior cladding:**

- Contributing commercial buildings should retain a predominance of materials that date from the period of significance, including both original and/or historic materials from upgrades up until 1954. Given the pressure on commercial owners to continually upgrade their buildings, more contemporary materials (such as windows, see below) may have been added subsequently. The building will remain contributing as long as these later materials do not significantly obliterate design.

#### **Fenestration:**

DRAFT

Name of Property

County and State

- Replacement windows in the same openings do not make a building non-contributing as long as the trim and the size of the windows have been maintained. Replacement windows in altered openings may be acceptable if the original opening remains readable and can be restored. Replacement windows outside the period of significance that completely change the fenestration by removing all trim and/or changing window shape render buildings non-contributing. An isolated window (or windows) may be ignored if the building meets other integrity measures.

Storefronts:

- Alteration of storefronts is a common and expected change made to most commercial buildings, as owners sought to attract new generations of shoppers and as businesses changed. Loss of original design and materials on the first floor does not make a building non-contributing if the upper floors retain integrity.

Streetscape:

- The building continues to contribute to the continuity of the streetscape.
- Integrity of design, likewise, is important for high-style buildings, which are contributing if they retain enough character-defining features that their original design is substantially legible. For vernacular buildings the following considerations were used to evaluate the integrity of design:
  - The building should retain its historic scale and massing. Additions that are clearly secondary, e.g., located at the back or side where they are visually distinct from the historic form, are common and are considered part of the normal evolution of buildings in the neighborhood. Such additions do not detract from integrity.
    - The building should retain its original roofline. Alterations to the roofline during the period of significance are acceptable.
    - Replacement sash in original or slightly modified openings are common in the district and do not render a building noncontributing, nor do alterations to openings if the original openings remain legible (e.g. partial wood infill of a window opening in a brick building). Extensive alteration to fenestration patterns due to complete infill of openings or introduction of new windows not consistent with the location, rhythm, operational type, and/or size of historic fenestration may render a building noncontributing. An isolated instance, or alterations to fenestration on less-prominent sides of the building, will not render a building noncontributing in the absence of other integrity issues.
    - Alterations to historic front porches are common and are often a response to deterioration and/or the need for additional interior space. Few porches in the district retain all their historic materials, and some porches have been removed or infilled. Alterations to historic porches, up to and including removal, will not on their own render a building noncontributing. Replacement of a historic open front porch with an alternative not typical of the period of significance, such as an uncovered deck or a full enclosure that does not retain evidence of original open character, may alter the building enough that it is no longer contributing.

DRAFT

Name of Property

County and State

- Buildings that are categorized as non-contributing may be re-evaluated if materials that obscure original form, scale, design, materials, and workmanship are removed, and original or historic elements are rediscovered. This guideline acknowledges that blocked windows may be unblocked, facades may be removed to reveal the original wall treatment, and other changes may be reversed that will enable a building to contribute to the district.

The majority of, residential, commercial, religious, and municipal buildings constructed in the expanded district during the height of development, between 1662 and 1954, remain intact. The buildings that remain typically retain integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Several of the older buildings have been altered by the replacement of their original windows or removal of secondary details such as trim. Regardless of these losses, these buildings retain the other cited aspects of integrity. Taken as a whole, the expanded Southampton Village Historic District retains a highly intact collection of historic buildings in this area of Suffolk County.

**Resource Count: Update count** (subtract hospital)

**ADD:** (203 Meeting House 2C)(245 Meeting House Lane 2C)(88 Pine St 1 C)

462 Contributing Buildings, including:

305 Contributing Primary Buildings

157 Contributing Secondary Buildings

167 Non-contributing Buildings, including:

114 Non-contributing Primary Buildings

53 Non-contributing Secondary Buildings (add in 85 Toylsome, modern garage)

**Insert Draft Section 7 Building Descriptions when comments/edits returned from Alex.**



---

## 8. Statement of Significance

---

### Applicable National Register Criteria

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

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

### Criteria Considerations

(Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:

- |                          |   |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | A | Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | B | removed from its original location.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | C | a birthplace or grave.   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | D | a cemetery.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | E | a reconstructed building, object, or structure.                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | F | a commemorative property.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | G | less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years. |

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Period of Significance**

1662-1954

---

**Significant Dates**

---

---

---

**Significant Person**

(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

---

**Cultural Affiliation**

---

---

**Architect/Builder**

Architects: Walter E. Brady, J. Madison Jagger

Builders: Frederick Corwin, Frederick Thompson

---

**Period of Significance (justification)****Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)****Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph**

(Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance and applicable criteria.)

The Southampton Village Historic District Boundary Expansion represents a significant increase

in the geographic extent of the Southampton Village Historic District, listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1988 and initially expanded in 1993. Due to the similarity in architectural character, the expansion areas are indistinct from and comparable with the existing district.

Criteria for the existing Southampton Village Historic District is listed under C for Architecture and A for Settlement. The district expansion is eligible for listing under Criterion C as a largely intact suburban area on the periphery of the existing district containing a variety of residential, commercial, and religious building types and styles dating from the late-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. The expansion of this district includes areas in the south and northwest sections of the Village as the dates of construction, architectural types, styles, and history of the building stock in those areas correspond with the existing Southampton Village Historic District. The majority of properties located in the recommended areas of expansion are intact and retain integrity of design, location, workmanship, and association.

The period of significance has been expanded to 1954 to include mid-century buildings, specifically single family homes that were constructed throughout the Village in the post-war period. There are a number of buildings constructed during this period that served to build-out the remaining vacant lots in the expansion areas.

---

## **Narrative Statement of Significance**

### Settlement and Colonial Periods (1640-1800)

Numerous groups of Algonquin peoples inhabited the area of Suffolk County prior to the arrival of European settlers on Long Island. At the time of European contact, the South Folk was occupied by the Shinnecock Nation, speakers of the Mohegan-Pequot-Montauk-Algonquian language. The Shinnecock maintained relationships with the Pequod and Narragansett Nations across the Long Island Sound and produced wampumpeag, a valuable commodity for commercial exchange. Due to their proximity to the Atlantic, the Shinnecock also developed effective whaling techniques later adapted by the commercial whalers of subsequent centuries.<sup>i</sup>

The first European settlers to arrive in the area of Southampton were English speaking Puritan colonists from Lynn in what was then the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Having received dispensation from Governor John Winthrop and the agent of the Earl of Stirling, then proprietor of English claims to Long Island, a group of eight settlers led by Edward Howell, Daniel How, and Henry Walton signed a three-part agreement structuring the management of their prospective settlement in 1639 and traveled to Manhasset Bay toward the western end of Long Island in May of the following year. A territorial dispute with the Dutch colonial authorities from Manhattan Island forced the settlers to relocate, and they travelled to Peconic Bay. The settlers then landed in North Sea, directly north of the Village of Southampton, and trekked overland to the area near Old Town Pond, in the southeastern part of the present-day village. They then negotiated an agreement with Shinnecock authorities for the exchange of a deed granting the title to the area for a fixed sum of food and dry goods and a

---

<sup>i</sup> John A. Strong, "Indian Whalers on Long Island, 1669-1746," *Long Island History Journal* 25, no. 1 (2016).

commitment to their protection against “unjust violence.” The settlers thereby founded the Town of Southampton, and the current boundaries of the town were established by the end of the century, the result of a series of further purchases from the Shinnecock Nation.<sup>ii</sup>

The settlement of the Village of Southampton proceeded from this initial endeavor. These settlers constructed homes (non-extant) in the area near Old Town Pond and began cultivating corn, trapping game, and digging clams. The first agricultural activity largely took place in the flatland between Agawam Lake and Shinnecock inlet, an area dubbed the Great Plains by the early settlers. Residents of the village also engaged in the enterprise of whaling from the earliest years of settlement. The group of settlers attended sermons led by Abraham Pierson at a small meetinghouse (non-extant), where they also held town meetings and governed by consensus. Although the settlers initially received dispensation from the Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, a vote held in 1644 placed the town within the jurisdiction of the Colony of Connecticut. By the end of the decade, at least twenty-nine families lived in Southampton, and the construction of the new homes expanded the settled area to the west along Agawam Lake and to the north along what is now Main Street.<sup>iii</sup>

Southampton remained under the jurisdiction of the Colony of Connecticut until the 1660s, when the conclusion of the Second Anglo-Dutch War reconfigured the colonial boundaries of the region surrounding the Long Island Sound. At the end of the war, Dutch authorities ceded Manhattan and its surrounds to the British Crown, which established the Colony of New York for its governance. Although further conflict jeopardized British control of the territory, the arrangement ultimately endured, and the Colony of New York assumed jurisdiction over of Long Island in 1664. Despite some initial protestations from the residents of Southampton and nearby Southold, Long Island remained a part of the colony until it became the State of New York.

The settlement grew slowly through the following century, and residents remained engaged in agricultural labor and maritime activities. The settlement of the area that later incorporated as the Village of Southampton first concentrated around what is now Main Street, and a few buildings constructed in the seventeenth century remain extant in the Southampton Village Historic District, including the Halsey House (1662, NR 1986) at 251 South Main Street and the Foster House (1695, NR 1986) at 264 South Main Street. While the plenitude of land initially enabled settlers to claim tracts as they arrived in the town, the arrival of more settlers in the following decades required the division of Southampton into lots. The initial group of settlers asked 150 pounds for the ownership these lots, and the first sale included most of the village (the remainder of the town was divided into lots and offered at subsequent sales). Although the availability of land did attract some settlers, the relatively poor quality of the sandy soil in Southampton challenged agricultural enterprises, dampening population growth in the area well into the nineteenth century. Most families that settled in Southampton did engage in agriculture

---

<sup>ii</sup> William S. Pelletreau, “Southampton,” *History of Suffolk County, New York, with Illustrations, Portraits, & Sketches of Prominent Families and Individuals* (New York: W.W. Munsell & Co., 1882), 1-5; Southampton 16-25

<sup>iii</sup> Pelletreau, “Southampton,” *History of Suffolk County*, 10; David Goddard, *Colonizing Southampton: The Transformation of a Long Island Community, 1870-1900* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2011), 13-14; George Rogers Howell, *The Early History of Southampton, L. I., New York: With Genealogies* (Southampton: Yankee Peddler Book Company, 1887), 14-31

in some form, however, and the typical products included corn and potatoes foremost, as well as livestock, orchard fruit, and wheat and other grains.<sup>iv</sup>

Although the population remained small and little construction occurred during the decades around the turn of the eighteenth century, residents did plan some improvements:

Several streets in Southampton date from this early period. Little Plains Road led to the Little Playnes, a fenced cultivated field on the east, with Great Plains Road leading to the Great Playnes, another common farm area, on the west. Toylesome, Meeting House, and Job's Lanes all existed by the 1660s. Gin Lane, opened in 1664, owes its name to the "gin" or trap for stray cattle kept at this location near the Little Playnes. Ox Pasture Road divided two separate ox pastures to the north and south. Windmill Lane, which extends from Lake Agawam to North Sea Road, took its name from the windmills which stood at either end of the road by 1713.... Travel by boat to Connecticut was relatively easy and cemented commercial ties between eastern Long Island and New England. Roads connecting Southampton with other settlements to its north and east as well as with New York City to the west were established during the early eighteenth century. These now constitute North Sea Road, Hampton Road, Hill Street (also known as the Shinnecock Road), and North Main Street.<sup>v</sup>

The eighteenth century remained a period of relatively slow growth and constancy in Southampton until the events of the American Revolutionary War. While development did occur, particularly along North Main Street, few extant buildings in the Village of Southampton date to this period. During the war itself, men from Southampton may have joined the revolutionary forces at the battle of Brooklyn, but British forces later asserted control over all of Long Island, including Southampton, bringing a close to revolutionary activity in the town. At least 500 men from the town of 3,400 signed an oath of loyalty to the crown. Some of these signatories may have done so under duress, as the occupation of Southampton included the quartering of at least 2,500 soldiers led by General William Erskine. After the conclusion of the war and the foundation of the United States, Southampton became a part of the State of New York, and normal agricultural activity resumed in the area.<sup>vi</sup>

### Agrarian Period (1800-1870)

Southampton remained on the periphery of New York State and New England well into the nineteenth century. Agriculture and the complementary industrial processes remained the driving force behind what little growth did occur in the village prior to the advent of the railroad:

Southampton remained overwhelmingly agricultural and relatively isolated from New York City for most of the period between 1800 and the Civil War... Other than the grinding of flour in windmills and water mills, there was little manufacturing or industry in either Southampton or its vicinity. A

---

<sup>iv</sup> Pelletreau, "Southampton," *History of Suffolk County*, 9-10; Goddard, *Colonizing Southampton*, 31; New York State Parks and Recreation Agency, "Southampton Village Historic District," National Register of Historic Places Nomination, Albany, NY, August 1986, 26.

<sup>v</sup> Geoffrey B. Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey and Survey Update of the Village of Southampton, New York," August 1998, Section 3, 10-11

<sup>vi</sup> Goddard, *Colonizing Southampton*, 32; Howell, *The Early History of Southampton*, 74

description of Southampton in 1842 stated that it contained 400 inhabitants, 50 dwellings, one Presbyterian church, three windmills, "besides several taverns, stores and mechanic shops" ...<sup>vii</sup>

As a result of the economic conditions in Southampton, the village remained agrarian in character. A small cluster of residential and commercial buildings occupied the core of the village, but signs of the summer colony to come remained very sparse before the Civil War:

Southampton was still basically a cluster of buildings, and a few streets strung out along the main road from New York City. Main Street still served as the major north-south road and was crossed at right angles by Hill Street to the west and Bridgehampton Road to the east. The area south of Hill Street extending to the end of Halsey's Neck and Cooper's Neck was almost entirely agricultural. Residents generally shunned the ocean dunes area, and no homes were built south of the midpoint of Lake Agawam. A Coast Guard lifesaving station, built in the 1850s, was the sole ocean outpost.<sup>viii</sup>

#### Arrival of the Long Island Railroad (1870-1918)

The arrival of the Long Island Railroad represents the major turning point in the development of the Village of Southampton. The construction of the railroad in the early 1870s connected the small town to New York City, easing the cost of both freight and passenger travel between the South Fork and the urban centers of the Northeast. The rise of manufacturing, resource extraction, and tourism followed its arrival:

Until the Civil War, Southampton was an agricultural and trading village no different from many others on Long Island. Its physical appearance and social makeup changed irreversibly after the Civil War. The arrival of the Long Island Railroad in Southampton in 1870 inaugurated daily passenger and freight service to and from New York City. Beer's *Atlas of Suffolk County* published in [1873], was one of the first to show the route of the railroad through Southampton and the beginning of small manufacturing enterprises, such as lumberyards, sprouting up in the vicinity of the railroad depot... The railroad opened up the South Fork of Long Island to a steadily increasing influx of visitors from the city seeking recreation and a healthful climate. Although the railroad provided the means for economic growth, changing social and recreational trends in Gilded Age America provided the motivation for the sustained 50-year growth in Southampton.<sup>ix</sup>

After the conclusion of the Civil War and the construction of railroads throughout the United States, the country entered a period of intensive industrialization and economic growth. During what economic historian Robert J.

---

<sup>vii</sup> Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey," 12.

<sup>viii</sup> Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey," 14.

<sup>ix</sup> Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey," 14.

Gordon refers to as America's Second Industrial Revolution, a revolution in the production of material goods and the initiation of an economy oriented around the provision of consumer goods to urban markets led to a large increase in the standard of living in the United States, along with a large increase in material inequality. The predominant economic paradigm of laissez-faire enabled titans of industry to engage in consolidation and monopolization, allowing them to amass unprecedented fortunes.<sup>x</sup> The rise in the leisure economy that catered to the affluent brought changes to many formerly isolated locales like Southampton, which emerged as desirable vacation destinations. The particularities of its history and its location contributed to the rise of the summer colony in Southampton:

Several factors contributed to the emergence of Southampton as a premier summer destination for city dwellers. First was the dramatic growth of a monied leisure class as a result of the economic expansion of New York City after the Civil War. This class had the time and money to pursue such outdoor sports as bicycling, tennis, sailing, and sea bathing, all of which greatly increased in popularity in the 1870s and 1890s. Second, the crowded and often unsanitary conditions of New York City made it less desirable as a year-round residence for the upper classes and spurred the search for such summer destinations as Newport in Rhode Island, the Adirondacks, and the North and South Shores of Long Island. The South Fork and its natural beauty were popularized in guide books and pamphlets, as well as in the paintings of such *plein air* artists as Winslow Homer and William Merritt Chase. Chase established the first major American school of outdoor painting at the Shinnecock Hills Summer School of Art in 1891. Southampton was heavily promoted by the Long Island Railroad, which stated in one brochure: "It is hardly possible to imagine a more desirable location for a summer residence. The land is high, and from this rounded plateau one looks down upon one of the finest marine views on the Atlantic coast. The ocean, flecked with sails, is before, while behind, the winding waters of Peconic bay, with the intermingling shores, give infinite variety of scene." Finally, the nation's centennial in 1876 stimulated a tremendous interest in the colonial period of architecture. Southampton, which retained much of its late eighteenth century appearance of farms, windmills, and colonial houses, was rediscovered by popular writers and summer visitors alike. According to a description in the *New York Times* in 1875, Southampton "was full of relics of the long-buried past . . . teeming with associations and traditions of our young country."<sup>xi</sup>

As the railroad brought more tourists, a community of wealthy regulars began to construct their own residences in formerly undeveloped parts of the village. The new construction altered the fabric of Southampton, bringing an end to the primacy of agriculture and the totally agrarian character of the village:

Residents of New York City had ventured out to the South Fork of Long Island for summer vacations beginning in the 1850s. Dr. T. Gaillard Thomas, a New York physician, was one of the first to recommend the healthful climate of Southampton to his patients. These visitors, among the first of Southampton's summer colony, usually stayed in boarding houses or rented houses from local residents

---

<sup>x</sup> Robert J. Gordon, *The Rise and Fall of American Growth* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), 31; Ibid. 313; Ibid. 321.

<sup>xi</sup> Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey," 18.

for the summer months...The wealthier class of visitors that appeared in Southampton for the summer season after 1870, however, desired their own houses and began to build new summer residences on undeveloped lots in the village.<sup>xii</sup>

The rise of tourism and the settlement of the wealthy in Southampton determined the direction of the economy for the remainder of the nineteenth century and beyond. These new residents, however temporary their stays in the area, created a surge in demand for new services and new construction, and both sectors created new labor opportunities. Laborers in the building trades and the leisure economy took up residence in Southampton in large numbers, and new developers constructed divisions of more modest dwellings for the rising population in undeveloped areas of the town:

The *New York Herald* declared in 1889 that "Long Island is rapidly being divided up into estates of immense acreage beyond all precedents in American country life." Beginning in the late 1880s, farmland closest to the village, along Ox Pasture, Great Plains, and Halsey Neck Road began to be divided into large lots on which were placed sprawling mansions of the Shingle Style... Nearly 180 new homes and estates were constructed as summer residences in Southampton over the thirty-year period between 1888 and 1918. The unprecedented building boom attracted large numbers of workers skilled in the building trades—carpenters, masons, builders, painters, and roofers—to the Southampton area. This was in addition to the greatly increased demand for gardeners, caretakers, chauffeurs, coachmen, and other servants to work on these estates. This influx of new workers and their families resulted in the subdivision and development of large sections of the Village.<sup>xiii</sup>

The population growth that occurred in Southampton alongside the emergence of the leisure economy required the expansion of the settlement and the establishment of new institutions. The construction of new residential fabric spurred the organization of the Southampton Fire Department in 1881. In order to govern the growing settlement and accommodate the larger population, the Village of Southampton incorporated in 1894. The village government assumed many functions previously carried out by the Town of Southampton, including the administration of the fire department.<sup>xiv</sup> Meanwhile, the construction of homes for both wealthy vacationers and laborers required the opening of new roads near the original core of the village along Main Street:

The 1902 *Atlas of Suffolk County, Long Island, New York (South Side Ocean Shore)* illustrates the extensive changes occurring in Southampton by this time. Development...occurred along such streets as Walnut, Cameron, Pine, Burnett, and Oak Streets, located east of Main Street and north of Meeting House Road. Small building lots, usually between one-quarter and one-half acre in size, were developed with single-family houses, greatly altering the character of these formerly rural parts of the village.<sup>xv</sup>

---

<sup>xii</sup> Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey," 18.

<sup>xiii</sup> Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey," 19-23.

<sup>xiv</sup> Goddard, *Colonizing Southampton*, 16.

<sup>xv</sup> Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey," 23.



The seasonal and permanent populations of the Village of Southampton continued to grow as urban families either gained access to the wealth necessary to take expensive vacations or sought the work opportunities created by those expenses. The demand for new homes drove development, which quickly exceeded the boundaries of early settlement, and it became necessary for developers to convert land formerly used for agriculture into residential fabric. As new construction proceeded further from the core of the village, geographic sorting took place and new settlement patterns emerged. Wealthy estate owners tended to live closer to the south shore and Shinnecock Bay, where coastal views, beach access, and belonging in the social world of the summer colony commanded a premium. For example, the construction of homes along Toylsome Lane in the expanded district provided wealthy vacationers with large residences and substantial lots within walking distance to the beach just blocks to the south. Stately residences such as Metauwak at 85 Toylsome Lane (extant) and Sea Rest at 108 Toylsome Lane (extant) are excellent examples of the summer cottages frequented by wealthy urban families during the summer months. Metauwak was regularly featured on the annual “Summer Cottage List” published by the *East Hampton Star* alongside architect-designed homes such as “The Dolphins” on First Neck Lane by Stanford White, and “Claverack” on Halsey Neck Lane by Robert Henderson Robertson with gardens designed by Frederick Law Olmstead.<sup>xvi</sup>

Meanwhile, middle-class homeowners and renters sought homes in the neighborhood directly south of the village core, between Old Town Road and South Main, while more modest neighborhoods spread away to the north. As a result, seven new subdivisions were laid out in the expanded district between 1915 and 1928. The new subdivisions to the south between Old Town Road and South Main Street were the Brody Block (1915), Cameron Street Subdivision (1916), Burnett Street Subdivision (1921), Old Town Park (1922) and the Herrick Subdivision (1928). To the north, the Halsey Street Subdivision (1917) and the Cooper Street Development (1919) were created.<sup>xvii</sup>

During the early twentieth century, evolving economic conditions brought about changes to the habits of wealthy vacationers, and the social and material landscape of Southampton evolved in turn. The relative decline in the predominance of unrestrictive economics and the introduction of policies like regulation and progressive taxes brought an end to the Gilded Era and the accompanying consolidation of wealth. While legacy families continued to frequent Southampton, construction of large estates dwindled, and the number of families with incomes sufficient to afford slightly more modest vacations in the area increased:

---

<sup>xvi</sup> <https://www.loc.gov/item/2007685922/>; “Southampton Cottage List for 1930,” *East Hampton Star*, July 11, 1930, 12; “Southampton Cottage List for 1931,” *East Hampton Star*, September 4, 1931, 14.

<sup>xvii</sup> James Richardson, *Map of the Brophy Block at Southampton, NY*, 1915; Alexander Cameron, *Cameron Street Subdivision*, 1916; Wallace H. Halsey, C.E., *Subdivision Map of Property Owned by F.W. Burnett situate Village of Southampton, Long Island, NY*, 1921; Wallace H. Halsey, C.E., *Revised Map of Old Town Park at Southampton, Long Island*, 1922; Wallace H. Halsey, C.E., *Map of Herrick Subdivision situate Village of Southampton, Long Island, NY*, 1928; Seth J. Raynor, C.E., *Map of Property belong to Cameron and...formerly of the Old Horse Assoc. Grounds, Southampton, NY*, 1917; Wallace H. Halsey, C.E., *Subdivision Map of property owned by Edward J. Halsey situate Southampton, Long Island*, 1919.

The imposition of the Federal income tax in 1913 is often supposed to have signaled the end of the age of great country house building in Southampton. The unsettled social conditions after World War I and the shortage of domestic servants are also cited as reasons for this supposed decline. In truth, Southampton continued to reign as one of the premier resort destinations on the Eastern Seaboard in the interwar years. *Who's Who in Southampton and Easthampton*, a social register of summer residents published in 1928, listed a full complement of New York Society, including members of the Whitney, Thaw, Crocker, and Livingston families, as well as families from elsewhere in the East such as DuPont, Mellon, and Carnegie....Unlike its early years at the turn of the century, Southampton was no longer a place to escape civilization to pursue such rustic activities as walking, canoeing, and bicycling. Instead, the social calendar of a typical summer resident in Southampton was a constant series of parties, teas, and tennis tournaments. Seaside activities, including both sun bathing and sea bathing increased in popularity, drawing even more visitors to Southampton.<sup>xviii</sup>

These vacationers arrived in Southampton with money to spend, fueling the growth of business in the village. New retailers and restaurants opened along Main Street, and entrepreneurs offered new forms of entertainment. The taxes raised from these businesses and the growing number of residences also allowed the village to expand the services it provided, including electrification and the establishment of a modern police department. In 1923, the village constructed a two-story brick fire hall at 25 Windmill Lane (extant) to house the fire department, which provided fire response to nearby municipalities as well.<sup>xix</sup>

The growth of Southampton accelerated in the lead up to the Great Depression and World War II, and the job opportunities provided by the building and service sectors attracted many more permanent residents to the village:

The northern...sections of Southampton continued to grow, as additional lots were subdivided and developed in the 1920s and 1930s. By 1930, the Village's resident year-round population had reached 3,700 people...Many residents in these areas continued to be employed in the building trades.... The building and construction trades proved to be an especially steady source of employment after the devastating hurricane of 1938 destroyed or heavily damaged many ocean-front estates.<sup>xx</sup>

Many of the homes in the northwest expansion area were built to house residents who were American-born and of English, Irish, French, German, or Scandinavian descent. The majority of these residents worked in the construction trades in jobs as carpenters, painters, electricians, and plumbers.<sup>xxi</sup>

---

<sup>xviii</sup> Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey," 27.

<sup>xix</sup> *The Southampton Press*, July 14, 1977; "Department History," *Southampton Fire Department*.

<sup>xx</sup> Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey," 30.

<sup>xxi</sup> New York State Census, 1915; United States Federal Census, 1920.

## Development of Southampton Village after 1935

While the Great Depression and World War II slowed the course of development in Southampton, the suburbanization of Eastern Long Island brought changes to the village by the middle of the twentieth century. The construction of Levittown in Nassau County in the late 1940s prompted developers to plan similar subdivisions, with long blocks of residences built for single family homeowners, across the South Fork. During the second half of the twentieth century developers adapted the form in subdivisions designed to accommodate a range of income levels in the construction of homes toward the eastern and western limits of the Village of Southampton. Although there were no new subdivisions planned in the south and northwest expansion areas, there are a number of buildings constructed during this period that served to build-out the remaining vacant lots in these sections of the Village.

This post-war period of suburbanization also brought an end to almost all agricultural activity within the village itself, where the construction of subdivisions crowded out the remaining farmland. Many of the bordering municipalities underwent a transition away from agriculture as well, and that which remained by the end of the century took the form of agritourist destinations like wineries and boutique farms. The construction of subdivisions continued throughout the second half of the twentieth century, notable in the areas to the north and south of Wickapogue Road, where larger homes attracted wealthy newcomers.<sup>xxii</sup>

## **Architecture**

Architecturally and spatially, the expanded district reflects Southampton's development between the late-nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries with few earlier exceptions. The buildings in the expanded district embody a variety of distinctive characteristics primarily associated with late nineteenth and early-to-mid-twentieth-century vernacular architecture. Properties are primarily residential, with commercial and religious buildings included as well. Most of the historic buildings in the expanded district have survived.

Previously non-contributing buildings and buildings overlooked in the original 1988 National Register nomination that are outside of the expanded district boundaries have been added to Section 7 of this nomination. There are very few buildings in this group that fell outside the period of significance to 1930. Architectural types and styles for those buildings are covered in this narrative. Building types and styles for the remainder of those buildings constructed 1930 and prior are already discussed in the 1986 nomination.

### *Residential architecture*

The majority of the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century homes in the expanded district can best be described as vernacular forms that borrowed the qualities or decorative features from other popular styles such as the Colonial Revival and Shingle Styles. Overall, the buildings display a general consistency of scale, forms, rooflines, orientations, and setbacks from the street, materials (wood, stucco, brick), and continuity, yet some variety in design. They are generally one-and-a-half to two-and-a-half-story buildings of wood-frame

---

<sup>xxii</sup> Geoffrey B. Henry, "Historic Architectural Survey and Survey Update of the Village of Southampton, New York," August 1998, 32.

construction composed of one or more square or rectangular volumes. Roofs are predominantly gabled and hipped. Ornamentation, if present, may be found on the full-width porches, eaves, and gable ends. Many of these buildings have evolved with various side and rear additions and the use of replacement siding and windows. A good deal of early twentieth century period revival styles found in the expanded district are Shingle Style, Colonial Revival, Dutch Colonial Revival, American Foursquare, Craftsman/Bungalow, and Tudor Revival.

As a consequence of modest growth in Southampton during its Agrarian period, the expanded district contains far fewer examples of architecture from 1830-1870. An exception is the oldest surviving resource in the expanded district, the J. King House (contributing) at 98 Meeting House Lane. Constructed circa 1850 or possibly earlier, the house was enlarged sometime in the late nineteenth to early twentieth century with a one-story rear addition that does not impact the original footprint or character of the building.<sup>xxiii</sup> The one-and-a-half story, four-bay frame house features elements of the Federal style with its side gable roof with high roof plate and an unpedimented surround with entablature and divided light transom.

There are a few buildings in the expanded district that were constructed in the 1870s and 1880s. One example is the two-story, five-bay frame Gothic Revival Style home at 90 Meeting House Road (contributing). This home exhibits elements of the style with its side gable roof, a prominent central cross gable, and an original four-pane pointed arch wood window extending into the gable. Another example in the expanded district is located at 71 Walnut Street (contributing). Although updated with new siding and windows, the house has retained its original form, apart from a one-story porch that was removed sometime in the late twentieth century. The two-and-a-half story, three-bay frame house features simplistic elements of the Italianate style with its front-gabled roof and symmetrical rectangular windows.

The coming of the railroad and the dramatic growth of a wealthy leisure class due to the economic expansion of New York City after the Civil War drew city residents to the village for summer vacation rentals beginning in the 1850s. However, it wasn't until after 1870 that the wealthy class of visitors that summered in Southampton began to build their own summer residences on undeveloped lots in the village. The new summer residents who formed the "summer colony" in the southern part of the Village disliked the eclectic stylistic trends of the late nineteenth century that included the Late Second Empire, Queen Anne, and Gingerbread Victorian. Instead, the houses built in Southampton's summer colony during this time were the result of a concerted search by some of America's principal architects to produce a "national style" that would reflect the colonial heritage of the country.<sup>xxiv</sup>

Between 1888 and 1918, approximately 180 new homes and estates were built as summer residences in the Village. During this era, premier architects such as McKim, Mead, and White, Robert H. Robertson, Grosvenor Atterbury, and John Russell Pope designed distinguished homes in the Colonial Revival and Shingle Styles for

---

<sup>xxiii</sup> GAI Index; Gretchen Luxenberg, "Building-Structure Inventory Form USN No. 103-57-0110," Village of Southampton Historic Resources Survey, 1979.

<sup>xxiv</sup> GAI Survey Report Southampton 1998, 14, 18-19.

summer colony residents, putting the Village in the forefront of American resort architecture.<sup>xxv</sup> Two excellent examples of this trend within the expanded district are located at 85 Toylsome Lane (Metauwak, contributing) and 108 Toylsome Lane (Sea Rest, contributing). Although research did not reveal any information on the architects or builders of these homes, historic maps show both properties on large lots with outbuildings, typical of a summer colony residence. Metauwak was constructed ca. 1900 and exhibits classical detailing such as its asymmetrical form and massing, classical columns and dentil molding. It retains a historic frame saltbox style barn at the rear of the property. Also constructed ca. 1900, Sea Rest is a sprawling, asymmetrical example of the Colonial Revival Style with its classical columns and balustrades at the entranceways. This estate originally included the one-story cottage at 104 Toylsome Lane (contributing, ca. 1920) and the barn at the rear of this property (contributing, ca. 1900) before the property was subdivided sometime between the mid-1930s-1940s.<sup>xxvi</sup>

This great increase in construction attracted skilled workers from the building trades and estate workers to the area who settled in the new subdivisions to the north of the summer colony.<sup>xxvii</sup> The homes in these newly developed working-class neighborhoods were constructed in modest versions of the popular earlier twentieth century styles and gave work to many local builders and architects. Architect Walter E. Brady along with builders Frederick Corwin and Frederick Thompson designed and constructed numerous houses along Herrick Road in the early 1900s.<sup>xxviii</sup> In 1898, Brady placed an advertisement in *Sea-Side Times* advertising “Herrick Building” as part of his practice.<sup>xxix</sup> Although no specific homes could be linked directly to Brady on Herrick Road, there are a number of fine period homes that may have been architect-designed such as the Tudor Revival Style house at 242 Herrick Road (ca. 1915, contributing) and the Colonial Revival style house at (167 Herrick Road (ca. 1910). Another notable local architect who established a successful career during the development of the summer colony was J. Madison Jagger.<sup>xxx</sup> While limited information was available for Jagger, research did show that he likely designed and built a home for Dr. John H. Nugent within the expanded district at 55 Hampton Road (not extant).<sup>xxxi</sup>

Although many of the homes built in the new northern subdivisions were designed in the Colonial Revival Style with some in the Shingle Style, they were much smaller in scale than the mansions of the summer estates. Many of these more modest homes were clad in brown shingles. A typical example is the house at 79 Moses Lane (contributing). Constructed ca. 1910 it is a more modest example of the Shingle Style with its side-gable roof with prominent curved porches featuring unpainted shingled columns. An older historic home at 89 Meeting

---

<sup>xxv</sup> GAI Survey Report Southampton 1998, 19; Austin O’Brien, “National Register of Historic Places Nomination for the Southampton Multiple Resource Area,” August 1986, Section 8, 8.

<sup>xxvi</sup> Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, 1895-1964.

<sup>xxvii</sup> GAI Survey Report Southampton 1998, 23.

<sup>xxviii</sup> GAI Survey Report Southampton 1998, 26.

<sup>xxix</sup> “Business Cards, *Sea-Side Times*, February 10, 1898, 6.

<sup>xxx</sup> Austin O’Brien, “National Register of Historic Places Nomination for the Southampton Multiple Resource Area,” August 1986, Section 8, 11.

<sup>xxxi</sup> “From Past Presses, 1921,” *Southampton Press*, July 25, 1996; Federal Census, 1930.

House Lane was constructed in the Colonial Revival style in the late nineteenth century. Asymmetrical in form, it features a hip on gable roof with bracketed eaves, an ocular window in the gable, a pedimented portico with dentil molding and classical columns, and an entry with wood surround and leaded glass sidelights. More traditionally Dutch Colonial in style featuring side and front-gambrel roof lines are the early 1900s houses at 210 Little Plains Road, 88 Halsey Street, and 104 Burnett Street.

A rare example of the Queen Anne Style in the expanded district is located at 39 Walnut Street, constructed in the 1890s. Although it has undergone updates such as window and siding replacement, this two-story, three-bay frame home exhibits features of the style with its hipped roof with higher cross-gable and partial porch with decorative brackets and turned posts.

The emergence of the American Foursquare style was a shift away from late nineteenth century forms toward a more simplified cubic dwelling. The style was moderate in cost with minimal decoration and affordable for middle income and working-class consumers.<sup>xxxii</sup> The American Foursquare became prevalent in both Southampton and the rest of the country after 1910. Classical features of the style can be seen in the house at 60 Cameron Street. This two-story, three-bay frame home features a hipped roof, wide eaves, a hipped roof center dormer, and a hipped roof front porch with Doric columns. Another example with additional Colonial Revival-style detailing is seen at 237 Meeting House Lane. The majority of the American Foursquare houses in Southampton are covered in wood shingle. However, the style's simple flat surfaces also allowed for the use of stucco cladding as seen at 55 Rogers Street and 43 Cameron Street.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Fine examples of the style in the expanded district are located on Cameron Street, Meeting House Lane, Toylsome Lane, Cooper Street, Halsey Street, Moses Lane, and Henry Street.

Another house type that became widely popular in the early nineteen hundreds was the Bungalow. In general, a bungalow is a low profile one-to-one-and-a-half story house featuring a wide gabled roof with porch beneath and small, second-story dormer(s).<sup>xxxiv</sup> Variants of the style can be seen along Henry and Halsey Streets where there is a higher concentration of this type as compared to the rest of the expanded district. Some particularly good examples are 9 Henry Street (contributing), 128 Halsey Street (contributing), and 170 Halsey Street (contributing).

The areas north of the summer colony continued to grow and develop in the 1920s and 1930s with many residents continuing to work in the building trades. Numerous trends developed at the turn of the century continued to be used in the design of middle-class housing in these areas and throughout the Village from the 1920s to the 1940s. The majority of these homes were built of frame construction and featured shingle siding. Although the American Foursquare and Bungalow style houses were constructed into the early 1930s, houses were largely built in the Colonial Revival, Dutch Colonial Revival, or Cape Cod styles.<sup>xxxv</sup> A good example of

---

<sup>xxxii</sup> Daniel D. Reiff, *Houses from Books: Treatises, Pattern Books, and Catalogs of American Architecture, 1738-1950*, (Pennsylvania State University Press: University Park, Pennsylvania), 2000. 170-171.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> GAI Survey Report Southampton 1998, 26.

<sup>xxxiv</sup> Reiff, *Houses from Books: Treatises, Pattern Books, and Catalogs of American Architecture, 1738-1950*, (Pennsylvania State University Press: University Park, Pennsylvania), 2000, 172.

<sup>xxxv</sup> GAI Survey Report Southampton 1998, 30.

the transition can be found at 26 and 32 Cooper Street. Both houses were constructed ca. 1920 with 26 Cooper Street (contributing) designed in the Dutch Colonial Revival style and 32 Cooper Street (contributing) in the American Foursquare Style.

While good examples of the Colonial Revival style can be found throughout the expanded district, two of the more unusual examples are at 51 Cameron Street and 80 Old Town Crossing. The house at 51 Cameron Street was built in the 1940s and is the only one of its type within the expanded district clad in brick. Similarly, the house at 80 Old Town Crossing was built circa 1927 and is a rare example of the type clad in stucco from this period.

Examples of the Dutch Colonial Revival Style can be found throughout the expanded district with earlier examples on Old Town Crossing and Old Town Road. Rogers Avenue features both early and later houses in this style. A good example of a later period house can be seen at 27 Rogers Avenue, constructed circa 1940 and unusually clad in stucco.

Builders also constructed houses for more upper-income, year-round residents in variations of the Tudor, English Cottage, and Spanish Colonial Revival styles. One of the finest Spanish-informed examples from this period is located at 43 Cameron Street, constructed circa 1920. English Cottage and vernacular styles from circa 1930 are located throughout the expanded district on Lewis Street, Halsey Street, Henry Street, Old Town Road, and Cameron Street. Particularly good examples can be seen at 35 Cameron Street and 190 Lewis Street.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

The Cape Cod Revival emerged in the late 1920s, quickly gaining prominence through shelter magazines and home-builder catalogs. By the late 1930s, it had become one of the most widely embraced Colonial Revival styles, showcased in model homes at exhibitions and new developments. This house form was typically a one-to-one-and-a-half story home topped by steeply pitched roofs featuring a clean façade, some with dormers, and accented with multi-pane windows, decorative shutters, brick chimneys, and finely detailed entrances. The style began to dwindle in popularity in the 1950s, replaced by the Ranch and other modern forms.<sup>xxxvii</sup> In the expanded district, empty lots built-out in the post-war period frequently display houses designed in this style. Post Lane was sparsely developed in 1945 but completely built-out by the early 1960s. Several Cape Cod Revival houses are located along Post Lane with number 132 Post Lane (contributing) being a particularly fine example. On Toylsome Lane, one of the earliest examples of the style is located at 190 Toylsome Lane (contributing), constructed ca. 1920. A later example on this street is 95 Toylsome Lane (contributing), ca. 1940, also a very good example of the style. More houses of this type can be seen scattered throughout the expanded district on Lewis Street, Herrick Road, Old Town Road, and Halsey Street.

The Ranch style house gained mass appeal after World War II, offering affordable, practical housing for returning veterans and their growing families in the suburbs. Features of the style are a low, horizontal profile, one-story in height, with deep eaves. This house type is often designed in rectangular, L-shaped, or U-shaped

---

<sup>xxxvi</sup> GAI Survey Report Southampton 1998, 32.

<sup>xxxvii</sup> <https://dahp.wa.gov/historic-preservation/historic-buildings/architectural-style-guide/cape-cod-revival#:~:text=The%20design%20was%20featured%20advertisements,other%20more%20modern%20house%20forms.&text=The%20revival%20of%20Cape%20Cod,extra%20living%20spaces%20or%20garages.>



forms.<sup>xxxviii</sup> Much like the Cape Cod, the Ranch style houses in the expanded district were constructed on empty lots built-out after World War II. Ranch style houses are also scattered throughout the district with good examples at 50 Post Lane (contributing) and 57 Old Town Road (contributing).

### *Commercial architecture*

The nine commercial buildings in the expanded district differ from the central business district on Main Street and Job's Lane in terms of density. The central business district features a concentrated area of shops and businesses while commercial buildings in the expanded district are dispersed just outside of the business district with a small concentration on Hampton Road. Development of these outlying businesses range from the late nineteenth century to the 1930s.

There are several different types of commercial buildings in the expanded district. The most prevalent can be defined as "living behind or over the store." These consist of commercial enterprises that were constructed in front of houses or buildings and buildings that have residences above the stores. Generally, the business would be located in a building constructed in front of the house or on the first floor and the business owner would live above or behind it for proximity to the store.<sup>xxxix</sup> An excellent example of the living behind the shop can be found at 210 Hampton Road. The two-story dwelling at the rear was constructed circa 1915 and the restaurant in front was added sometime before 1926. An example of living over the store can be seen at 41 Meeting House Lane. Built in the late 1920s, this is the only apartment building in the expanded district. It features businesses on the first floor and apartments on the second floor.

The oldest commercial building in the expanded district is located at 10 Oak Street and is an excellent example of adaptive re-use overtime. Constructed sometime in the late nineteenth century, this building originated as J.W. Hallocks Livery and Board Stables. It was then converted to a garage in the 1920s and today houses a beauty salon. There is also a 1930s gas station at 270 Hampton Road and a small, late 1920s store at 88 Pine Street.

### *Religious architecture*

There is only one religious building in the expanded district. This is the First Church of Christ, Scientist at 70 Cameron Street. The small church was constructed in the Tudor Revival style in 1929, a popular design choice for the era. It was later expanded with a sympathetic addition to the west side of the building in 1968.

## **After the Period of Significance**

Toward the end of the twentieth century, a new surge of interest from wealthy vacationers brought new activity to the Village of Southampton. These vacationers drove a rise in property values that continued into the twenty-first century and restored consumer interest in the retail core of the village. While the Global Financial Crisis of 2008 cooled the real estate market, demand quickly recovered, and property values again began to rise.

---

<sup>xxxviii</sup> <https://www.architecturaldigest.com/story/ranch-style-house-everything-you-need-to-know>.

<sup>xxxix</sup> Howard Davis, *Living Over the Store*, (Routledge: New York), 2012, 78-79.



Subsequently, the pandemic disrupted the traditional summer seasonal nature of the village and accelerated two trends that have been affecting development: demolishing smaller, traditionally primary homes to create large (usually second) homes; and the disruption of the traditional summer “seasonal” nature of the village that lead to second homeowners relocating to their summer homes and remaining year round.

Today, the Village of Southampton remains a premier vacation and second-home destination, and leisure activity and real estate persist as the forces driving the local economy. Due to an increase in the cost of living, fewer working-class families remain in the area, and unaffordability continues to challenge those that do so.<sup>x1</sup>

## **Conclusion**

The expanded Southampton Village Historic District is significant under Criterion C in architecture for its large collection of intact buildings representing vernacular interpretations of popular architectural styles from the late nineteenth to mid-twentieth century. It possesses a high level of visual and architectural integrity and continues to reflect its historic identity as a preeminent enclave for seasonal retreat and second home ownership in the United States. The buildings represent the residential, commercial, and spiritual history of the community during its period of significance, representing years during the agrarian period, the subsequent development of the summer colony, and the resultant middle-class housing that continued to develop and grow to support it.

---

<sup>x1</sup> Terry Pristin, “Renting or Buying, Hamptons Feel Pinch,” *New York Times*, April 9, 2009.

---

## 9. Major Bibliographical References

---

**Bibliography** (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form.)

*Atlas of Long Island, New York: from recent and actual surveys and records under the superintendence of F. W. Beers.* Beers, Comstock & Cline: New York, 1873.  
<http://www.historicmapworks.com/Map/US/1636/Greenport+Town/Long+Island+1873/New+York/>.

Belcher Hyde Map Co., Plate 024, Southampton – Southeast, Suffolk County 1916 Vol. 2 Long Island, NY.

Chace, J. Johnson Douglass, and Robert Pearsall Smith. *Map of Suffolk County, L.I., N.Y. from actual surveys.* Philadelphia: John Douglas, publisher, 1858.  
<https://www.loc.gov/item/2013593235/>.

Cummings, Mary. *Images of America: Southampton.* Charleston SC: Arcadia Publishing, 1996.

“Department History.” *Southampton Fire Department.* Accessed November 28, 2022.  
<http://www.southamptonfd.org/history.html>.

Goddard, David. *Colonizing Southampton: The Transformation of a Long Island Community, 1870-1900.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2011.

Gordon, Robert J. *The Rise and Fall of American Growth.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.

Gordon, Valerie. “Ground Broken for New Museum.” *Southampton Press*, July 12, 2018.

Henry, Geoffrey B. “Historic Architectural Survey and Survey Update of the Village of Southampton, New York.” August 1998. Section 3.

“History | First Church of Christ, Scientist, Southampton, New York,” n.d. Accessed December 15, 2022. <http://www.christiansciencehamptons.org/history/>.

“History of Suffolk County.” *Suffolk County Government Website.*  
<https://www.suffolkcountyny.gov/Elected-Officials/County-Executive/History-of-Suffolk-County>.

Howell, George Rogers. *The Early History of Southampton, L. I., New York: With Genealogies*. Southampton: Yankee Peddler Book Company, 1887.

Jackson, Kenneth T. *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United State*. Oxford University Press: New York, 1985.

New York State Census, 1915.

New York State Parks and Recreation Agency. "Southampton Village Historic District. National Register of Historic Places Nomination. Albany, NY. August 1986.

"Our History," n.d. Accessed December 1, 2022. <https://saamuseum.org/our-history/>.

Parker, Patricia L. *Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*. Vol. 24, Washington DC: National Park Service, 1985. National Register Bulletin, Web. 6 July 2010; 12. <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/nrb24.pdf>.'

Pelletreau, William S. "Southampton." *History of Suffolk County, New York, with Illustrations, Portraits, & Sketches of Prominent Families and Individuals*. New York: W.W. Munsell & Co., 1882. <http://archive.org/details/cu31924028834848>.

Pristin, Terry. "Renting or Buying, Hamptons Feel Pinch." *New York Times*. April 9, 2009.

Reynolds, Coleen, "New Life for a Landmark." *Southampton Press*, December 23, 2010.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, 1916, 1926, 1932, 1945, 1964.  
*Southampton Press*, May 14, 1948, 2.

*Southampton Press*, July 14, 1977.

*Southampton Telephone Directories*, 1959-1985.

Strong, John A. "Indian Whalers on Long Island, 1669-1746." *Long Island History Journal* 25, no. 1 (2016).

United States Federal Census, 1850-1950.

Walkowski, Jennifer and Meagan Baco. "Reconnaissance Level Historic Resources Survey, City

of Lockport, Niagara County, New York,” February 2011, Section 5.

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

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

**Primary location of additional data:**

\_\_\_\_\_ State Historic Preservation Office  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other State agency  
\_\_\_\_\_ Federal agency  
\_\_\_\_\_ Local government  
\_\_\_\_\_ University  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other

Name of  
repository: \_\_\_\_\_

Historic Resources Survey Number (if  
assigned): \_\_\_\_\_

**10. Geographical Data**

**Acreage of Property** \_\_\_\_\_

(Do not include previously listed resource acreage.)

**Latitude/Longitude Coordinates**

Datum if other than WGS84: \_\_\_\_\_  
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

1. Latitude:	Longitude:
2. Latitude:	Longitude:
3. Latitude:	Longitude:
4. Latitude:	Longitude:

**Verbal Boundary Description** (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

The boundary is indicated by a heavy line on the enclosed map with scale.

**Boundary Justification** (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

---

### 11. Form Prepared By

---

name/

title

organization

date

street & number

telephone

city or

zip

town

state

code

e-mail

---

### Additional Documentation

---

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A **USGS map** (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.  
A **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.
- **Continuation Sheets**
- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items.)

---

### Photographs:

---

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map.

Name of Property:

City or Vicinity:

County:

State:

Photographer:

Date Photographed:

Description of Photograph(s) and number:

1 of \_\_\_\_.

---

**Property Owner:**

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

---

name      N/A

street & number

telephone

city or

town

state

zip code

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:** This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).

**Estimated Burden Statement:** Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Office of Planning and Performance Management, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC.