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FOREWORD

“It is my hope and desire to get close to Nature, to know her character more intimately, but I will be old, old, old before I can do even the little I do without her assistance.” – Julian Alden Weir

American artist Julian Alden Weir was larger than life. Famous for his role in the founding of American Impressionism, Weir had about him a magnetism attracting admirers and fellow artists. A vibrant life is represented in his fascinating personal letters, thousands of works of art, and the landscape settings where he painted. Gregarious and robust, he traveled extensively with his family between New York, Europe, and Connecticut at the turn of the nineteenth century. You may ask, how did this stony Connecticut farm compare with the art-centric societies and circles he frequented? It was not meant to. In Branchville Weir conjured a different sort of setting to inspire art. Weir, his friends and family, painted and sketched en plein air, immersed in the rural landscape—captivated by light and color.

Today, Weir Farm National Historic Site is recognized as nationally significant for its cultural landscape and is widely considered among the finest surviving landscapes of American Impressionism. Because this place was created in part by and for artists, preserving the essential character of the landscape is central to the park’s cultural landscape program. Accomplishing this goal has required a herculean documentary effort as well as a creative approach toward landscape maintenance. These efforts are well reflected in the report that you hold in your hands.

This report, an updated landscape treatment plan and record of past landscape treatment, is the third in a series of in-depth studies produced by the Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation. Like many endeavors at Weir Farm, the preparation of this report has been a labor of love. Expertly directed and managed by Historical Landscape Architects Timothy Layton and Eliot Foulds, this volume represents the culmination of a fifteen-year collaborative relationship between staff of the Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation and Weir Farm National Historic Site. Greg Waters, Chief of Resources, has devoted over ten years of his career to the park landscape and his active role in this report is paramount. These professionals and many others, especially the park’s gardeners, grounds crews, garden volunteers, and summer interns, have all contributed to the preservation and protection of the Weir Farm landscape.

This current volume makes remarkable and effective use of maps, drawings, and photographs. Much like the artistic setting that it documents, the report is visually inspiring. Its narrative is well organized and begs to be read, used, and
consulted by Weir Farm’s future stewards. The report contains the most current information about, and direction for, the domestic landscape of the park’s historic core where, over the course of the past eight years, much of the park’s energy and resources have been devoted. As the building preservation projects within this core area approach completion, the park is able to turn its efforts to the domestic landscape setting surrounding the structures and restore period characteristics and features to the landscape. A seasonal haystack near the Weir Barn, trellises for climbing roses, a grape arbor, vegetable gardens, and a much anticipated chicken yard will soon be returned to their place. And in so doing, the contributions of Weir’s daughters and their families and former caretakers, gardeners, farm workers, and house staff will come alive. Extending the story and history to those who worked the fields and did the cooking brings the site even closer to the heart of every visitor.

Yet, it is the incorporation of a record of prior landscape treatment that adds a new level of excellence and usefulness to this report. As managers we are often so focused on what has yet to be done that we risk losing sight of what has been accomplished. Such a record of prior work offers future managers a sequential status of completed landscape preservation tasks, making it possible to adapt future choices to prior experience. The organization of this record of completed landscape treatment is intuitive and provides the park with a comprehensive volume for compliance, reference, and interpretation, capturing incredibly valuable institutional knowledge that otherwise would have been lost with the departure of long-term staff and the passage of time.

Weir Farm’s 2013 Long Range Interpretive Plan states “Art and artistic expression are the essence of Weir Farm National Historic Site’s history and legacy. The park’s collection of exterior, interior, and sensory environments inspired several generations of artists and visitors—beginning with Julian Alden Weir and continuing today.” This report will be an important tool for the park’s grounds staff, who are artists in their own way, as they preserve and protect, rehabilitate and restore the gardens, orchards, trails, paths, fields, stone walls, trees, and most importantly the historic views and painting sites for all to enjoy and use as inspiration.

Maybe Weir already said it best, *What a beautiful world it is.* – Julian Alden Weir

Linda A. Cook
Superintendent
Weir Farm National Historic Site
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INTRODUCTION

Located astride the boundary line separating the New England towns of Ridgefield and Wilton, Connecticut, Weir Farm National Historic Site preserves the setting that for over one hundred years inspired the art of Julian Alden Weir, and other artists who followed him in both ownership and preservation of this extraordinary rural property (Figure 1). As the first national park in Connecticut, and the only National Park Service site in the nation dedicated to American painting, the park currently preserves approximately sixty acres of historic farmland, miles of stone walls, and sixteen historic structures, some dating back to the late eighteenth century.

Weir Farm National Historic Site is significant for its association with artist Julian Alden Weir and the development of the American Impressionist school of painting. The property is also significant for the Weir farmhouse, two art studios, and farm outbuildings that collectively form a unique collection of building types in the state of Connecticut. The periods of significance for Weir Farm National Historic Site are from 1760–1882 and 1882–1957. The first period is attributed to the initial construction dates, including the 1760–78 Weir House, and continues through the occupation of the Beers and Webb families. The second historic period, from 1882–1957, includes the period when Julian Alden Weir and Mahonri Young owned and lived at the property, as well as the period when the property was used as an artists’ retreat. This latter period of significance begins when Weir assumed ownership of the property and ends with the death of Young. The threefold purpose of Weir Farm National Historic Site, as described in its enabling legislation, is to: 1) preserve a significant site associated with the tradition of American Impressionism; 2) maintain the integrity of a setting that inspired artistic expression; and 3) continue to offer opportunities for people to study and create art at the farm.

The Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) is the primary document used by the National Park Service to guide the treatment and management of a cultural landscape. Park staff, regional specialists, and public participants articulated Weir Farm National Historic Site’s management goals in the park’s General Management Plan, completed in 1995. The General Management Plan specifically recognized the cultural landscape as significant for its association with the work of Julian Alden Weir and contemporary artists such as Childe Hassam and John Henry Twachtman. The landscape was further acknowledged as a primary cultural resource of equal value to and inseparable from the site’s buildings.1

Given the significance of the landscape articulated in the General Management Plan, the Cultural Landscape Report for Weir Farm National Historic Site, Volume
1: Site History and Existing Conditions was published in 1996 documenting the site’s cultural landscape history and existing landscape conditions. Based on General Management Plan goals and documented existing conditions, the Cultural Landscape Report for Weir Farm National Historic Site, Volume 2: Analysis and Treatment was completed in 1997. This document evaluated the significance of landscape characteristics and features according to National Register of Historic Places criteria, providing recommendations for managing the landscape’s historic character. The landscape treatment recommendations outlined in the 1997 volume served as the basis for a park-specific programmatic agreement for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act between the National Park Service, the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Based on the recommendations outlined in the 1997 Volume 2 report, several landscape projects have been accomplished that enhance the historic character of the property. These accomplishments include the recovery of former woodland edges that had encroached on historic orchards, gardens and domestic landscape spaces. Individual gardens, outbuildings and small-scale landscape features have also been stabilized, restored or otherwise reconstructed, including a rustic fence crafted of coarsely split pickets that has long defined the character of the rural intersection of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. Other recommendations previously offered for enhanced interpretation and visitor access to the Weir house and landscape were deferred due to the life tenancy of the Andrews family. Doris and Sperry Andrews lived at Weir Farm when the property was acquired by the National Park Service and the couple continued on in the site’s artistic tradition, as the third successive family of artists to reside at the site. The National Park Service acquired full occupancy of buildings in the Weir domestic grounds and the Caretaker’s domestic grounds in 2005.

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this report is to update prior landscape treatment guidance based on existing conditions, newly acquired documentation, and current management goals and objectives. Leaving the provisions of the 1997 programmatic agreement facilitating compliance with Section 106 unaltered, this updated report also provides a useful record of landscape treatment tasks completed since 1997. Landscape conditions at Weir Farm National Historic Site have changed since the completion of the 1997 Volume 2 report. With the passage of over fifteen years, new issues have been identified that were unanticipated in previous efforts and recently acquired oral histories and newly discovered photographs have become available to support landscape treatment recommendations. These circumstances suggest the value of updating prior recommendations.
This report has been prepared for consistency with *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques* (National Park Service, 1998). Building upon the recommendations in the 1997 Volume 2 report, this report is organized into six chapters. The first chapter provides a narrative and graphic description of existing landscape conditions based upon current documentation and on-site observations. The second chapter furnishes an analysis of landscape characteristics and features, comparing documented historical conditions with existing conditions. The third chapter outlines a framework for treatment, presenting a landscape treatment philosophy fully supported by enabling legislation, National Park Service policies, and Weir Farm National Historic Site’s prior planning documents. The forth chapter details the overarching landscape treatment issues facing the park. The fifth chapter narrates and illustrates specific landscape treatment tasks necessary to retain, enhance, and reestablish the historic character of the landscape. The sixth chapter presents a record of treatment for tasks completed between 1997 and 2012. Given the cyclical nature of all landscape maintenance and care, when Weir Farm’s landscape features inevitably require follow-up care or re-treatment in the future, this final section of the report will serve as a helpful reference.

Study Area

Weir Farm National Historic Site’s General Management Plan identifies three distinct areas within the park that are defined by the intersection of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane (Figure 2). North of Pelham Lane and west of Nod Hill Road is the Weir Complex. Approximately ten acres in size, the Weir Complex contains a farmhouse, a barn, two studios, several farm outbuildings, and a secluded garden. South of Pelham Lane and west of Nod Hill Road is the Burlingham Complex, named for Weir’s daughter Cora and her husband Charles Burlingham. The Burlingham Complex comprises approximately twelve acres and contains a main house, barn, woodshed, potting shed, and sunken garden. The final and largest of the three areas, approximately thirty-eight acres in size, is the Pond and Woodland Area to the east of Nod Hill Road. This area contains a dense forested canopy created by a variety of hardwood trees, intermittent streams, wetlands, and a pond and dam Weir had constructed in the late nineteenth century. Also in the Pond and Woodland Area, along Nod Hill Road, are a Caretaker’s House and artist-in-residence studio. The Weir Complex, Burlingham Complex, and Pond and Woodland Area combine to form an approximate sixty-acre park. This updated treatment report addresses all three areas.

Landscape Character Areas

In order to clearly organize and present information, this report retains the thematic and geographical subdivisions established in the 1997 Volume 2 report.
Thus, this report divides the landscape into the following six landscape character areas, or zones.

- Weir Complex Domestic Grounds
- Weir Complex Agricultural Zone
- Burlingham Complex Domestic Grounds
- Burlingham Complex Agricultural Zone
- Caretaker’s Domestic Grounds
- Pond and Woodland Area

**Mapping**

In support of infrastructure and accessibility improvements at the park, contractors completed a topographic survey in 2009 for a large portion of the Weir and Burlingham complexes. This report utilizes the 2009 survey drawing as the base for all of the maps and maintains the Connecticut State Plane coordinate system used in the survey. Older drawings and unprojected aerial photographs were either converted to the state plane system or proportionally scaled and rotated to align with the 2009 survey. Base information for the Pond and Woodland Area was obtained from an aerial survey prepared for the park in 1993. For all maps, the canopy outlines showing masses of vegetation were traced from 2008 color orthophotos provided by the U.S. Geological Survey.

This report includes plans at two different scales to best describe existing conditions and treatment tasks. A large-scale map at approximately 1”=200’ shows the overall property, highlights park-wide treatment tasks, and denotes tasks for the Pond and Woodland Area. Separate plans at 1”=60’ show the existing conditions and proposed treatment for the Weir and Burlingham complexes.

**COMPLIANCE STRATEGIES**

**CULTURAL RESOURCE COMPLIANCE**

In October 1997, after reviewing the draft findings and recommendations of the Cultural Landscape Report for Weir Farm National Historic Site, Volume 2: Analysis and Treatment, the National Park Service, the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation entered into a park-specific programmatic agreement greatly reducing the requirement for further consultation regarding the individual landscape treatment tasks described in the 1997 report.

The following updated report includes all treatment tasks outlined in the 1997 report. Tasks that have been competed since 1997 are presented in the final chapter, constituting a record of landscape treatment. Tasks yet to be completed remain presented as recommendations. Landscape treatment tasks developed since 1997 based on new information or changing issues are presented with former tasks, however post-1997 tasks are not covered by the park’s programmatic
agreement, and will require individual Section 106 consultation. To assist in identifying Section 106 compliance needs, this report contains summary tables at the conclusion of the treatment narratives featuring a column clearly identifying new, post-1997 landscape treatment tasks and tasks reiterated from the earlier 1997 Volume 2 report that are subject to the programmatic agreement.

**NATURAL RESOURCE COMPLIANCE**

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, all federal agencies must prepare an “Environmental Impact Statement” for proposed actions having the potential to cause significant impacts on the environment. The public and the Environmental Protection Agency reviewed a draft environmental impact statement for Weir Farm National Historic Site in conjunction with preparing the General Management Plan. Comments were addressed in the combined final General Management Plan and environmental impact statement approved in February 1995. The following landscape-related tasks were identified and their impacts assessed as part of the park’s environmental impact statement:

- Restoration of Weir Complex landscape to reflect conditions extant circa 1940.
- Rehabilitation of Burlingham Complex landscape to retain changes Cora Weir Burlingham made after 1940.
- Restoration of Pond and Woodland Area landscape to reestablish select farm fields and other missing features that existed circa 1940.
- Expand current path system and upgrade surfaces to form a loop that links key park sites.
- Provide barrier-free access to buildings and landscape wherever possible without significantly changing the character of the historic building or landscape.
- Provide vegetative screening of contemporary development at the boundaries of park property.
- Provide for replacement and upgrade of septic system serving employees and visitors.
- Stabilize earthen dam associated with the Weir Pond.
- Reconstruction of missing historic structures extant circa 1940, including the Wagon Shed and the Caretaker’s Carriage House.
LOCAL REGULATORY COMPLIANCE

In addition to compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and other applicable federal codes and regulations, the park will work with the State of Connecticut and the Towns of Ridgefield and Wilton on compliance with state and local environmental regulations. Chief among the categories of environmental compliance are regulations pertaining to inland wetlands. The Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection has developed several expedited and short processes to facilitate the permitting of minor activities in its jurisdiction. For example, a general permit is available for certain activities related to dam safety repair and alteration that would lessen the need for repeat regulatory filings. The park may also pursue plan-related agreements with the Department of Environmental Protection similar to the programmatic agreement developed with the State Historic Preservation Officer.

In the Town of Ridgefield, the Inland Wetlands Board reviews proposals and issues permits for regulated activities adjacent to or within designated inland wetlands areas and watercourses. In the Town of Wilton, the Inland Wetlands Department performs the same function and provides applications for minor, intermediate, and significant activity. The park should apply to one or both of the towns as a specific project may require. It is important to note that the wetland areas shown on the existing conditions and treatment plan maps are for illustrative purposes only and should not be used for regulatory compliance or permitting. Where necessary, the park should have a wetland scientist field delineate wetland areas in the vicinity of any proposed project.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

THE PRE-WEIR PERIOD, CIRCA 1745–1882

Prior to Julian Alden Weir’s acquiring farm property in southwestern Connecticut, the Beers and Webb families owned the parcels of land around the intersection of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. In 1789, Anthony Beers purchased two contiguous parcels of land that had been originally granted by the Ridgefield Proprietors in 1745. According to deed records, Beers’ purchase included a dwelling house on the northwest corner of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. Architectural investigations revealed the house was likely constructed between 1760 and 1779. Anthony Beers purchased a third contiguous parcel in 1797 and the combined property remained in the Beers family following Anthony’s death in 1820. Lewis Beers, Anthony’s son, purchased other adjoining properties and added a barn and other agricultural outbuildings. An 1861 probate inventory lists on Lewis Beers’ property a main farmhouse, small dwelling house, carriage house, barn and cow houses, wash house, and hog house.
In 1880, the heirs of Lewis Beers sold the property to the Gilbert & Bennett Manufacturing Company, a local company with ties to the Beers family. That same year, the company sold the property to Connecticut native and silver mine owner Erwin Davis. Interested in collecting art, Davis hired Julian Alden Weir to take a European tour and purchase paintings in the summer of 1880. Two years later, Davis transferred ownership of the farm property to Weir in exchange for a painting Weir previously purchased for $560 and an additional ten dollars.

When Weir acquired the 153-acre property, the Webb family owned and farmed a fifty-acre property south of Pelham Lane. These fifty acres originated from a 1748 grant for a forty-one acre and a nine-acre parcel in common land known as Rockhouse Woods. A 1782 deed lists a main house on the nine-acre parcel and in 1832, Jared Webb purchased that property. Webb purchased the adjoining forty-one acres in 1843 and by that time, a barn stood on the property along with the main house. By 1855 William Webb, Jared’s son, owned the entire fifty-acre property and continued as the owner until 1907.

THE WEIR PERIOD, 1882–1919

Weir’s new property lay in the southeast section of the Town of Ridgefield and bordered the Town of Wilton. This area was known as Branchville due to the beginning of a branch rail line from the Danbury and Norwalk Railroad that extended to Ridgefield Village. Many of Weir’s artworks and correspondence reference Branchville or his Branchville farm.

After completing his studies in Paris at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Weir returned to the United States in 1877 and began his art career concentrating on portraits and still lifes. Weir and his first wife Anna Baker maintained a residence in New York City near Weir’s studio in Washington Square and traveled to the Branchville farm for weekend retreats (Figure 3). In addition, they resided at the farm continuously from May until the late fall. The first major change to the property during Weir’s tenure occurred in 1885. By that summer, Weir completed a studio north of the main house and west of the barn. The architect of the studio is unknown, however, stylistic evidence indicates the possibility that Charles Platt may have influenced the design.

In the 1880s and 1890s, Weir’s painting transitioned in subject matter and style. He began experimenting with painting landscapes and the rural scenes around his Branchville farm. Painting with his associates John Henry Twachtman and Childe Hassam, Weir’s work began to emphasize patterns of color and light instead of a strict attention to detail. Critics started identifying Weir, often disparagingly, as an Impressionist.
In addition to drawing inspiration and subject matter from his farm, Weir hosted contemporary artists at Branchville such as Albert Pinkham Ryder, John Henry Twachtman, Childe Hassam, John Singer Sargent, J. Appleton Brown, and William Glackens. While some of these visits were simply social calls, other visitors, such as Childe Hassam, used their time on the farm to paint, sketch, and experiment in new representational techniques that were being recognized as American Impressionism.10

In 1895, Weir submitted his painting “The Truants” to a competition conducted by the Boston Art Club. The painting is of a scene looking west across a meadow on the east side of Nod Hill Road. In the foreground, two boys hide in a hollow that rises up to a stone wall along the road. The painting won first prize and with the prize money, Weir purchased ten acres east of Nod Hill Road in 1896. On the newly purchased property, Weir directed the construction of a dam and pond that covered over three and a half acres (Figure 4). In addition to the dam and pond, by the 1890s Weir’s Branchville farm featured sapling fences, rustic arbors and bridges, hen runs, and informal gardens. Correspondence from the period credits an Alsatian immigrant, Paul Remy, with creating these small-scale features. Remy and his family worked as farmers and caretakers on the property between 1890 and circa 1907.11

Weir’s contribution to the establishment of American Impressionism included more than his paintings and eventual critical success. Dissatisfied with the exhibition practices of the Society of American Artists, Weir became one of the founders of The Ten American Painters in late 1897. “The Ten” became recognized as the core group of American Impressionism and Weir exhibited with the group until it disbanded in 1919.12

During the first decades of the 1900s, Weir directed two renovations to the main house in Branchville and purchased additional adjoining land that brought his total farm property to 238 acres. Weir commissioned Charles Platt to design an expansion of the main house that elongated the house to the west and formalized the entrance on the south facade off of Pelham Lane. Workers completed the expansion between 1900 and 1901, and a decade later, Weir employed the firm of McKim, Mead and White to design a dining room addition to the north of the house. In 1907, Weir purchased the fifty-acre Webb farm to the south of his property. Weir’s intentions for purchasing the Webb farm are not documented. Since he and the tenant farmers he employed were not involved in profitable agriculture, the new property may have been a preemptive purchase against development that would alter his farm’s setting.13

Illness struck Weir in the summer of 1919 and he was unable to recover, passing away on December 8, 1919. During his tenure, Weir expanded his farm property to 238 acres, altered the circa 1760 main house, constructed a studio and agricultural outbuildings, developed a pond on the eastern portion of the
property, and added gardens and rustic features such as the fence along the public roads (Figure 5).

**ELLA AND DOROTHY WEIR PERIOD, 1919–1931**

Weir bequeathed his Branchville property to his second wife Ella Baker and daughters Caroline (Caro), Dorothy, and Cora. Caro and Cora transferred their rights to the property to Ella and Dorothy in 1922. During this period, Ella and Dorothy spent summers at the Branchville farm and continued employing tenant farmers year round. Farming and gardening continued, however, there is no indication from available resources that major changes occurred at the property during Ella and Dorothy's tenure. In the early 1920s Dorothy met the sculptor Mahonri Young in New York City. Young, grandson of Mormon pioneer Brigham Young, had completed commissions for the Mormon Church including the 1913 *Seagull Monument* erected in Temple Square, Salt Lake City.\(^{14}\) A courtship ensued between Mahonri and Dorothy and following Ella’s death in December 1930, Mahonri and Dorothy were married in February 1931.\(^{15}\) The couple continued Julian Alden Weir’s practice of maintaining a residence in New York City and spending time at the farm in Branchville.

**THE YOUNG PERIOD, 1931–1957**

Dorothy Weir and Mahonri Young intended to spend more than the summer months at Branchville and in the summer of 1931, they installed electrical service and a central heating system at the main house. That same year, Dorothy transferred ownership of the fifty-acre Webb property to her sister Cora and her husband Charles Burlingham. The Burlinghams maintained their property south of Pelham Lane independently from the Youngs. By the early 1940s, the Burlinghams had renovated the property’s main house and barn, installed a stone terrace south of the house, added a stone potting shed, directed the construction of the Sunken Garden, and employed local masons from the Knoche family to construct new stone walls around the perimeter of their property (Figure 6).

During the same time period, Dorothy Weir and Mahonri Young were active in modifying Weir Farm beyond their initial addition of electricity and central heat. Mahonri Young directed the construction of a second studio at the property. Young’s studio, constructed west of the Weir Studio, was designed by Young’s son-in-law Oliver Lay and completed in 1932. Lay, son of the noted landscape architect Charles Downing Lay, had recently graduated from the Columbia University School of Architecture and would go on to work for the New York City Parks Department and later as a site planner for the architectural firm York and Sawyer.\(^{16}\) With a dedicated sculpture studio completed, Young sculpted figures and friezes for the monumental sculpture *This Is the Place*. The 1947 sculpture
commemorates the location where Brigham Young entered the Salt Lake Valley. Mahonri Young also produced numerous sketches that document the changes and everyday use of Weir Farm during his and Dorothy’s tenure.

By circa 1940, the Youngs had added a terraced vegetable garden west of the main house, constructed a wagon shed and animal shelter, and converted a pre-existing ice house to a chicken house (Figure 7). In addition the Bass family, then living at the Caretaker’s House, had added a three-car garage south of their residence. Mahonri Young’s numerous sketches also record arbors and trellises in the landscape, maintenance on stone walls, harvesting apples in the orchard, and small-scale crop production and animal husbandry. Following Dorothy Weir Young’s death in 1947, Mahonri spent increasingly less time at Weir Farm. Agricultural activity diminished and successional growth developed in the fields and meadows (Figure 8).

In 1952, Mahonri Young prepared an introduction for a catalog accompanying an exhibit of Julian Alden Weir’s work. Sperry Andrews, an artist who visited the exhibit and lived in Ridgefield, visited Young at Weir Farm. The two became friends and after Young’s death in 1957, Sperry and his wife Doris purchased the core of the farm from Young’s heirs.

THE ANDREWS PERIOD, 1958–1990

Doris and Sperry Andrews became the next generation of resident artists at Weir Farm when they purchased the property in 1958. The two met while sharing an easel during a class at the Art Students League and were married in 1948. Like Julian Alden Weir and Mahonri Young before him, Sperry Andrews painted the landscape and subtle outdoor features of Weir Farm (Figure 9). Described as a “painter’s painter,” Sperry was noted for his dedication and practice of completing paintings entirely outdoors throughout the year.\(^{17}\) His paintings were featured at one-man exhibitions and are part of the permanent collections at the Wadsworth Atheneum, the Columbus Gallery of Fine Art, the National Academy of Design, and the New Britain Museum of American Art.\(^{18}\)

Doris and Sperry Andrews made few changes to the property during their tenure. Woody vegetation continued to encroach on agricultural fields that had been farmed before World War II. Lacking regular use and routine maintenance, both the Wagon Shed and the Caretaker’s Carriage House collapsed during the later years of the Andrews’ tenure. Plantings requiring a high level of maintenance, such as the Secret Garden and vegetable garden terraces, lost the quantity and quality of plant material they had once possessed. The greatest change to Weir Farm occurred on surrounding properties with the subdivision of large farming parcels and the construction of suburban housing following the end of World War II.
Working with Cora Weir Burlingham and other local supporters, Doris and Sperry Andrews were instrumental in preserving Weir Farm. Their advocacy helped lead to legislation creating Weir Farm National Historic Site in 1990 (Figure 10). Doris and Sperry Andrews retained a life tenancy with the creation of the new park and continued to reside at the Weir House until 2003 and 2005 respectively.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Beginning in the mid-1990s with plans to restore the Secret Garden and working through 2012, Weir Farm National Historic Site has completed forty-six treatment tasks that preserve and enhance historic landscape character and address park management, interpretive, and visitor services objectives. Twenty-two of the completed treatment tasks were identified in the 1997 Volume 2 report and addressed restoration and rehabilitation of features including agricultural outbuildings, two orchards, rustic picket fencing, and ornamental gardens. Between the fall of 2010 and the end of 2012, twenty-four landscape treatments tasks were completed focusing on small-scale features and dry-laid stonework that provided agricultural function, rustic ornamentation, and recreation opportunities during the treatment period.

An additional twenty-four treatment tasks from the 1997 Volume 2 report remain to be completed and are reiterated in this report along with nineteen newly identified tasks. Tasks retained from the 1997 Volume 2 report have not substantively changed and should be implemented following the site-specific programmatic agreement entered among Weir Farm National Historic Site, the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The nineteen new tasks are not included in the programmatic agreement and will need individual Section 106 compliance review.

The new and remaining treatment tasks continue to improve historic landscape character and include the reconstruction of the Wagon Shed, the replanting of missing foundation and other ornamental plants, and the replacement in kind of historic trees. Of all the remaining tasks, the removal of successional woody vegetation from the Triangular and Ridgetop meadows and the re-establishment of meadow turf in these spaces will have the greatest impact on historic landscape character at the park.
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Figure 1. Weir Farm National Historic Site location map. Weir Farm National Historic Site preserves the setting that for over one hundred years inspired the art of Julian Alden Weir and other artists who followed him in both ownership and preservation of a rural property in southwestern Connecticut (http://www.nps.gov/wefa/planyourvisit/upload/Area%20Map%20Final.pdf).

Figure 2. Weir Farm property overview. The General Management Plan identifies three distinct areas created by the intersection of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. North of Pelham Lane is the Weir Complex, south of Pelham Lane is the Burlingham Complex, and east of Nod Hill Road is the Pond and Woodland Area. Plan view, 2010 (Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation, hereafter OCLP).
Figure 3. Julian Alden Weir on horseback in front of the barn. View looking north, circa 1900 (Weir Farm National Historic Site, hereafter WEFA, HP 883).

Figure 4. Julian Alden Weir fishing on the pond he had constructed in 1896. A linear band of stones in the background mark the crest of the dam used to retain the pond. View looking north, circa 1900 (WEFA HP 22).
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Figure 5. Weir Farm 1919 Period Plan. During his tenure, J. Alden Weir expanded his farm property to 238 acres, altered the circa 1760 main house, constructed a studio and agricultural outbuildings, developed a pond on the eastern portion of the property, and added gardens and rustic features such as the fence along the public roads. Plan view, 1996 (Child Associates, Inc. and Cynthia Zaitzevsky, Cultural Landscape Report for Weir Farm National Historic Site, vol. 1, Site History and Existing Conditions, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service).
Figure 6. During their ownership of the fifty-acre Webb property, Cora and Charles Burlingham directed the construction of the Sunken Garden, located west of the main house. View looking east, circa 1950s (WEFA HP 127).

Figure 7. Seasonal vegetable plantings in the terraced garden installed west of the Weir House and south of the Weir and Young studios during the Young period. View looking north, circa 1940 (WEFA HP 1040).
Figure 8. Weir Farm 1947 Period Plan. By circa 1940, the Youngs had added a terraced vegetable garden west of the main house, constructed a wagon shed and animal shelter, and converted the ice house to a chicken house. Plan view, 1996 (Child Associates, Inc. and Cynthia Zaltzevsky, Cultural Landscape Report for Weir Farm National Historic Site, vol. 1, Site History and Existing Conditions, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service).
Figure 9. Sperry Andrews painting *en plein air* in the Weir Orchard. View looking north, circa 1960s (Andrews Family Home Movies, WEFA 6830).

Figure 10. Sperry Andrews presenting to a school tour in front of the Weir Studio. View looking southwest, circa 1990s (WEFA HP 1138).
1. Existing Conditions

This chapter describes the existing landscape conditions of the Weir Farm National Historic Site landscape during 2012. For the purpose of this report, the Weir Farm National Historic Site landscape is organized and described according to six landscape character areas or zones. The *Cultural Landscape Report for Weir Farm National Historic Site, Volume 2: Analysis and Treatment* (1997) provided a similar organization and description of the landscape and its features. In subsequent landscape analysis, treatment, and record of treatment chapters of this updated report, these six landscape character areas are reiterated to serve as a consistent organizing structure.

Many landscape treatment recommendations have been accomplished following completion of the 1997 volume 2 report. These circumstances, combined with the dynamic qualities inherent in all landscapes, suggests the value of reexamining landscape conditions as part of this updated report. This chapter describes each character area followed by an existing conditions summary. Specific landscape features found within each landscape character area are presented and analyzed in a tabular format within the chapter immediately following this one.

**LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AREAS**

Landscape character areas are typically delineated and used within cultural landscape reports to define the geographic scope of land areas sharing similar qualities, land-use, or resource concentration and type. The landscape character areas delineated in this project for Weir Farm National Historic Site build upon the three complexes—Weir, Burlingham, and Pond and Woodland—defined in the 1995 General Management Plan. Within each complex, a subdivision between domestic and agricultural areas is defined resulting in the following six landscape character areas.

- Weir Complex Domestic Grounds
- Weir Complex Agricultural Zone
- Burlingham Complex Domestic Grounds
- Burlingham Complex Agricultural Zone
- Caretaker’s Domestic Grounds
- Pond and Woodland Area

**EXISTING LANDSCAPE CONDITIONS**

**Weir Complex Domestic Grounds**

The Weir Complex domestic grounds comprise the area immediately surrounding the Weir House, the Weir and Young studios, and the Secret Garden. The area
immediately surrounding the Weir House, likely referred to as the “dooryard” by Weir and his family, features a combination of rustic fencing, ornamental planting, and relatively level topography that together define a specific embellished landscape space within the domestic grounds. Functionally, the ensemble of landscape features in the Weir Complex domestic grounds supported the daily lives of the park’s three generations of artists and included activity in ornamental and recreational gardening. The domestic grounds are distinct from landscape features associated with farming and agricultural pursuits.

South of the Weir House, the boundary of the domestic grounds extends to the pavement edge on Pelham Lane. To the east, the boundary extends to the edge of Nod Hill Road and is reinforced along both Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane by a rustic picket fence. To the west of the Weir House, the domestic grounds extend to the granite well cover and follow the toe or western end of a moderate slope. To the north of the Weir House, the domestic grounds boundary runs south of the barnyard fence, extends to the northeast corner of the Weir Studio deck, wraps around the perimeter of the Secret Garden, and continues around the sloping ground west of the Young Studio (Figure 11).

Landscape restoration efforts were underway within the Weir Complex domestic grounds well before the 2005 end of the Andrews life tenancy. Projects included the restoration of the Secret Garden in 1994 and restoration of the rustic picket fencing in 2003. During 2012, the park was nearing conclusion of a comprehensive multi-year program of building system improvements in an effort to both protect the structures and their contents, as well as to make sensitive modifications needed in order to open the Weir House and studios to public visitation. This work has included extensive excavation throughout the Weir Complex domestic grounds in order to bury utilities, building fire suppression, and intrusion alarm systems out of view. The scope of this program also provides for restoring the historic configuration of the south-facing porch of the Weir House with modifications for universal accessibility, restoring deteriorated dry-laid stone walls, and reconstructing rustic garden trellises, fences, and features attributed to the historic period (Figure 12). As a result, the Weir Complex domestic grounds are in good condition. Work remaining in 2012 includes minor planting and turf renovation that is scheduled to commence following conclusion of all construction activity.

**Weir Complex Agricultural Zone**

The Weir Complex agricultural zone comprises the remaining area northwards beyond the Weir Complex domestic grounds. The agricultural zone extends north from the domestic grounds and includes the Weir Barn, Tack House, and agricultural outbuildings. The agricultural zone is vegetated in nearly equal parts of woodland and rough-cut meadow grasses and also includes an informally arranged orchard and the stone pig pens west of the Young Studio (see Figure 11).
Existing Conditions

Restoration efforts within the Weir Complex agricultural zone began in 1995 with the restoration of the eighteenth century Weir Barn and its adjacent Tack House. The small free-standing Animal Shelter and the Corn Crib were both restored in 1998 concurrent with a project to restore the Weir Orchard by replanting clones of surviving historic apple tree varieties that were made from cuttings taken in 1995. In 2003, rustic picket fencing was constructed south of and enclosing the barn courtyard as part of the program to restore the rustic picket fencing within the Weir Complex domestic grounds. In 2008, the Chicken House was stabilized by repairing foundations and rotting sills. During 2010, the north barnyard sapling fence, the woven-wire-mesh poultry fencing, and a rustic trellis on the west ell of the Weir Barn were fabricated based on historic imagery and installed by staff from the National Park Service Historic Preservation Training Center. As a result of these projects, the existing condition of the Weir Complex agricultural zone is good, reflecting the approximate conditions of the landscape during the treatment period (Figure 13). Restoration projects yet to be completed include the reconstruction of the missing Wagon Shed, a project identified in the park’s General Management Plan, as well as the reproduction of the missing haystack appearing in historic photography of the site during the treatment period.

Burlingham Complex Domestic Grounds

Similar to the neighboring Weir Complex, the Burlingham Complex domestic grounds consist of a cluster of landscape features arrayed around a former dwelling. The eastern edge of the Burlingham Complex domestic grounds is defined by Nod Hill Road and is reinforced by a stone wall offset from the road’s paved surface. To the north, this area is further bounded by another stone wall, set perpendicular to the wall along Nod Hill Road, and approximately 200 feet south of the Nod Hill Road-Pelham Lane intersection. From the east-west line of this wall, the boundary of the domestic grounds then jogs to the south to include the stone Potting Shed and then west again to the northwest corner of the Sunken Garden. From this point, the boundary of the domestic grounds continues south, crossing a driveway, and includes the meadow surrounding the South Garden terraces. The southern boundary of the domestic grounds is formed by a stone wall, oriented from east to west, at the southern end of this meadow (see Figure 11).

The Burlingham Complex domestic grounds feature a number of finely crafted masonry features, including a rustic stone entrance terrace, a sunken garden defined on one side by a substantial stone retaining wall, dressed stone stairs, and an accompanying Potting Shed crafted from tooled ashlar blocks of local granite. Park staff and volunteers have rehabilitated the Sunken Garden, following plans prepared in 1997 by Norma Williams. The stone entrance terraces received the attentions of the Acadia National Park trails crew in 2001 when loose and heaved stones were leveled and reset. Additional garden terraces, constructed post-World
War II, are located south of the Burlingham driveway. These garden terraces, subjected to an overpopulation of white-tailed deer well prior to the National Park Service acquisition of the property, retain only the hardiest of plants growing within the limits of the stone-lined planting beds. During the fall of 2010, wooden cold frame covers and a deteriorated raspberry trellis system were replaced in-kind by staff of the National Park Service Historic Preservation Training Center. During 2011, an accessible pathway oriented in a line parallel to Nod Hill Road leading between the Burlingham Complex and the Weir Complex was completed as a replacement to a similar non-historic visitor pathway winding through the meadow between the Burlingham Barn and the Nod Hill Road/Pelham Lane intersection. Rehabilitation efforts to date have left the Burlingham Complex domestic grounds in good condition, well-serving the purposes intended for this area of the park landscape spelled out in planning documents (Figure 14). Work yet to be accomplished includes infill and replacement of overly mature plantings surrounding the Burlingham House foundation, and replanting of the garden terraces south of the Burlingham driveway with resilient garden species that are out-of-favor with the local population of white-tailed deer.

**Burlingham Complex Agricultural Zone**

The Burlingham Complex agricultural zone consists of the agricultural buildings and outlying meadows that surround the central domestic area. A barn and woodshed are located at the western end of the Burlingham driveway, centrally positioned to service the outlying fields. The placement of these two buildings, flanked by stone walls, creates a barnyard court opened to the west and east. Five fields, bordered by stone walls, are splayed around the barn and woodshed. The three western fields and the field furthest south abut conservation land, known as Weir Preserve, which is owned by the Weir Farm Art Center. The southwest portion of the southern field contains an orchard (see Figure 11).4

Beginning in 1998, the Burlingham Complex agricultural zone was treated to remove the overgrowth of woody vegetation invading the former meadows, work which also involved the rehabilitation of a small pre-existing orchard (Figure 15). Work has also included the 2004 rehabilitation of the Burlingham Barn in support of visitor use and educational programing. The project included the retrofit of accessible restrooms into the pre-existing annex built on the north side of the barn. Similarly, responding to overcrowding in the small visitor parking lot on Nod Hill Road, the park installed a fifteen-car staff parking area, concealed west of the Burlingham Barn in 2011. As a result of these and other projects, the Burlingham Complex agricultural zone is in good condition and well supports the preservation, visitor use, and interpretive objectives expressed in park plans.
Caretaker’s Domestic Grounds

The Caretaker’s domestic grounds occupy the east side of Nod Hill Road, extending southward from the Nod Hill Road-Pelham Lane intersection. The western boundary of this small area is defined by Nod Hill Road and reinforced by a rustic picket fence. The northern and eastern boundary of this space is defined by the top of a steep, wooded slope that is distinct from the open, relatively flat area containing the Caretaker’s House and rehabilitated Carriage House and garage. The domestic grounds’ southern boundary is defined by the edge of the visitor parking lot constructed in 1993 (see Figure 11).³

Rehabilitation efforts in this area have focused on the demolition and replacement of the pre-existing Caretaker’s Garage with an Artist-in-Residence Studio. The former garage building had been allowed to deteriorate to such an extent that it was impossible to preserve its historic materials. Instead, it has been replaced with a new building sharing similar geometry, scale, and finishes. The completion of this project in 2009, formerly a key task identified in park planning, as well as the earlier reconstruction of the missing historic rustic picket fencing in 2003, has left the Caretaker’s domestic grounds in good condition and well equipped to satisfy the goals expressed in publicly reviewed park plans (Figure 16).

Pond and Woodland Area

The Pond and Woodland Area is the largest character area at Weir Farm National Historic Site. The area extends east from Nod Hill Road and the northern, eastern, and southern boundaries of the Caretaker’s domestic grounds. The Pond and Woodland Area contains alternating bands of uplands and lowlands carved by glaciers over 10,000 years ago. The topography and drainage patterns support a dense forested canopy, intermittent streams, and wetlands. The eastern end of the Pond and Woodland Area features a pond and dam Julian Alden Weir had constructed in the late nineteenth century (Figure 17). The southern boundary of the Pond and Woodland Area abuts suburban residential properties that have developed since the late 1950s. The eastern boundary abuts Town of Ridgefield and State of Connecticut open space parcels and the northern boundary abuts both open space parcels and residential properties (see Figure 11).⁶

Prior to World War II, upland meadows in this area were open and free of trees and shrubs, separated by low ground that was wet, boggy, and forested. Spatial distinctions based on topographic differences continue to exist, but are less apparent, as many of the upland meadows have become closed in with self-sown woody growth. Except for the meadow immediately east of Nod Hill Road, it is the sense of three dimensional landscape space that has deteriorated in the Pond and Woodland Area. Importantly, the growth of young trees within former meadow areas has resulted in loss of the normally densely vegetated meadow/woodland edge, magnifying the visibility of contemporary suburban development just outside the park boundary.
The park has undertaken a limited program of work in the Pond and Woodland Area, focusing primarily on fashioning a network of walking paths for visitor enjoyment as stipulated by park planning documents. The first of these projects focused during 1998 on design and construction of a contemporary pedestrian bridge adjacent to the site of the narrow fishing bridge depicted in well-known artworks of the site. Additionally, the park has supported local Eagle Scout projects that have installed bog-walks where walking trails traverse seasonally wet areas. The park has also collaborated with the Acadia National Park trails crew to install a ribbon of native stepping stones around the southeast quadrant of the Weir Pond, making a dry circumferential route around the historic pond possible. These projects, as well as the careful attention that park staff has paid to the control of invasive species and the monitoring and maintenance of hazardous trees, has left this area of the park in good condition. However, the continued growth of young forest trees in formerly open meadows remain as a significant opportunity to enhance the historic setting that once inspired artistic expression. Additionally, engineering assessments have indicated that the earthen dam impounding the waters of the Weir Pond requires attention and will likely need to be addressed within the next ten to fifteen years.

ENDNOTES

1 Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation, _Cultural Landscape Report for Weir Farm National Historic Site_, vol. 2, _Analysis and Treatment_ (United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, September 1997), 63-64.

2 Ibid., 86.

3 Ibid., 99-100.

4 Ibid., 111. In 2005, the Connecticut Chapter of the Nature Conservancy transferred the Weir Preserve to the Weir Farm Art Center. The Weir Farm Art Center is a private, non-profit organization that serves as a programming partner of Weir Farm National Historic Site.

5 Ibid., 137.

6 Ibid., 118.
Figure 11. Weir Farm character areas. Within the Weir Complex, Burlingham Complex, and Pond and Woodland Area there is a division in historic use between domestic and agricultural or woodland areas that helps to define character areas. Plan view, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 12. Weir Complex domestic grounds. View looking north, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 13. Weir Complex agricultural zone. View looking south, 2011 (OCLP).

Figure 14. Burlingham Complex domestic grounds. View looking north, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 15. Burlingham Complex agricultural zone. View looking northwest, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 16. Caretaker’s domestic grounds. View looking north, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 17. Pond and Woodland Area. View looking southeast, 2011 (OCLP).
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2. ANALYSIS

Analysis of specific landscape features within Weir Farm’s six landscape character areas is further documented in detailed tables listing the various features and their role in contributing to the significance of the property according to the terms and criteria of the National Register of Historic Places. The tables also provide a convenient capsule history of each landscape feature accompanied by a description of the feature’s existing condition.

NATIONAL REGISTER STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE SUMMARY

The Weir Farm National Historic Site is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A, B, C, and D. Primary significance for the National Historic Site is found under Criterion B at the national level in the area of art, as the country home of American Impressionist painter Julian Alden Weir during the greater part of his career. The property is evidence of Weir’s affinity for the rural farm landscape depicted in many of his most noted paintings. Weir Farm National Historic Site is the only place where the domestic and creative milieus of a prominent nineteenth-century artist remain intact, including the home, studios, and a significant portion of the landscape that were integral to the artist’s vision. Significance is also found under Criterion B in the area of art because the National Historic Site was the home and studio of American sculptor Mahonri Young from 1931 until his death in 1957. Young was the son-in-law of Julian Alden Weir and in 1939, Young began work on his This Is the Place sculpture which commemorates the arrival of Mormon pioneers in the Salt Lake Valley. His studio in Branchville afforded him all that he needed to create the massive composition. Weir Farm provided the tranquility and energy necessary for Young to complete the piece successfully.¹

The periods of significance for the Weir Farm National Historic Site are from 1760–1882 and 1882–1957. The initial date can be attributed to initial construction dates, including the 1760–78 Weir House, continuing through the occupation of the Beers and Webb families. The second historic period of thematic importance, from 1882–1957, includes the period when Julian Alden Weir and Mahonri Young successively owned and lived at the property and used it as an artists’ retreat. This latter period of significance begins when Weir assumed ownership of the property and ends with the death of Young. Finally, the period of significance for the pre-contact archeological component, eligible on the state level, is defined as 2000–1000 B. P., indicated through the recovery of a Woodland Period projectile point and understanding of regional settlement patterns.²
The Weir Farm National Historic Site meets Criterion A at the national level for the development of American Impressionism and association with The Ten American Painters or “The Ten.” The property served as a venue for expression, practice, socialization, and collaboration for Weir and his contemporaries. The beauty of his farm and its rural landscape encouraged Weir and other artists to explore and ultimately embrace American Impressionism. Due in part to Julian Alden Weir’s ability to foster relationships with other artists, the American Impressionist movement gained success and legitimacy in the United States. By providing an environment for Weir and his contemporaries to gather and discuss ideas, trends, and theories, the site was critical in the founding of “The Ten.”

Under Criterion C, the site possesses significance at the local level as an intact collection of domestic and agricultural buildings and landscapes that exemplify regionally significant agricultural and rural landscape features. Weir was drawn to the location by the beauty of the site and, as a gentleman farmer, went to great lengths to preserve the rural setting and farm the land. Weir Farm National Historic Site is a regionally significant building complex and farming landscape that includes examples of eighteenth and early-nineteenth century vernacular architecture as well as an artistic retreat. Both the Webb and Beers families developed the landscape featuring eighteenth century farmhouses, stone walls, fences, fields, and orchards that would eventually inspire Julian Alden Weir and other artists. Weir and Young each added their studios and gardens within Weir Farm to enhance their artistic pursuits while enjoying the comfort of the rural retreat. Weir Farm National Historic Site is also significant under Criterion D in the area of archeology for late eighteenth century to early twentieth century farming in western Connecticut. Additional significance under Criterion D includes archeological remnants attributable to the development of the domestic and artistic landscape of Julian Alden Weir, Mahonri Young, and the Weir family. These themes are expressed through a series of significant archeological sites demonstrating a high degree of integrity and the ability to convey the significance of the property through documented information potential.

**EVALUATION OF LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISTICS AND FEATURES**

Landscape characteristics are the broad patterns, systems, and feature categories that together compose a landscape and help determine how people interact with the environment. The following evaluation of landscape characteristics and features is accomplished by comparing existing conditions to what is known to have been present during the historic period. This comparison is essential to determining which landscape characteristics or features convey the significance of a cultural landscape and of contribute to historic character.
The following evaluation of landscape features is presented in tabular form with an individual table for each of the six character areas starting with the Weir Complex Domestic Grounds, the Weir Complex Agricultural Zone, the Burlingham Complex Domestic Grounds, the Burlingham Complex Agricultural Zone, the Caretaker’s Domestic Grounds, and concluding with the Pond and Woodland Area. Features within each table are organized by landscape characteristic including buildings and structures, circulation, vegetation, and small-scale features. For the Pond and Woodland Area only, a fifth landscape characteristic—constructed water features—is added for features such as the Weir Pond and dam. Columns in the tables identify the landscape feature and if the feature was extant in circa 1940, extant in 1957, and also present during the existing conditions review between March 2010 and April 2012. The last column contains a narrative analysis for the feature comparing historic and existing condition and concludes with a condition assessment. Listing whether a feature was extant in circa 1940 corresponds to the treatment period identified in the park’s General Management Plan. Listing whether a feature was extant in 1957 corresponds to the end date for the period of significance identified in the park’s National Register nomination. In general, there is no discrepancy between the presence of features in circa 1940 and 1957; however, there is a change in the intensity and frequency of agricultural activity due to Dorothy Weir Young’s death in 1947 with Mahonri Young subsequently spending less time at the property. Diminished agricultural activity had the greatest effect on the character of open fields and meadows where young trees and shrubs were allowed to grow and mature, encroaching and eventually overtaking formerly open meadows, orchards and garden spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weir House (LCS # 41414)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Property deeds indicate that the main portion of the dwelling was built by 1778, and physical evidence may indicate a construction date as early as 1760. The structure was remodeled in the Greek Revival style, probably between 1830 and 1850, and may have been remodeled and made larger by Julian Alden Weir when he bought the house in 1882. Weir directed a series of alterations during his tenure including additions designed by Charles Platt and the firm of McKim, Mead and White. The home passed from Weir to his daughter Dorothy and her husband Mahonri Young and finally to Doris and Sperry Andrews. Following the Andrews’ life tenancy, the National Park Service recently upgraded building infrastructure to open the house for tours and it is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weir Studio (LCS # 41415)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In the summer of 1885, Julian Alden Weir completed a studio north of the main house and west of the barn. The stylistic characteristics of the building suggest the influence of Charles Platt. Mahonri Young had his own, independent studio constructed on the property and avoided making changes to the Weir Studio. The National Park Service recently upgraded building infrastructure to protect it and as part of an effort to open the building to tours. It is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Studio (LCS # 41416)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In 1932, shortly after his marriage to Weir’s daughter, Mahonri Young directed construction of a sculpture studio west of the Weir Studio. Young’s son-in-law, Oliver Lay, designed the studio and during Young’s lifetime, additional windows were added to the north side of the structure. The National Park Service recently upgraded building infrastructure to open the studio for tours and it is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool Shed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Constructed between 1900 and 1930, likely in connection with the building of the rustic gate structures at the Secret Garden. In 1999, the park preserved the Tool Shed and it is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone boundary walls (Type 1)§ (LCS # TBD)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Prior to Julian Alden Weir’s purchase of the property in 1882, previous owners constructed stone boundary walls along Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. The walls are approximately three feet in height, one to three feet in width, and constructed from stacked, irregularly shaped fieldstones. Starting at the corner of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane, the wall along Nod Hill Road is approximately one foot high and serves as a base for the rustic picket fence. The boundary walls are presently in good to fair condition with individual stones and short sections of the walls needing to be reset. A section along Pelham Lane, west of the stone well, is in poor condition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1: WEIR COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Garden terrace walls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Two L-shape retaining walls constructed from dry-laid stone form an upper and lower terrace used to grow fruits and vegetables. Dorothy Weir Young directed the construction of the terraces in 1937 and they are located west of the Weir House and south of the Weir and Young studios. The Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc. repaired the terrace walls in fall 2010 and they are presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Historic photographs record a circulation route south of the Weir Barn that entered from Nod Hill Road, continued west past the barn, and then turned north paralleling the barn’s west ell. The route permitted wagons to enter the barn and access agricultural areas to the north and east. Today a short, compacted earth driveway is present south of the Weir Barn. The driveway is approximately ten feet wide at Nod Hill Road and widens to roughly twenty feet near the barn’s west ell. The driveway is in good condition but may develop ruts from repeated use and erosion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone walkway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In the early 1900s, in conjunction with installing the rustic picket fence, Julian Alden Weir likely installed a stone walkway from Pelham Lane to the south facing porch of the Weir House. The walkway proceeds north from a gate at Pelham Lane and turns ninety degrees to the west approximately two thirds of the way between the gate and the dwelling. The stone walkway is comprised of large rectangular sections of granite laid end-to-end and appears in a circa 1900–05 photograph. In 2012, the north-south section of the walkway, originating at Pelham Lane, was replaced in kind with wider granite pieces that met accessibility requirements. The east-west section was reset using original material. The walkway is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone steps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Three sets of stone steps are present southwest of the Weir House. The first set consists of two fieldstone risers set into a low retaining wall. The retaining wall extends from the southwest corner of the porch and creates a level lawn surface south of the house. The low wall and steps were likely installed as part of the circa 1900 modifications to the porch. The second set consists of two fieldstone risers north of the stone picnic table and were likely installed in conjunction with the picnic table by 1894. The third set consists of seven monolithic granite risers set perpendicular to a stone wall along Pelham Lane. The construction history of the monolithic granite steps has not yet been determined. All three sets of stone steps are in good to fair condition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1: WEIR COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic lawn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>During the historic period, the turf around the Weir House featured finer textured species and varieties than the meadow grasses of the outlying fields. The turf was also mown more frequently and at a lower height than the neighboring meadows. The existing lawn is in fair to poor condition as a result of compaction due to recent construction activity. Presently turf grasses compete against broad-leaved weeds and moss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation plantings at Weir House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Stone-edged planting beds wrap around the porch and south facade of the Weir House and featured annual and perennial flowers with some hardy vines during the Weir tenure. Informal foundation plantings continued in the beds through circa 1940. Two espaliered pears were added west of the porch by 1937 and circa 1940s photographs show the informal placement of small clay pots containing annual flowers on either side of the porch’s broad granite stairs. Circa 1940s photographs also record occasional plantings of iris, hosta, and fern along the east and north sides of the house and shrubs including lilacs and weigela near the northwest corner and west side. Today, iris, peonies, periwinkle, trumpet creeper, English Ivy, and daylilies are present in the beds south of the porch. Foundation plants on the north and west sides are missing due to recent infrastructure upgrades at the Weir House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable plantings in Garden Terrace</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dorothy Weir Young directed the construction of the terraces in 1937 to grow fruits and vegetables for home use. Historic images show rows oriented in a north-south direction with low herbs bordering the eastern edge, peas or pole beans comprising a large portion of the garden, and grapes growing on a rustic arbor at the northern end of the terrace. The quantity of and routine maintenance applied to the plantings likely diminished following Dorothy Weir Young’s death in 1947. Presently, both terraces feature a mixture of turf grass species with three fruit trees around their perimeter and a pear tree at the middle of the wall dividing the upper and lower terrace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Garden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>By circa 1915, a series of photographs indicate that the Weir family expanded a garden north of the Weir Studio to include extensive perennial planting, a perimeter hedge, a fountain, a sundial, and two rustic roofed gates. In the mid-1990s, the Ridgefield Garden Club led the restoration of the Secret Garden that addressed the planting, garden ornaments, fencing, and gates. In 2012, new gates were fabricated and all the fencing posts and rails were replaced. The garden is presently in good condition with the fencing and gates retrofitted with non-historic segments of woven wire in an effort to exclude white-tailed deer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1: WEIR COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustic picket fence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In the early 1900s, Weir had rustic fencing installed to replace a more classically designed fence at the Weir House. In 2003, the park restored the rustic picket fence with new lumber that matched the original. The current fence is in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone well</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Between 1890 and 1905, a stone well was built west of the Weir House and near Pelham Lane. The well featured an Adirondack-style twig-framed canopy attached to a stone cover. It is uncertain that the canopy survived into the 1940s and therefore, the park has not restored this feature. In 2005, the park replaced the deteriorated stone cover and presently the well is in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone picnic table</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Two granite slab benches and a wide granite slab table, all set on supporting granite blocks and stones, form a picnic table on a ledge outcropping southwest of the Weir House. The stone picnic table appears in Weir’s 1894 painting “In the Dogwood” and the initials of Weir and his three daughters are carved into the table’s southwest corner. The picnic table is extant and presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carved granite splash blocks</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>At the western end of Weir House, two carved granite splash blocks rest below separate downspouts. The installation history of the splash blocks has not yet been determined. Both are presently extant and in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought iron porch finials</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Circa 1900, Julian Alden Weir installed a matching pair of decorative, wrought iron finials on the outside edges of the porch’s granite steps. The park restored the finials in 2005 and presently they are in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weir mailbox</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Existing conditions documentation in 1995 recorded two mailboxes along the eastern side of Nod Hill Road near its intersection with Pelham Lane. One mailbox was located near the driveway to the Caretaker’s House and to the north, a second mailbox was installed for the Weir House. Both are important small-scale features communicating to visitors the domestic qualities of the landscape. The mailbox associated with the Weir House is presently in storage at the park’s maintenance shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog house</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mahonri Young sketches from the late 1930s and early 1940s show dog houses in various locations around the Weir House. The dog houses are small in size, simple wood construction, and may have been moved to various locations around the house during the circa 1940 period. The Historic Preservation Training Center constructed a reproduction dog house in fall 2010 and the structure is in good condition. The dog house enhances the domestic character of the site and conceals a contemporary well pump head, however, as a reproduction it is not a contributing feature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1: WEIR COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firewood pile between Weir and Young studios</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A circa 1942 photograph looks south at the Weir Barn, main house, two studios, and Mahonri Young walking in the farm’s landscape. A neatly stacked pile of firewood is clearly present between the two studios and was probably needed to heat both structures. The woodpile remained present at this location into the mid-1990s. Today, the firewood pile is not extant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalding vat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Interviews conducted with the Bass family indicate that a large cast iron kettle, presently located between the Weir and Young studios, was used as a scalding vat to prepare slaughtered hogs for butchering. During the historic period, the Bass family used the vat near the Wagon Shed. The vat was moved, possibly to its present location, prior to circa 1960 photographs of the Wagon Shed that do not show the feature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2: WEIR COMPLEX AGRICULTURAL ZONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weir Barn (LCS # 41408)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Prior to Julian Alden Weir’s purchase of the property in 1882, a barn stood immediately west of Nod Hill Road. U-shape in plan, the barn consisted of a main block at the north end and two wings or ells that extended south. Lewis Beers’ 1861 probate inventory lists a barn, cow house, wash house, and carriage house on his property and it is possible that all of these structures/functions existed within the U-shaped, barn complex. The Youngs retained the barn through the end of the historic period and in 1997, the park completed restoration work on the structure. The barn is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tack House (LCS # 41413)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>By 1918, a structure similar in scale and form to the current Tack House was located south of the barn. In 1997, the park completed restoration work on the Tack House and it is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice House/Chicken House (LCS # 41409)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>During the Weir tenure, the family directed the construction of an ice house in circa 1891. The Youngs converted the Ice House to a Chicken House around 1941. The park recently stabilized the Chicken House and it is in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Crib</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Property tax records prepared in 1920 recorded a corn crib along with several other agricultural outbuildings at Weir Farm. The structure appears in a 1932 Mahonri Young sketch and was in poor condition when the National Park Service acquired the property. In 1998, the park restored the Corn Crib and it is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Shelter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Between 1930 and 1941, the Animal Shelter was constructed to replace a long, shed-roof chicken coop that stood to the west of the Weir Studio. The structure appears in a 1941 Mahonri Young drawing and was in poor condition when the National Park Service acquired the property. The park stabilized the Animal Shelter and it is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagon Shed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>George R. Bass and his sons, tenant farmers at the property, constructed the Wagon Shed in the early 1930s. Oliver Lay, architect and son-in-law of Mahonri Young, may have influenced the design of the structure. The Wagon Shed collapsed around 1980.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig Pens</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Correspondence during both the Weir and Young tenures record that the families raised pigs on the farm. Historic photographs indicate that two stone enclosures northwest of the Young studio were used as pig pens. These two rectangular pens are formed by stone walls two to four feet high. In 2010, the Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc., stabilized the pig pens and presently the pens are in good condition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2: WEIR COMPLEX AGRICULTURAL ZONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone boundary walls (Type 1) (LCS # TBD)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Prior to Julian Alden Weir’s purchase of the property in 1882, previous owners constructed stone boundary walls along Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. The walls are approximately three feet in height, one to three feet in width, and constructed from stacked, irregularly shaped fieldstones. The boundary walls are presently in good to fair condition with individual stones and short sections of the walls needing to be reset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn courtyard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>When Julian Alden Weir purchased the farm in 1882, the barn consisted of a main block at the north end and two wings that extended south to create a “courtyard” or semi-enclosed barnyard that faces the Weir House to the south/southwest. During the historic period, the courtyard featured small stones or cobbles that created a firm walking surface through the animal-trodden bare soil. Presently the courtyard is in good condition, but does not resemble an area used for raising animals. The space features a mixture of turf grass species and appears to be higher in elevation due to an accumulation of organic matter over the placed small stones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A Mahonri Young drawing indicates that crews harvested the orchard near the circa 1940 treatment period. The park restored the orchard by removing self-sown non-orchard trees and by propagating surviving trees and replanting them in the exact location of former trees. The orchard is in good condition and features fencing around individual trees to protect them from damage by browsing deer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustic picket fence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In the early 1900s, Weir had rustic fencing installed south of the barn courtyard. In 2003, the park restored the rustic picket fence with new lumber that matched the original. The current fence is in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haystack northwest of Barn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sketches by Mahonri Young during the late 1930s and early 1940s depict the preparation or transport of hay at the farm. A circa 1942 photograph records a rounded haystack, used for outdoor storage when a barn is full, northwest of the Weir Barn. Following World War II, agricultural activity diminished and successional growth developed the in fields and meadows at the property reducing hay production and storage. Presently, a haystack is not extant on any portion of the property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 3: BURLINGHAM COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingham House (LCS # 41405)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A portion of the existing main house may date to circa 1775 with the first reference to the structure occurring in a 1782 deed. Julian Alden Weir purchased the farm property south of Pelham Lane in 1907. His daughter, Cora Weir Burlingham, directed major alterations to the house between 1931 and 1940. The Burlingham house is presently in good condition and serves as administrative offices and the visitor contact station for the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potting Shed (LCS # 41403)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cora Weir Burlingham commissioned F. Nelson Breed to design the Potting Shed after the Sunken Garden was built in the late 1930s. Joseph John Knoche constructed the shed in 1940 and the structure appeared in circa 1942 sketches by Mahonri Young. Presently, the Potting Shed is in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone boundary walls (Type 3) (LCS # TBD)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Between 1931 and 1940, Cora Weir Burlingham directed the construction of dry-laid stone walls roughly following her property boundary along Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. Burlingham employed local masons from the Knoche family who constructed more refined walls than the piled stone walls common throughout the region. The boundary walls are three to four feet high, made of split-face granite two stones wide, infilled with stone rubble, and slightly battered to create a wider base and narrower top. Presently, the walls are in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunken Garden walls (LCS # 41419)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Originally designed by Vera Breed and built under the direction of Cora Weir Burlingham between 1932 and 1940, the Sunken Garden is a rectangular space that is between three and four feet below the surrounding ground plane on three sides and located immediately west of the Burlingham House. Local mason Joseph John Knoche, known as Old Joe, built massive, dry-laid stone walls to enclose the garden and retain the adjacent grade. The walls are presently in fair condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Garden terrace walls (LCS # 41422)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>After World War II, Cora Weir Burlingham abandoned her victory garden north of the Burlingham house and had the terraces south of the house constructed between 1946 and 1947. The Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc. repaired portions of the terrace walls in 2012 and they are presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The driveway enters the Burlingham complex at a right angle off Nod Hill Road and terminates at a barnyard court approximately 250 feet to the west. The driveway features two parallel tracks separated by a higher median. Both the tracks and median are finished with crushed stone. Presently, the driveway is in fair condition with some ponding of water developing near the Sunken Garden.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3: BURLINGHAM COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone walks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Stone walks comprised of large rectangular sections of granite laid end-to-end lead from the driveway and Nod Hill Road to the east facade of the Burlingham house. The stone walks are in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone paved terrace</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cora Weir and Charles Burlingham directed the construction of a stone paved terrace south of their home between 1933 and 1938. In 2001, the park completed repairs to the stone paved terrace with assistance from an Acadia National Park masonry team. The stone paved terrace is in good condition with a few stones needing to be reset to correct uneven transitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic lawn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>During the historic period, the turf around the Burlingham House featured finer textured species and varieties than the meadow grasses of the outlying fields. The turf was also mown more frequently and at a lower height than the neighboring meadows. The existing lawn is in fair to poor condition with turf grasses outcompeted by broad-leaved weeds and moss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation plantings at Burlingham House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As a gardening enthusiast, Cora Weir Burlingham embellished her property with a great quantity and variety of plant material. Around the Burlingham House she added evergreen shrubs such as yew, laurel, and pieris and herbaceous plantings consisting of spiderwort, lily of the valley, and Kenilworth ivy. Presently, the foundation plantings are in good to fair condition with specific plants needing rejuvenative pruning or division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunken Garden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Constructed between 1932 and 1940, Cora Weir Burlingham directed a major planting redesign at the Sunken Garden in 1969. Based on plans prepared in 2001, the park rehabilitated the Sunken Garden reusing existing material and incorporating new plants from the 1969 redesign. The park also made deer-resistant plant substitutions as a component of the rehabilitation. The Sunken Garden is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Garden terraces</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>After World War II, Cora Weir Burlingham abandoned her victory garden and had the terraces installed between 1946 and 1947. She concentrated on growing small fruits such as raspberries and strawberries. At the southern end of the lower terrace, remnants of a wire trellis system remain that is typical of a support for raspberry plants. The South Garden terrace plantings are presently in fair condition and are missing the raspberries and some perennial and groundcover plantings between the stone walls and pieces of exposed ledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3: BURLINGHAM COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete cold frame</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cora Weir Burlingham directed construction of a concrete cold frame north of the South Garden terraces. The concrete cold frame is five feet square and is in good condition. The Historic Preservation Training Center restored wood sashes to fit over the concrete cold frame in the fall of 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood cold frame</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cora Weir Burlingham directed construction of a wood cold frame north of the South Garden terraces. The wood cold frame is four feet wide by twelve feet long. In 2010, the Historic Preservation Training Center replaced the wood cold frame in kind and reset square clay pavers bordering two sides of the feature. The cold frame and pavers are presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden urn (LCS # 41419)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>An iron urn serves as the focal point at the west end of the Sunken Garden. The urn was placed at this location at the direction of Cora Burlingham and is in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry well cover</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>A masonry well cover is located southwest of the South Garden terraces. This structure, four feet in height, is constructed of mortared river stones with squared granite blocks at the corners. The top of the structure consists of a poured-in-place concrete slab. The well construction dates have not been documented and presently, it is in fair condition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4: BURLINGHAM COMPLEX AGRICULTURAL ZONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingham Barn (LCS # 41402)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Based on a deed listing multiple buildings on the property, the Burlingham Barn is thought to have been built before 1843 and may have been built as early as the circa 1775 Burlingham house. The Burlinghams renovated the barn soon after they acquired it in 1931. Between 2002 and 2004, the park rehabilitated the structure to support visitor and educational programming and it is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodshed (LCS # 41404)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Woodshed is thought to have been built circa 1850 and may have been one of the buildings mentioned in the 1843 property deed. The woodshed attained its current size and roof line by 1931 and appeared in Mahonri Young sketches from the mid-1930s. The west facing stone wall appears to have been rebuilt to be visually consistent with wall construction undertaken by Cora Weir Burlingham during the 1930s and 1940s. The Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc. repaired a bulged section along the west wall and at the northwest corner in fall 2010 and roofing materials were replaced in summer 2011. Presently, the woodshed is in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone boundary walls (Types 1 and 3) (LCS # TBD) (LCS # TBD)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Between 1931 and 1940, Cora Weir Burlingham directed the construction of dry-laid stone walls roughly following her property boundary along Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. Burlingham employed local masons from the Knoche family who constructed more refined walls than the piled stone walls common throughout the region. The boundary walls are three to four feet high, made of split face granite two stones wide, infilled with rubble and stone mix, and slightly battered to create a wider base and narrower top. Presently, the walls are in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Historic aerial photographs from 1941 and 1951 indicate a geometrically arranged orchard that contained ten to thirteen trees in the southeast portion of the Burlingham Complex. The park rehabilitated the orchard by replacing missing trees with propagated trees from the Weir orchard. The orchard is in good condition and features fencing around the younger trees to protect them from deer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A stone wall, consistent in construction methodology with the boundary walls built on the property between 1931 and 1940, extends roughly twenty-five feet south from the southwest corner of the Burlingham Barn. Located on the west side of the end of the wall stands a dry-laid stone structure likely built in conjunction with the wall. The structure served as an incinerator for burning trash and measures approximately three feet square by three feet high and features a large opening in its top face and a small opening at the bottom of its west face. The incinerator is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 5: CARETAKER’S DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker’s House (LCS # 41407)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Based on deed and census records, a dwelling may have been present east of the Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane intersection as early as 1811. An 1861 probate inventory describes a small dwelling and in 1882, Julian Alden Weir directed improvements to a small dwelling house on his newly purchased property. Drawings, sketches, and historic photographs from the Weir and Young families record the Caretaker’s House near the circa 1940 treatment period. The present structure consists of a 1½-story main house and a one-story ell situated on the east wall of the main house. The Caretaker’s House is in good condition and provides housing for the park’s artist-in-residence program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House/ Caretaker’s Garage (LCS # 41406)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>An 1861 probate inventory lists a “carriage house” as one of several buildings that comprised Lewis Beers’ farm complex. Although the inventory does not specify a location, current research indicates this carriage house was associated with the Caretaker’s House on the east side of Nod Hill Road. During the early 1930s the Bass family, living at the Caretaker’s House, added a three-car garage to the north of the Carriage House. The three bays formed a rectangular structure, one story high, that was topped with a saltbox roof. The Carriage House was retained through the end of the historic period, but demolished between 1970 and 1975. The garage remained in its original location, but was in a declining condition. The park completed a rehabilitation project in 2009 to repair the three-bay garage and to provide an artist-in-residence studio space on the footprint of the former Carriage House. The studio and garage are presently in excellent condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining wall north of Caretaker’s House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North and east of the Caretaker’s House, a dry-laid stone wall retains a lawn area adjacent to the structure. The wall is documented in a circa 1940 Mahonri Young sketch of the Caretaker’s House and topped with a rustic picket fence. Presently, the wall is in fair condition and features embedded iron pins that were used to anchor the rustic fence posts. In 2010, the Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc., repaired an approximate twenty-five foot section that extends east from Nod Hill Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker’s Driveway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The driveway to the Caretaker’s House and Garage is roughly L-shape with the short leg of the “L” connecting to Nod Hill Road and the long leg proceeding south to the Garage. Bass family photographs from the early 1940s show a similar circulation pattern defined by compacted earth. Today, the driveway is surfaced with crushed stone and is in good condition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 5: CARETAKER’S DOMESTIC GROUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker’s domestic lawn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>During the historic period, the turf around the Caretaker’s House featured finer textured species and varieties than the meadow grasses of the outlying fields. The turf was also mown more frequently and at a lower height than the neighboring meadows. The existing lawn is in fair to poor condition with turf grasses outcompeted by broad-leaved weeds and moss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker’s mailbox</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The successive residents at the Caretaker’s House have maintained a large, metal mailbox mounted on top of an unpeeled wood pole. The mailbox is presently extant and located immediately west of the Caretaker’s House along Nod Hill Road. Both the mailbox and wood pole are in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker’s rustic fence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rustic picket fencing lined the western and northern boundaries of the Caretaker’s House and was historically used as a motif to unite the house, Weir House, and Weir Barn across Nod Hill Road. Historic photographs and sketches reveal that the rustic fencing was retained through the historic period. In April 2003, the park restored the rustic picket fencing along Nod Hill Road at the Caretaker’s House. The Historic Preservation Training Center restored three fence sections north of the house in 2010 and one section in 2011. The rustic picket fence is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A monolithic stone, roughly three feet in diameter and four feet high, presently stands north of Caretaker’s driveway near the drive’s intersection with Nod Hill Road. Interviews conducted with the Bass family indicate that the stone was present in this location circa 1940. The top of the stone features a concave area that may have been used to grind grains, however, during the historic period the stone was ornamental and not a functional implement. Presently, the stone is in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron pins and rings</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>North of the Caretaker’s House and stone retaining wall are two iron pin and ring assemblies. Both pins are anchored vertically into ledge covered by leaf litter and organic debris. The top of each pin features an eyelet that holds an iron ring. The origin and purpose of the pins and rings has not been documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Extant ca. 1940</td>
<td>Extant 1957</td>
<td>Extant 2012</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Summary Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone boundary walls (Types 1 and 2) (LCS # TBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A distinct type of stone wall (Type 2) is present opposite the Weir House on the east side of Nod Hill Road. Following Julian Alden Weir’s 1896 purchase of the land east of Nod Hill Road, a stacked stone wall paralleling the road was likely rebuilt with dressed stones, battered sides, and irregularly shaped coping stones along the top course. The Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc. repaired a pronounced bulge in this wall in fall 2010 and presently the wall is in good condition. Throughout the Pond and Woodland area, common stone walls (Type 1) are present and composed of stacked, irregularly shaped fieldstones. The walls predate Julian Alden Weir’s purchase of the property in 1882. Between 2000 and 2010, repair work by volunteers and youth groups and during stone wall workshops has corrected loose and failing wall sections. The common walls are presently in good to fair condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Summerhouse</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A small Summerhouse featuring a conical roof appears in 1919 photographs of the pond’s small island. Oral histories indicate the Summerhouse was reduced to remnants or disappeared entirely in the 1930s and the structure does not appear on a 1951 aerial photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boathouse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Historic family photographs from the Weir tenure and oral histories document a small boathouse on the western shore of Weir Pond. Additionally, a home movie from the Andrews Family shows the boathouse in circa 1961. Oral history suggests that the boathouse was destroyed by arson or vandalism in the late 1960s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor parking lot</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In 1993, the park constructed a fifteen-car visitor parking lot on the east side of Nod Hill Road across from the Burlingham House. The visitor parking lot is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagon Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>During the Weir and Young tenures, repeated trips from the house to the fields, pond, woodlands, and dump east of Nod Hill Road created a circulation feature known as the Wagon Road. The road, a compacted earthen route, began near the northwest corner of the Trueants’ Meadow, continued along the meadow’s eastern edge, and entered the woodland area to the south. The Wagon Road is presently in good condition with the park maintaining an approximate ten-foot wide swath along the historic roadbed free of woody vegetation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6: POND AND WOODLAND AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path to Weir Pond</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The path to Weir Pond begins immediately opposite the Weir House at a gap in the stone wall on the east side of Nod Hill Road. Monolithic granite steps lead down to a lawn terrace. From the terrace, a trail proceeds north and leads down four sets of stone steps set into a slope. A mown path extends from the end of the steps and leads across the Truants’ Meadow to a wetland crossing south of the former Fishing Bridge. A compacted earth path continues from the wetland crossing through the Triangular and Ridgetop meadows and unites with the path around Weir Pond. The path is in good to fair condition with the park having added a wetland crossing and bogwalks that define the route and make potentially difficult areas feasible to cross. In 2012, the Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc., installed the four sets of stone steps for a more consistent route north of the lawn terrace. The path to Weir Pond cannot be made universally accessible due to the nature of the surrounding landscape, but as a rustic path, it is presently in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path around Weir Pond</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Following construction of the dam and pond in 1896, it is likely that a path around Weir Pond was created over time by persistent pedestrian traffic. The current path is in good condition and the park maintains it free from young woody vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone stairs at Ridgetop Meadow</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A series of fieldstone steps are set into a steep hillside that leads from the Ridgetop Meadow to Weir Pond. Each tread consists of one to three stones laid edge-to-edge, often reinforced on the sides by larger, rounded fieldstones. The construction history of the steps has not been determined. Their installation may be associated with construction of the pond and boathouse to serve as a more direct route down the hillside. The stone steps are presently in fair condition with individual stones needing to be reset to correct uneven transitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone causeway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A stone causeway pre-existing Julian Alden Weir’s ownership lies across a wetland at the base of the slope immediately east of the contemporary visitor parking lot. This causeway was constructed by building up layers of stone in a strip at right angles to the wetland. The causeway is presently in poor condition due to vegetation growing among the stones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Bridge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As a component of the circulation to the pond, Julian Alden Weir added a small, rustic wooden bridge to cross a wetland area east of the Truants’ Meadow. The bridge appears in an 1896 photograph and featured a narrow walking surface with a single handrail on its northern side. The bridge persisted into the 1940s, but only fragments remained when the National Park Service acquired the property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6: POND AND WOODLAND AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truants’ Meadow</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A meadow area east of the Weir House and Barn served as the setting for Julian Alden Weir’s 1895 painting “The Truants.” Weir purchased the meadow as part of ten acres of land east of Nod Hill Road in 1896. Aerial photographs from 1941 and 1951 show the meadow remained open during the circa 1940 treatment period. Presently the meadow is in good condition, retaining much its historic character. The meadow will benefit from a maintenance regimen to address emerging woody plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular Meadow</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Triangular Meadow is defined by several extant stone walls that form a triangular space in the Pond and Woodland Area. A narrow footpath to Weir Pond passes through this space that was maintained as an open meadow during the circa 1940 treatment period. A historic aerial photograph from 1951 shows the emergence of woody vegetation in the meadow and the beginning of a change in landscape character. Presently, the area is predominantly woodlands that have grown since the late 1940s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgetop Meadow</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Ridgetop Meadow is defined by several extant stone walls that run below a series of connected, topographic high points west of Weir Pond. Historic photographs and aerals show a cleared area to the west of the pond. A historic aerial photograph from 1951 shows the emergence of woody vegetation in the meadow and the beginning of a change in landscape character. Presently, this area is predominantly woodlands that have grown since the late 1940s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting of birches on island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Circa 1920s photographs of the pond’s small island show a ring of birches at the perimeter of the landform. Although the island summerhouse did not survive into the 1940s, the ring of birches likely survived. Presently, the birches are not extant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructed Water Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weir Pond</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Julian Alden Weir authorized the construction of Weir Pond in 1896 using prize money won from a Boston Art Club exhibition. The pond covers approximately four acres and is in good to fair condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam (LCS # 41433)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In order to create the pond, workers constructed an earthen dam in 1896. The dam varies in width from eight to ten feet and extends for over 200 feet in a gentle arc along the north perimeter of Weir Pond. Based on notes maintained by Dorothy Weir Young, a smaller concrete dam was constructed along the toe of the earthen dam in 1937. The earthen dam is in fair to poor condition due to the piping of embankment material and dislocated or missing face stones from the pond side of the structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6: POND AND WOODLAND AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Extant ca. 1940</th>
<th>Extant 1957</th>
<th>Extant 2012</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone-lined water diversion system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The stone-lined water diversion system appears to have been constructed in 1896 in conjunction with the creation of Weir Pond to divert runoff from an adjacent watershed into Weir Pond. The system begins north of the Triangular Meadow carrying water from a wetland area. A stone-lined ditch runs from west to east and after approximately 250 feet, the ditch branches into a south fork heading to Weir Pond and a north fork leading around the pond. The system is presently extant and in fair condition. Some stones have collapsed into the ditch and certain sections are laden with debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring box and circular pool</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Two constructed water features are present southwest of Weir Pond that may pre-date Weir’s purchase of the property or were developed during his tenure. A rectangular pool, lined with stones, captures water from a spring and directs it to an outlet that leads to a stone-lined circular pool at a lower elevation. The circular pool is approximately twelve feet across, two feet deep, and drains into the small stream which flows to Weir Pond. The spring box and circular pool may have been constructed for human consumption, livestock, bathing, or raising fish to stock the pond. The water features are in poor condition resulting from sedimentation and an accumulation of debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palace Car</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A circa 1890 Weir painting entitled “The Palace Car” shows a small wood frame structure located in the Truants’ Meadow. Correspondence from fall 1890 records that Weir and his caretaker Paul Remy constructed the Palace Car to enable Weir to paint outdoors year round. The structure stood on wood runners so oxen could pull it to different locations on the property. After years of use, Weir’s children turned the Palace Car into a playhouse and the structure was not present during the treatment period. In 2012, the park completed a replica Palace Car to be located in the landscape as an interpretive exhibit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENDNOTES**
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6. Presently, the National Park Service List of Classified Structures documents nine different types of stone walls. This report recommends revising the List of Classified Structures to reflect three distinct wall types at Weir Farm. Based on construction methodology, the three types include common piled stone walls, stone walls with a dressed top course along Nod Hill Road, and split-face granite walls infilled with a rubble and stone mix at the Burlingham property.
3. Framework for Treatment

This chapter describes a philosophical framework that provides context for the treatment recommendations presented in this report. This chapter includes an overview of applicable regulations and policies, park enabling legislation, and current planning. Based on this framework, a treatment philosophy articulates a guiding vision for the Weir Farm landscape, including consistent treatment reference dates and primary treatments for the Weir Complex, the Burlingham Complex and the Pond and Woodland Area.

Enabling Legislation

Concerned about the loss of Weir Farm to suburban development, Cora Weir Burlingham, Doris and Sperry Andrews, and local neighbors worked with the private non-profit group Trust for Public Land to purchase lots around Weir Pond in 1985. Local advocates continued their efforts, petitioned Congress, and on October 31, 1990, enabling legislation passed for the creation of Weir Farm National Historic Site. The enabling legislation listed a three-part purpose for the site as a unit of the National Park Service:

1. To preserve a significant site associated with the tradition of American Impressionism;

2. To maintain the integrity of a setting that inspired artistic expression and encourages public enjoyment;

3. To offer opportunities for the inspirational benefit and education of the American people.¹

Between 1992 and 1994, the Trust for Public Land and the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection transferred property to the National Park Service totaling approximately sixty acres. The new national historic site comprised roughly a quarter of the total land that Julian Alden Weir had purchased by 1907.²

Mission and Policies

As a unit of the national park system, treatment of Weir Farm National Historic Site is guided by the mission of the National Park Service “…to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations” (Organic...
Act of 1916). The application of this mission is defined in National Park Service Management Policies (2001), which calls for the Park Service to “...provide for the long-term preservation of, public access to, and appreciation of, the features, materials, and qualities contributing to the significance of cultural resources” (Section 5.3.5). These policies are based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and are further articulated in the National Park Service Cultural Resource Management Guideline (NPS-28).

Of relevance to Weir Farm National Historic Site’s cultural landscape, NPS-28 provides guidance on management of biotic systems, which it defines as plant and animal communities associated with human settlement and use. It directs management of specimen vegetation such as trees, hedges, and orchards to ensure health and vigor and, if appropriate, provide for propagation of the next generation, especially for rare or unavailable plants. For vegetation systems such as woods and agricultural lands, NPS-28 calls for managing for overall patterns to allow for natural dynamics and crop rotation. Exotic plant species, which are often part of cultural landscapes, should be monitored and controlled to avoid spreading and disrupting adjacent natural plant communities. In addition to biotic systems, NPS-28 states that historic circulation features are rehabilitated to accommodate health and safety codes (such as the Americans with Disabilities Act), but in ways that minimize impacts on historic character.

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Following the creation of the park, the National Park Service prepared a General Management Plan to serve as the comprehensive document to guide planning and management at Weir Farm National Historic Site. Completed in February 1995, the Weir Farm General Management Plan emphasizes the relationship of American art to the rural landscape in two ways:

1. By reuniting works of art with the landscapes that inspired them;

2. By presenting the farm’s buildings and landscape to the visitor as they appeared to their historic occupants.

Unlike conventional art museums where visitors might only see the creative products of an artist’s life, the goal at Weir Farm National Historic Site is to acquaint visitors with the domestic, personal, and creative dimensions of Julian Alden Weir’s life and the successive artist-owners of the property. To achieve this goal, the General Management Plan defines three complexes of buildings and landscape features at the park and assigns each a corresponding treatment approach and treatment period. The three complexes are: the Weir Complex located north of Pelham Lane and west of Nod Hill Road, the Burlingham Complex located south of Pelham Lane and west of Nod Hill Road, and the Pond and Woodland Area located east of Nod Hill Road (Figure 18).
In the Weir Complex, the General Management Plan clearly stipulates that the landscape will be restored to its appearance in about 1940 to reflect the continuous use of the site while conveying the historic character of the landscape that prevailed though both the Weir and Young periods. Actions identified for restoring the cultural landscape in the Weir Complex include:

- Preserving and properly maintaining the fields, orchard, and gardens created during the Weir tenure and maintained throughout the Young ownership
- Clearing overgrown fields and protecting their specimen trees
- Restoring the Secret Garden located north of the Weir Studio
- Reconstructing and interpreting the Wagon Shed that collapsed around 1980
- Replacing features that no longer exist from the circa 1940 period provided there is adequate documentation to guide the replacement.5

In the Burlingham Complex, the General Management Plan stipulates that the landscape will be rehabilitated rather than restored so that the changes Cora Weir Burlingham made after 1940 are retained. Actions identified for rehabilitating the cultural landscape in the Burlingham Complex include:

- Reclaiming the existing, overgrown fields
- Rehabilitating the Sunken Garden based on post-1940 planting designs
- Rehabilitating the South Garden terraces, completed post-World War II.6

In the Pond and Woodland Area, the General Management Plan stipulates that the cultural landscape will be rehabilitated to enhance character from circa 1940 with specific actions identified that include:

- Selective clearing east of Nod Hill Road to recreate the circa 1940 open appearance
- Planting additional vegetation to screen contemporary off-site development
- Replacing missing historic features from the circa 1940 period provided there is adequate documentation to guide the replacement
- Expanding the present system of pedestrian paths to create a loop that links the Weir Complex, the Burlingham Complex, the Pond and Woodland Area, and adjacent open space.7

**TREATMENT PHILOSOPHY**

Consistent with direction expressed in enabling legislation and park planning documents, the landscape treatment philosophy for Weir Farm National Historic
Site is to restore missing features and enhance historic character so that the Weir Complex and Pond and Woodland Area landscape more closely reflects circa 1940 conditions. The Burlingham Complex, south of Pelham Lane, should retain the post-1940 landscape changes directed by Cora Weir Burlingham concluding with the replanting of the Sunken Garden in 1969. Application of this treatment philosophy will in time present visitors with a landscape familiar to the Weir and Young families; a setting that served as the inspiration for art.

In the Weir Complex, visitors will tour the restored buildings and grounds and understand how the agricultural outbuildings supported the farming activities of the families. Plantings consistent with the historic period will thrive in the upper vegetable garden terrace, around the foundation of the home, in the Secret Garden and in the orchard. Small-scale features added during Weir’s tenure for their rustic quality or associated with agricultural pursuits, will furnish the domestic and agricultural areas. In the Burlingham Complex, the landscape will be rehabilitated to facilitate visitor services, with visitor orientation presented in and surrounding the Burlingham House. The park’s educational programs will be supported in the Burlingham Barn. Staff will park in a small, gravel-surfaced parking area accessed from the Burlingham drive and screened from view by existing buildings, stone walls, and vegetation. Plantings consistent with the historic period will thrive around the foundation of the Burlingham House, in the Sunken Garden, in the South Garden terraces, and in the orchard. Small-scale features in the Sunken Garden and South Garden terraces will convey Cora Weir Burlingham’s interest in gardening.

In the Pond and Woodland Area, the Caretaker’s House and rehabilitated garage will support the park’s artist-in-residence program. A clearly defined pedestrian circulation system will connect the Pond and Woodland Area to the Weir and Burlingham complexes. Pedestrians will pass through a series of open meadows and wooded areas en route to Weir Pond. The pond’s water level and the two dams will be maintained to blend into the woodland setting and not stand out as highly engineered features. Contemporary off-site views will be screened to the extent that is practical with appropriate plantings on the park property.

**Primary Treatments**

To implement this treatment philosophy for Weir Farm National Historic Site, the General Management Plan identifies a primary treatment and treatment period for each of the three complexes. The four primary treatments—preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction—are defined in the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Restoration is the primary treatment for the Weir Complex with the treatment period identified as circa 1940. Rehabilitation is the primary treatment for the Burlingham Complex and Pond and Woodland Area. In the Burlingham Complex, the treatment period
extends to 1969 to preserve changes made by Cora Weir Burlingham. In the Pond and Woodland Area, the treatment period is identified as circa 1940 (see Figure 18).

Generally, the difference between restoration and rehabilitation is that restoration focuses on character and features from a particular period of time in support of interpretive objectives while rehabilitation can support a compatible, contemporary use. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards define restoration as “the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by removing features from other periods in its history and reconstructing missing features from the restoration period.” Rehabilitation is defined as “the act or process 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.” The Secretary of the Interior provides further detail for each primary treatment through a series of standards that guide implementation.

**Standards for Restoration**

- A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that reflects the property’s restoration period.

- Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.

- Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.

- Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.

- Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.

- Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials.
• Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.

• Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

• Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

• Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

**Standards for Rehabilitation**

• A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and relationships.

• The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

• Each property will 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 elements from other historical properties, will not be undertaken.

• Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

• Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

• Deteriorated historical features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

• Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

• Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
• New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historical materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historical materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

• New additions or related new construction will 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.

It should be noted that accessibility, as well as life safety code requirements, are separate considerations from the standards for restoration and rehabilitation. Work to comply with current codes should not result in the damage or loss of character-defining landscape features at Weir Farm National Historic Site. The introduction of a contemporary element for accessibility or life safety does not affect the primary treatment for the Weir Complex, Burlingham Complex, or Pond and Woodland Area. This is especially true for the restoration of the Weir Complex, guided by a circa 1940 treatment period, which would not permit the introduction of contemporary additions.

ENDNOTES
1 1990 Public Law 101-485.
5 Ibid., 25.
6 Ibid., 26.
7 Ibid., 28.
Figure 18. Weir Farm treatment overview. Plan view, 2010 (OCLP).
4. General Treatment Issues

The following are general landscape treatment issues present within the Weir Farm landscape that inform recommended treatment tasks presented in the next section of this report. These issues are fundamentally associated with circulation and accessibility, historic character, and providing an authentic, high quality, visitor experience.

Adjacent Land Use and Ownership

Suburban development nearly surrounds the sixty acres of land comprising Weir Farm National Historic Site. Owners of adjacent properties are stakeholders in decisions and activities undertaken by the park. Successful implementation of landscape treatment recommendations will require the support and cooperation of the park’s neighbors. When major repair work on the Weir Pond dam becomes necessary, equipment for rehabilitating the dam cannot be provided through park property without irrevocable damage to natural and cultural resources. Alternatives for off-site access routes must be explored and considered. Mitigating off-site views of contemporary development is desirable in order to enhance the expansive feeling of the property that is presently a quarter the size of the property maintained during the historic period. Locations for screening plant material should be within the park property.

Preserving Vegetation along Scenic Roads

One’s first impression of Weir Farm National Historic Site is from the vantage point of public roads that are neither owned nor managed by the National Park Service. Both Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane have been designated as scenic roads in the towns of Ridgefield and Wilton. The character of these two roads is defined by narrow travel lanes, a winding layout that accommodates natural features, and corridors beyond the travel lanes lined by stone walls and mature deciduous trees. The scenic designation requires town review and approval of changes to the roads such as widening, new surface materials, drainage and grading, signage, or alterations to stone walls. Although both town ordinances acknowledge the value of mature trees to designation of a scenic road, neither requires vegetation to be replaced in order to achieve the same scale and proportions of the road corridor.
Management of Field and Forest Vegetation

Since completion of the 1997 Volume 2 report, the park has redefined the boundaries between field and forest vegetation in the Weir and Burlingham complexes. The park did not restore the exact boundaries documented circa 1940 as a practical necessity; a means of limiting views of contemporary off site development. Routine and cyclic maintenance, specified in the park’s Landscape Preservation Maintenance Plan, will be required to maintain the distinction between open and woodland areas in the Weir and Burlingham complexes. In the Pond and Woodland Area, two meadows present during the historic period have been overtaken by successional woody vegetation. Reestablishing the historic patterns of field and forest in the Pond and Woodland Area must weigh the former extent of the open areas against the need to screen contemporary off site development.

Impacts of White-Tailed Deer Population

Vegetation at Weir Farm National Historic Site shows clear evidence of deer browse, and deer are seen every day in the fields near the Burlingham and Weir houses. Deer population density ranges from about thirty to sixty animals per square mile. The area’s deer population is expected to increase, which will increase the level of browsing and further change the character of the vegetation. Studies which were part of the General Management Plan planning effort did not dismiss the possibility of controlling the deer population, however, the studies recommended approaching the problem as one of vegetation management rather than deer management.

Management of Invasive Non-native Vegetation

Invasive vegetation is a challenge faced not only site-wide at Weir Farm National Historic Site, but statewide as well. This issue is also strongly correlated to pressures on park vegetation posed by the overpopulation of white-tailed deer. In 2003, Connecticut law authorized the creation of an Invasive Plants Council comprised of representatives from state departments, universities, businesses, and non-profits. Most recently revised in October 2011, the council maintains a list of invasive and potentially invasive plants in the state. Invasive non-native vegetation management is needed to preserve the open character of fields and meadows and to prevent emerging woody vegetation. In addition, management is needed to maintain the native plant composition in woodland areas.

Universal Accessibility

Given the uneven topography and stony qualities of this quintessentially New England landscape, providing universal access to every quadrant of Weir
Farm National Historic Site cannot be accomplished without fundamentally changing the setting that inspired generations of artistic expression. Reasonable accommodations have been made for those with mobility impairments through construction of an accessible visitor parking lot and an accessible route leading from the visitor parking lot to the Weir House. Universal access has not been planned for the Weir Complex landscape beyond access to the first floor of the Weir House. Visitors with mobility issues will have the opportunity to overlook the Weir Complex landscape from the vantage point of a restored historic outdoor elevated deck adjacent to the Weir kitchen. The accessible route primarily follows a six-foot wide chip and seal walk and leads visitors east of the Burlingham House and across a meadow in the northern section of the Burlingham Complex. The route then crosses Pelham Lane, proceeds along a short chip and seal apron, and continues on a walk of new granite pavers that gently rise to the Weir House porch. At the porch, inset decking ramps up to a flush transition with the surrounding decking and provides access to the house. In addition to the Weir House, there is also an accessible route following the Burlingham driveway that leads from the visitor parking lot to the educational programming space and restrooms in the Burlingham Barn. The Burlingham House and the Weir and Young studios are presently not accessible.

The park’s General Management Plan states that in accordance with federal law and National Park Service guidelines, every reasonable effort will be made to ensure that facilities and services at Weir Farm National Historic Site are accessible to and usable by all people, including those whose mobility is impaired. Additional accessible routes and improving access to historic structures should not adversely affect landscape character or features.

ENDNOTES


2  For the current list, please see: http://www.hort.uconn.edu/cipwg/list.html.
5. TREATMENT TASKS

This chapter outlines specific physical treatment tasks for Weir Farm National Historic Site’s cultural landscape. The identification and history of landscape features are based on the work presented in the Cultural Landscape Report for Weir Farm National Historic Site, Volume 1: Site History and Existing Conditions (hereafter Volume 1) completed in 1996. Many of the treatment tasks presented in this report build upon recommendations first articulated in the Cultural Landscape Report for Weir Farm National Historic Site, Volume 2: Analysis and Treatment (hereafter Volume 2) completed in 1997.

Landscape treatment tasks are presented first for park-wide (PK) actions and then geographically according to the six character areas defined in the existing conditions chapter of this report starting with the Weir Complex Domestic Grounds (WD), the Weir Complex Agricultural Zone (WA), the Burlingham Complex Domestic Grounds (BD), the Burlingham Complex Agricultural Zone (BA), the Caretaker’s Domestic Grounds (CD), and concluding with the Pond and Woodland Area (PW). Within the park-wide and separate character area presentations, treatment tasks are organized by landscape characteristics with each task narrative containing a brief overview of historic condition during the circa 1940 treatment period and existing conditions to provide background and rationale for treatment decisions. Each task is identified and referenced to summary tables and treatment plans with a unique treatment code such as WD-BL-1. The first two letters represent a the park-wide designation or a specific character area and the next two letters specify a landscape characteristic including buildings and structures (BL), circulation (CR), vegetation (VG), constructed water features (WF), small-scale features (SSF), and archeological sites (AR). Finally, each code concludes with a sequential number to identify different tasks in each landscape characteristic. Using this system, WD-BL-1 identifies the first treatment task in the buildings and structures landscape characteristic within the Weir Complex Domestic Grounds character area. The individual task narratives are supported with graphics, appear in summary tables at the conclusion of this chapter, and are illustrated on Drawings 4–6.
PARK-WIDE

BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

PK-BL-1: Preserve stone walls and barway gates

Weir Farm National Historic Site is overlain with a pattern of stone walls constructed from various methods and during different time periods that may be used to interpret the history of the landscape. These stone walls also serve as a common theme, helping to unify the visitor experience of the various areas of the park.

Where there is insufficient historical documentation to be certain of the physical condition or level of maintenance of the stone walls park-wide circa 1940, stone walls will be preserved, rather than restored (Figure 19). Varying in length, there are discrete sections of stone walls park-wide that are in deteriorated condition and this treatment is intended to arrest further decay. However, with regard to the stone walls located in the Weir Complex, the General Management Plan specifies a restoration approach for the landscape. Here, the stone walls may be restored to their circa 1940 condition based on the availability of documentation.

The growth of young trees at the base of stone walls threatens the long term integrity of these features. The destructive effect of trees growing next to stone walls may be seen throughout the property. Where trees have been allowed to mature next to a stone wall, the wall has slowly been broken apart by the growth of the trunk and roots.

While it is not recommended that mature trees, present during the circa 1940 treatment period be sacrificed for the sake of the stone walls, new damage can be prevented. Where there is any doubt as to a tree’s presence on the property during the treatment period, a core sample should be taken to determine its age before removal. Removing the threat to the stone walls associated with the growth of new woody vegetation should be first addressed by identifying and flagging trees less than 12 inches diameter at breast height (DBH) that are within two feet of a stone wall. By virtue of the proposed 12-inch DBH rule, this process would exclude historic trees surviving from the circa 1940 treatment period.

With the young vegetation within two feet of a stone wall identified and flagged, a committee selected by park management will review the trees identified for removal. Should an exceptional young tree be found to be growing near a historic tree that is in decline, that tree may be spared to serve as an eventual replacement for the historic tree.

The term “barway” refers to a crude gate of posts and poles constructed at many openings in stone walls historically throughout Weir Farm National Historic Site. Deteriorated fence posts, rails, and fixtures are to be replaced in kind as necessary (Figure 20).
VEGETATION

PK-VG-1: Preserve character of vegetation along public roads

The “Transportation Zone” identified by the Weir Farm General Management Plan is made up of the legal rights-of-way of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. These two public secondary roads are owned by the towns of Ridgefield and Wilton. In order to preserve rural road character, Ridgefield has designated Pelham Lane a scenic roadway and Wilton has designated its portion of Nod Hill Road a scenic roadway. The ownership rights of the two towns extend past the edge of the pavement to include the road’s vegetated shoulders or margins. The boundary of the right-of-way is often marked by a stone wall, itself jointly owned by the town and the adjacent property owner. Though not owned by the National Park Service, the experience of the landscape from these two roads creates the first impression of the park for every visitor, and is central to the visitor experience at the park (Figure 21).

Utility companies also own legal easements along these roads for the delivery of electrical power and communications services. These services are carried both on overhead wires and through buried cables. Both the towns of Ridgefield and Wilton, and various utility companies, are generally responsible for maintaining vegetation within their rights-of-way or easements to promote the safe passage of the public or the delivery of their products and services.

In an effort to preserve the rural character of the public roads comprising the park’s “Transportation Zone,” it may be helpful for the park to pursue formal agreements or understandings with the various entities concerned with vegetation along these two roads. Industry practices typical in the region, especially with regard to tree pruning, may not be in sympathy with the goals of the park.

In addition to tree pruning, the character of the vegetated road shoulder is of concern. Closely trimmed turf typical of suburban and institutional settings is especially inappropriate. Within the strip of soil between the pavement edge and stone walls, taller grasses should be allowed to grow permitting self sown wildflowers and herbaceous plants to bloom. This taller mix of herbaceous vegetation should be cut twice a year, or more frequently based on plant composition, to discourage the maturation of woody plant species.

PK-VG-2: Renovate domestic lawns

The turf areas at Weir Farm during the historic period can be divided into two categories: 1) regularly maintained lawns at the domestic areas around the Weir House, Burlingham House, and Caretaker’s House; and, 2) meadows and pastures in the outlying agricultural areas. Presently, the lawn in all three domestic areas is in fair condition. There are sparse areas of lawn and a high incidence of mosses
and broadleaved weeds that serve as indicators of poor growing conditions. Shallow soil depth to bedrock and visitor foot traffic have resulted in compaction that also contribute to the poor growth of turf grass species (Figure 22).

Renovating the domestic lawns to achieve healthy, uniform turf requires following a consistent maintenance program as outlined in the park’s Preservation Maintenance Plan. Park staff should routinely monitor for pest, disease, and cultural problems and promptly address any deficiencies. Fertilizing and soil chemistry adjustments should be made following the recommendations of regular soil test results and soil compaction can be reduced through aeration. Soil tests completed in 2010 recommend fertilizing all the domestic lawn areas in spring and fall with a 25-5-10 grade fertilizer at a rate of four pounds per 1,000 square feet. The tests also report acidic soil conditions with pH values between 4.8 and 5.4 and addressing this condition through the application of limestone at a rate of 75 to 125 pounds per 1,000 square feet.¹

For large areas with thin turf growth, overseeding should be performed with a slit-seeder or slicer-seeder that cuts a narrow and shallow slit through the existing turf and soil and places seed mechanically in direct contact with the soil. This process can greatly improve the germination success of turf seed. In smaller areas, the soil should be scarified by hand or mechanical methods, the seed uniformly applied, and the area lightly raked to incorporate the seed into the top quarter inch of the soil. New lawn seed used for overseeding should comprise a mixture of grass types selected for proper sun exposure and foot traffic.²

**PK-VG-3: Rehabilitate meadow turf**

The former agricultural areas immediately adjacent to the domestic complexes and in the Pond and Woodland Area are presently managed as meadows. Since completion of the Volume 2 report, the park has removed woody vegetation encroaching on meadow perimeters and expanded the boundaries of meadows to more closely reflect the open character present at the circa 1940 treatment period. The current meadows consist of a mixture of grass species such as little bluestem (*Schizachyrium scoparium*), orchardgrass (*Dactylis glomerata*), Indian grass (*Sorghastrum nutans*), Virginia wild rye (*Elymus virginicus*) and forbs such as butterfly weed (*Asclepias tuberosa*). Meadows in the Weir and Burlingham complexes are in good to fair condition with a dominant mixture of grasses and forbs and a limited amount of broadleaved weeds and woody species (Figure 23). Meadows in the Pond and Woodland Area, particularly the Truants’ Meadow, are in fair condition with increasing woody plant species such as sassafras (*Sassafras albidum*), wineberry (*Rubus phoenicosius*), and Japanese honeysuckle (*Lonicera japonica*).
In order to improve the quality of the meadows and maintain the integrity of historic open spaces, the park should increase mowing frequency during the growing season to weaken the broadleaved and woody plants and allow the grasses to effectively compete. Due to limited maintenance resources, the meadows are currently mowed once per growing season. Mowing Weir Farm’s meadows to a height of six to eight inches three times per growing season would have a beneficial effect. Increasing the number of cuttings will depend on sufficient staff resources. Additionally, regular soil tests and applying recommended treatments to address soil nutrient deficiencies will improve the meadow turf. Soil tests completed in 2010 recommend fertilizing all the meadows in spring and fall with a 25-5-10 grade fertilizer at a rate of four pounds per 1,000 square feet. The tests also report acidic soils that can bind nutrients and make them unavailable to plants with pH values between 4.0 and 4.7. To address the acidic soil condition, the report recommends the application of limestone at a rate of 150 to 200 pounds per 1,000 square feet. Upon the improved health of the meadow turf, mowing could be reduced to twice per growing season to limit reemergence of broadleaved and woody species.

To assist in visitor circulation, the park has established mowed paths through the meadow areas. These paths should be mowed weekly during the growing season to a height of three inches to allow steady, dry footing and to lessen the chance of encounter with plant and animal pests. Potential pests include deer ticks, which have the capability of carrying and transmitting Lyme Disease, and poison ivy. To limit the long-term impact of foot and lawnmower traffic on any particular route, the mowed paths should be relocated on an annual basis. The mowed paths should be gentle in grade change and not laid out perpendicular to an incline or decline. The path width should be at least 50 inches to allow two people to walk side-by-side comfortably.

PK-VG-4: Screen views of contemporary development

Adjacent private properties on two of the park boundaries are extensively developed and greatly impact the settings of Weir’s paintings. The development of adjacent suburban properties south of the pond has created pressure on the vegetation along the southern shore. Property owners to the south of the pond removed young trees and undergrowth in order to create a filtered view of the water similar to the effect that Weir had sought from his Ridgetop Meadow. Unfortunately, this has resulted in the visual intrusion of suburban development on the historic landscape.

As outlined by the park’s General Management Plan, measures should be taken to revegetate these areas to protect the site’s historic setting and also to insure the privacy of adjacent owners. This treatment plan has schematically identified areas where such vegetative screening would be beneficial. However, prior to the
installation of new plant material at any designated area, an archeological test of the area shall be undertaken. This screening will be a mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees and shrubs planted in several staggered rows and include areas where an open planting of trees would thrive in adequate sunshine, and areas below mature trees which would be planted with shade tolerant species (Figure 24). The following is a list of suggested plant material suitable for either condition.

**Clearing Edge Plantings**

Trees:

- *Cornus florida* - Flowering dogwood
- *Cotinus obovatus* - American Smoketree
- *Ilex opaca* - American Holly
- *Picea abies* - Norway spruce
- *Picea glauca* - White spruce
- *Pinus resinosa* - Red pine
- *Pinus rigida* - Pitch Pine
- *Pinus strobus* - White pine
- *Rhus typhina* - Staghorn sumac

Shrubs:

- *Deutzia scabra* - Deutzia
- *Hibiscus syriacus* - Rose-of-Sharon
- *Kalmia latifolia* - Mountain laurel
- *Myrica pensylvanica* - Bayberry
- *Robinia hispida* - Rose acacia
- *Spiraea sp.* - Spirea
- *Sorbaria sp.* - False spirea

**Understory Plantings**

Trees:

- *Abies balsamea* - Balsam fir
- *Picea abies* - Norway spruce
- *Tsuga canadensis* - Canada hemlock

Shrubs:

- *Clethra alnifolia* - Summersweet
- *Hamamelis virginica* - Witch hazel
- *Kalmia latifolia* - Mountain laurel
- *Lindera benzoin* - Spicebush
- *Viburnum acerifolium* - Maple-leaf Viburnum
- *Viburnum trilobum* - American cranberry-bush

Care must be taken to blend the screen plantings into the natural landscape, not calling attention to particular “ornamental” trees or shrubs. These screen plantings will require fencing for deer protection until well established and their size at planting must be considered, as there is presently no vehicular access to much of the Pond and Woodland Area. Plants sizes specified must be appropriate to transport via ballcart.
Figure 19. Stone walls to be preserved park wide including the repair of deteriorated sections to match of the character of the existing wall. View looking southwest in the Burlingham Complex, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 20. Barway gates to be preserved park wide including replacing in kind deteriorated fence posts, rails, and fixtures. View looking east in the Burlingham Complex, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 21. Vegetation character along public roads to be preserved park wide including mature deciduous trees and the lack of manicured vegetation along the road shoulders. View looking north on Nod Hill Road, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 22. Domestic lawns to be renovated park wide to address conditions such as broadleaf weeds, moss, and shallow soil depth. View looking south from the Weir House, 2011 (OCLP).
Figure 23. Meadow turf to be rehabilitated park wide. View looking west from painting site #5 toward the Weir Orchard, 2011 (OCLP).

Figure 24. Photo simulation showing view of contemporary development to be screened park wide. Simulation depicts plantings soon after installation. View looking northwest in the Weir Complex, 2010 (OCLP).
WEIR COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

WD-BL-1: Restore deck at Weir Studio

In the summer of 1885, Julian Alden Weir completed a studio north of the main house and west of the barn. The north end of the studio featured a wood deck that provided Weir with a space to paint rural scenes en plein air. Weir’s 1905 painting “The Shadow of My Studio” appears to have been prepared from the deck. The vantage of the painting is higher than ground level and looks north from the studio across the Secret Garden to the orchard in the background. The studio is indicated by a triangular shadow that protrudes into the painting’s foreground. During the Young tenure at Weir Farm, a circa 1942 photograph captures Mahonri Young walking near the northeast corner of the Secret Garden (Figure 25). The background shows the north facade of the Weir Studio and planking is visible on a stacked stone wall extending from the building.

Presently, a dry-laid stone foundation is extant north of the Weir Studio (Figure 26). The foundation’s facing stones are intact and fit together tightly. Stone rubble infill comprises the interior of the foundation. There is no evidence of the wood planking or decking.

The deck at the Weir Studio once provided a dedicated location for Weir’s Impressionist painting and survived during the circa 1940 treatment period. The park should restore the deck by resetting loose stones to form a level surface. Wood joists should be set on the stone base and decking attached to the joists. Plans for the restoring the deck should be developed in consultant with an historic architect.

WD-BL-2: Stabilize Weir vegetable garden terrace walls

Located west of the Weir House and south of the Weir and Young studios, two earthen terraces comprise the former Weir vegetable garden. Dorothy Weir Young directed the construction of the terraces in 1937. Each terrace was supported by L-shaped retaining walls constructed from dry-laid stone. Late 1930s sketches by Mahonri Young and circa 1945 photographs by Lewis Iselin document that the garden terraces were present during the circa 1940 treatment period.

At the southwest corner of each terrace, the walls extend up to sixteen inches high and taper to meet grade at the northern end. The walls are in good condition, however, individual stones and short sections of walls are displaced due to frost heave, wash out, and from visitors walking on top of the structures (Figure 27). The current condition of the walls is consistent with dry-laid stone walls over seventy years old.
The park should stabilize the Weir vegetable garden terrace walls as part of the restoration of the Weir Complex to its circa 1940 appearance. Since the walls are dry-laid, a small deficiency could lead to a larger failure in the wall that will require more effort to repair. Minor corrective actions include resetting loose stones and stones that have started to protrude from the wall face. Large voids should be filled with appropriately-sized stone flakes called chinks. Major corrective actions include disassembling bulged wall sections, compacting base material, replacing washed out soil, and reassembling wall sections to match the existing alignment and appearance of stone sizes, shapes, colors, and patterning. Since the garden terrace walls are dry-laid, there is no need to install a drainage layer behind the walls. The stacked placement of the stones will permit the passage of water and by avoiding the installation of a drainage layer, no additional excavation is required that could potentially impact archeological resources.

CIRCULATION

WD-CR-1: Install stabilized soil surface on lower Weir vegetable garden terrace

In 1937, Dorothy Weir Young directed the construction of the vegetable garden terraces west of the Weir House and south of the Weir and Young studios. A circa 1937 sketch by Mahonri Young shows the upper terrace contained rows of low-growing plants and an arbor at the terrace’s northern end (Figure 28). In interviews conducted during preparation of the 1996 Volume 1 report, the Youngs’ children confirmed that the family maintained a vegetable garden in the upper terrace and grew grapes on the arbor. The circa 1937 sketch and other artwork by Mahonri Young does not indicate how the family used the lower terrace. Circa 1945 photographs by Lewis Iselin show a contrast between extensive planting in the upper terrace and only a few plants in the lower terrace (Figures 29 and 30). The difference between the two terraces may indicate the lower terrace was planted later in the season or received limited planting and maintenance following Dorothy Weir Young’s death in 1947.

Presently, the lower terrace measures approximately 56 feet long by 28 feet wide and is defined by a dry-laid stone wall to the west and south that retains soil and creates a level surface. A second wall to the east rises approximately sixteen inches above the lower terrace and retains the upper terrace. To the north, the lower terrace transitions into a lawn area between the Weir and Young studios (Figure 31).

The character and condition of the lower terrace has not been specifically documented for the circa 1940 treatment period. As a result, the park should install a stabilized soil surface at the lower terrace and plant the stabilized soil with a lawn turf mixture that matches the surrounding domestic lawns. This treatment
is compatible with the character of the Weir Complex Domestic Grounds and will allow a future treatment to be directed by additional research. In addition, the stabilized soil surface will provide a location for tour groups to assemble in the vicinity of the Weir and Young studios without damaging adjacent lawn and planted areas. The lower terrace would also have the potential to serve as a special events site since the stabilized soil surface could support more concentrated visitor traffic.

The stabilized soil should consist of a mixture of 50 percent ¾-inch stone and 50 percent sterile topsoil. The stone, specified as AASHTO #57, lacks different sized stones and fine material typically found in crushed aggregates. The stone resists compaction and the topsoil acts as a binder and growing media for turf. This mixture has been successfully used by the Federal Highway Administration’s Eastern Federal Land’s Division for vegetated road shoulders and emergency pull-offs at National Park Service sites. The top two inches of the lower terrace should be removed in preparation to receive the topsoil-stone mixture. After excavation, the blended mixture should be added and finished to match the existing slope and pitch of the lower terrace. The stabilized soil should then be seeded with a lawn turf mixture that matches the surrounding domestic lawns. In September 2010, archeologists performed one shovel test pit in the eastern portion of the lower terrace. No features were encountered in this test and bedrock was uncovered at between eleven and fifteen inches below the surface. The archeologists’ report contains no specific recommendations for the lower terrace, however, since this task involves the whole area of the lower terrace, this task should be reviewed for archeological compliance.

WD-CR-2: Install compatible and appropriate surface for Weir driveway and south barnyard

The Weir driveway and south barnyard developed as a continuous, functional circulation feature associated with the barn. By the mid-nineteenth century, the south barnyard was framed by the barn’s main block to the north and two ells that extended south on the west and east sides. Archeological investigations conducted in 1995 revealed the south barnyard grade was raised by filling around natural ledge outcrops with cobbles, brick, soil, and sand. Based on diagnostic ceramic artifacts associated with the deposits, the filling occurred sometime after 1830. During the Weir tenure, the south barnyard consisted of a compacted earth surface and was framed on the south by a rustic picket fence. An opening in the fence defined the width of a connecting drive that curved to the east and joined with Nod Hill Road (Figure 32). The drive featured a compacted earth surface and was informally maintained by repeated trips to the surrounding fields.

Both the driveway and south barnyard were retained through the circa 1940s as agricultural production, limited in scale and scope, continued at the property.
After the Andrews family purchased the property in 1957, the driveway and south barnyard were surfaced with gravel and the driveway provided parking for the family’s car (Figure 33). During recent restoration work on the Weir House, the driveway provided access for materials and laborers and the area was excavated to run underground utilities such as sewer and telecommunications. Presently, a short compacted earth driveway connects Nod Hill Road with the south barnyard. The driveway is approximately ten feet wide at Nod Hill Road and widens to roughly twenty feet near the barn’s west ell. The south barnyard is maintained as turf and four wood plank ramps extend from the barn stalls into the lawn area (Figure 34).

The current configuration of the Weir driveway is too wide for a utilitarian route to the south barnyard. Additionally, the compacted earth surface will not support the occasional vehicle needed for park maintenance without ruts developing and erosion of the surface material. The park should install a ¾-inch crushed stone aggregate surface for the Weir driveway following a curved alignment that leads to the south barnyard (Figure 35). Areas beyond the extent of this new alignment should be scarified and seeded with a lawn turf mix. The south barnyard should have its existing lawn removed in a central area that extends out to the wood plank ramps. Lawn should remain between the ramps and directly up against the barn. Under the supervision of a regional archeologist, additional, non-historic fill should be removed to improve drainage in the south barnyard. A dry well should be installed in the northwest corner of the barnyard to intercept surface water before it contacts the historic structure. After removing the non-historic fill, filter fabric should be placed over the south barnyard to protect archeological resources. A ¾-inch crushed stone aggregate surface, matching the characteristics of the surface on the Weir driveway, should be added on top of the fabric. The aggregate surface has been successfully used at the park’s visitor and employee parking areas and will maintain the informal character of these circulation features.

**WD-CR-3: Install informal service route to Young Studio**

During the historic period, two informal routes extended from the Weir driveway to provide access to the domestic and agricultural areas. The first route proceeded northwest from the driveway, turned north following the west ell of the Weir Barn and the fence for the north barnyard, and lead to the Chicken House, Corn Crib, and across Nod Hill Road to the Pond and Woodland Area. The second route extended northwest from the driveway avoiding sections of exposed ledge, turned west following the north facade of the Weir Studio, and finally turned southwest between the Weir and Young studios connecting to the lower vegetable garden terrace. Portions of these two routes can be seen in a circa 1942 photograph of Mahonri Young walking near the northeast corner of the Secret Garden (see Figure 25).
Presently, access to the south entry of the Young Studio and lower vegetable garden terrace is possible through an open area between the Weir and Young studios. However, existing slopes between the studios vary from ten to fourteen percent and create challenging travel when staff and light utility vehicles are needed for routine maintenance and repairs (Figure 36). In order to provide a safer and more consistent route for park staff, the park should install an informal service route to the Young Studio. The route should begin northwest of the Weir Studio in a relatively flat area with existing grades at roughly 645.50 feet in elevation (Figure 37). The route should proceed west and gently turn south following the east facade of the Young Studio. Prior to the lower vegetable garden terrace, the route should gradually turn 180 degrees and end at the south entry of the Young Studio. This proposed route can be graded at a consistent five percent slope, surfaced with a lawn turf mix, and maintained in an identical manner to the surrounding domestic lawns (Figure 38). At the south entry of the Young Studio, the park may further improve consistent access by raising an existing stone slab roughly six inches so the reset slab is flush with the interior elevation of the studio.

**VEGETATION**

**WD-VG-1: Replace missing or deteriorated historic trees**

As a component of preparing a Preservation Maintenance Plan for the park, the Olmsted Center conducted an inventory of existing trees and shrubs in 1998. The 1998 inventory identified a missing sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), number WT-1-25, on the west side of the walk leading to the Weir house. Photographs document that during the historic period, a pair of sugar maples marked either side of the walk to the house (Figure 39). The sugar maple should be replaced in kind to restore a pairing of trees present in the Weir domestic grounds during the circa 1940 treatment period.

In addition to the sugar maple, historic photographs document a mature Canadian hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*) growing east of the Weir House in 1889 (Figure 40). The hemlock thrived and is seen in the background of a circa 1942 photograph showing Mahonri Young walking near the Secret Garden (see Figure 25). The 1998 inventory identified the hemlock with number WT-1-26 and recorded that the tree was in good condition. In 2011, the park removed the aging hemlock to limit impacts on the Weir House (Figure 41). The Canadian hemlock, present during the circa 1940 treatment period, should be replaced in kind. The new hemlock should be planted slightly further away from the Weir House foundation and steps in order to protect these architectural features and the tree should be routinely monitored and treated throughout each year to prevent an infestation of hemlock woolly adelgid.
Other trees identified in the *Preservation Maintenance Plan* that date to the treatment period should be replaced in kind when they reach the end of their lifecycle. Additionally, specimen trees found in the Weir domestic grounds, and also bordering the public right-of-way, could be inspected annually by a certified arborist. As resources permit, the park might establish a long-term relationship with a professional arborist either inside the National Park Service or in the private sector for this annual consultation. The recommendations of a professional arborist, regarding tree health and public safety, should be reviewed for concurrence with the goals of the park and implemented as soon as practicable.\textsuperscript{11}

**WD-VG-2: Replant missing foundation plantings at the Weir House**

Between 1900 and 1901, workers completed an addition on the Weir House that added a porch to the south facade and changed the primary entry from the east to the south facade. Following the porch’s completion, photographs of the south facade show a variety of plant material emerging from narrow beds including Boston ivy (*Parthenocissus tricuspidata*), trumpet creeper (*Campsis radicans*), bearded iris (*Iris × germanica*), and autumn clematis (*Clematis paniculata*) growing up the wrought iron finials on either side of the entry steps (Figure 42).

Historic photographs dating to circa 1940 show the east and north sides of the Weir house planted very sparsely with occasional groupings of iris, hosta, and fern. Period photography documents a lone weigela shrub which has survived to the present at the north side of the house. A historic view of the west facing facade features a planting of lilacs surrounding the elevated deck. This same photograph documents the foliage of iris and other spring bulbs planted in the interstices of exposed rock outcroppings north of the house. Historic photographs of the south facing facade of the Weir house dating to the 1940s show the alternate presence and absence of climbing vines on the porch balustrade. The vines, likely autumn clematis (*Clematis paniculata*), may have been periodically cut back from the balustrade to facilitate its painting and other maintenance. Additionally, the photographs show the informal placement of small clay pots containing annual flowers on either side of the broad granite stairs leading up to the south porch (Figures 43 and 44).

In 1999, the park removed three non-historic boxwood shrubs from the south beds and in 2002, replaced a missing espalier pear on the east side of the southwest bed with a clone prepared from the surviving pear on the west side of the bed. Presently restoration work on the Weir House, including projects for utility upgrades and universal access, has impacted the foundation plantings on all facades of the house (Figure 45). With these projects now complete, the park should replant the missing foundation plantings. Along the north facade, a small grouping three lilacs (*Syringa vulgaris*) and a single weigela (*Weigela florida*)
should be planted west of the dining room addition (Figure 46). A second group of lilacs should be planted west of the deck. Hay-scented ferns (Dennstaedtia punctilobula) should be planted in a narrow bed along the east facade of the dining room and transition to a bed of hosta (Hosta sp.) along the remaining section of the north facade. The south beds, defined by stone edging three to six inches wide, should contain a mixture of perennials and groundcovers that exhibit resistance to white-tail deer browsing including bearded iris (Iris × germanica), vinca (Vinca minor), lambs-ear (Stachys byzantina), and geranium (Geranium sanguineum). Autumn clematis (Clematis paniculata) should be planted on either side of the granite stairs and trained to the porch balustrade. Autumn clematis climbs by twining, so the vine will not damage or mark woodwork with holdfasts or other attachment structures. Finally, two small clay pots 6-8 inches in diameter should be added on either side of the granite stairs and seasonally planted with annuals.

In September 2010, archeologists completed fieldwork in the south beds and concluded that three of the four beds do not contain intact builder’s trenches or other stratigraphy worthy of additional study or avoidance. In the bed immediately east of the granite stairs, archeologists recorded a top layer of recent fill over a distinct layer likely redeposited from the porch’s construction. These two layers rest on strata that may contain sealed deposits from before 1901. The deposits appear very limited in extent and ground disturbing activity in this bed must be limited to within seven inches of the surface.12

WD-VG-3: Install seasonal vegetable plantings at upper terrace

West of the Weir House and south of the Weir and Young studios, Dorothy Weir Young directed the construction of the vegetable garden terraces in 1937.13 The terraces, an upper and a lower, were creating using L-shaped retaining walls constructed from dry-laid stone to support soil and provide a relatively level surface. Late 1930s sketches by Mahonri Young show the upper terrace contained rows oriented in a north-south direction of low-growing plants with several rows including wood stakes to support plant growth (see Figure 28). Young’s sketches are confirmed by a circa 1940s photograph showing an identical configuration of rows with a bare earth path maintained along the terrace’s south and east perimeter (Figure 47). Several years later, a circa 1945 photographs by Lewis Iselin show the bare earth path continuing along the west edge of the upper terrace and peas or pole beans comprising a large portion of the garden with the plants supported by dozens of round wood stakes (Figure 48 and see Figures 29 and 30).

The upper terrace is presently extant with its boundaries defined by the dry-laid stone wall, however, the terrace surface is finished with lawn turf and there are no rows of plant material. In order to improve the historic character of the Weir
domestic landscape, the park should restore the upper terrace with perennial and annual plantings that are consistent with the character of seasonal vegetables. The existing lawn should be removed saving as much of the existing topsoil as possible. As seen the in the historic photographs a bare earth border, two feet wide, should be maintained and not planted along the terrace perimeter. Rows should be planted at roughly four feet on center resulting in a two-foot wide path in between rows. Each row should be planted with a single plant species to match the uniform appearance seen in the historic images (Figure 49). To lessen yearly maintenance requirements, perennials should be selected over annuals. In addition, plants that exhibit deer resistance are necessary due to a dense population of white-tailed deer in and around the park. Appropriate plants include rhubarb (*Rheum × hybridum*), onions and chives (*Allium* sp.), lemon balm (*Melissa officinalis*), peppers (*Capsicum annum*), and tomatoes (*Solanum lycopersicum*). At least two rows should contain stakes fashioned from unmilled wood poles roughly two inches in diameter and extending four feet tall from the ground. Even if stakes are not needed for plant support, the stakes should still be installed to add an important vertical element documented in historic images. Fruit trees presently extant along the perimeter of the upper terrace include two plums (*Prunus* sp.), an apple (*Malus* sp.), and a pear (*Pyrus* sp.). These trees are not present in the historic photographs from the 1940s and should not be replaced when they reach the end of their lifecycles.

Archeological fieldwork completed in September 2010 uncovered portions of a stone foundation in the southeast section of the upper terrace varying between 4.7 and 15.7 inches below the surface. Additional shovel test pits and soil probes suggest a foundation six feet long by four feet wide. An accompanying report recommended that gardening activities be restricted to the northern half of the upper terrace due to the foundation feature and noted no ground disturbing impacts should occur in southern half.\(^ {14}\) Restoring the upper terrace with vegetable plantings should begin in the northern half and as additional archeological investigations and compliance are completed, proceed to the southwest section and finally the southeast section.

**WD-VG-4: Plant perennial vines and train to restored arbors and trellises**

During the circa 1940 treatment period, four arbor and trellis structures stood between the upper vegetable garden terrace and the Weir Studio that included a garden arbor, a rose arbor, and two trellises along the south facade of the Weir Studio. All four are documented in Mahonri Young sketches from the late 1930s and Lewis Iselin photographs from circa 1945 with vines or climbing roses trained to the wood supports (Figure 50 and see Figures 28, 29, and 30). At the north end of the upper terrace, grape vine appears centered on the garden arbor and two roses are trained to the rose arbor. Along the Weir Studio a larger-leaved, course-textured vine covers the west trellis and a finer textured vine covers the east trellis.
In addition to these structures, photographs from the Weir tenure and a Mahonri Young sketch from circa 1940 show a simple, ladder-like wood trellis on the west ell of the Weir Barn supporting a climbing vine (Figure 51 and see Figure 32).

The arbors and trellises were not present when Weir Farm became a National Park unit, however, currently all the structures have been restored and their restoration is detailed in this report’s Record of Treatment chapter. The arbors and trellises lack the vines and roses documented in historic images and these plants should be installed to enhance the landscape character present in circa 1940. Two grape vines (*Vitis vinifera*) should be planted with one centered on the arbor’s southern middle post and the other centered on the northern middle post (Figure 52). These vines should be trained to spread and cover the arbor. Two climbing roses (*Rosa ‘American Pillar’*) should be planted on the east side of the rose arbor at each of the arbor’s posts and trained to the structure. At the Weir Studio, the west trellis should be planted with three Dutchman’s pipe vines (*Aristolochia macrophylla*) since the large, heart-shaped leaves of this vine are consistent with the foliage seen in the historic photographs. The east trellis should be planted with a single wisteria (*Wisteria floribunda*) centered on the structure and trained to cover it. Once established, the wisteria should be pruned two to three times a year to limit fruit production and unintended seed dispersal. The first pruning should be scheduled for spring to reduce the vines’ length to four to six vegetative buds. If the vines are vigorously growing, a second pruning can take place in August but this pruning is as needed. The final pruning should be scheduled for fall. If the seed production becomes problematic after routine pruning, the park should replace the wisteria with a star magnolia (*Magnolia stellata*) trained as an espalier along the east trellis. The trellis at the barn’s west ell should be planted with a single climbing rose (*Rosa ‘Madame Alfred Carriere’*) centered on the structure (Figure 53). In addition, the rustic picket fence south of the barn’s Tack House should be planted with a row of hollyhocks (*Alcea rosea*) displaying mixed flower colors. The new hollyhocks may need to be planted every two to three years in order to maintain a solid row.

**SMALL-SCALE FEATURES**

**WD-SSF-1: Replace missing wood pile between Weir and Young studios**

Two cast iron stoves heated the Young Studio and remained operational in the building when the National Park Service acquired the property. A circa 1942 photograph of the barn, house, and two studios shows firewood neatly stacked and stored between the Weir and Young studios (see Figure 25). Fieldwork performed in 1995 documented an extant wood pile between the two studios but currently, the wood pile is not present.
The missing wood pile should be replaced to enhance the character of domestic grounds and restore a simple, utilitarian feature that supported Young’s artwork. Based on the circa 1942 photograph, the wood pile should be comprised of round logs and cover an area fifteen feet long by four feet wide and stacked up to five feet in height. Naturally rot-resistant logs, such as black locust or cedar, should be used to prolong the appearance of the feature and minimize replacing the wood. Determining a replacement schedule and monitoring the wood pile will require the attention of the park’s Integrated Pest Management (IPM) coordinator.

**WD-SSF-2: Relocate scalding vat to area south of reconstructed Wagon Shed**

The Bass family, who tenant farmed and served as caretakers at the property during the Young tenure, used a large cast iron kettle as a scalding vat to prepare slaughtered hogs for butchering. In an interview, Charlie Bass recalled setting the vat on rocks over a fire in an area south of the Wagon Shed. The vat held a boiling mixture of water, wood ash, and lye. Charlie’s father slaughtered the hogs near the Wagon Shed and then he and his brothers dunked each hog in the vat before scraping the hides free of hair. The family then transported the hogs to a butcher in Georgetown. Photographs of the Wagon Shed show that by circa 1960, the scalding vat had been moved to an undetermined location (Figure 54). Fieldwork performed in 1995 documented the scalding vat located between the Weir and Young studios and presently, the vat remains in a similar location on a level area of ground roughly ten feet away from the northeast corner of the Young Studio (Figure 55).

The scalding vat served as a distinct tool in agricultural production during the historic period and should be relocated to an area south of the Wagon Shed after the shed is reconstructed. To prevent theft, a heavy-gauge chain should be inconspicuously attached to the bottom of the vat and anchored to a concrete block buried in the soil. Prior to relocation, the vat should be reviewed by a conservation specialist to determine if any treatments to the cast iron should be implemented. For further information on reconstructing the Wagon Shed, please see task WA-BL-1.

**WD-SSF-3: Replace Weir mailbox**

Existing conditions documentation in 1995 recorded two mailboxes along the eastern side of Nod Hill Road near its intersection with Pelham Lane. One mailbox was located near the driveway to the Caretaker’s House and to the north a second mailbox was installed for the Weir House (Figure 56). Both mailboxes were U- or tunnel-shaped rectangles constructed from steel. Both featured signal flags on the right side of the box and were mounted on unpeeled wood posts set into the ground. The mailbox associated with the Caretaker’s House is currently extant and the mailbox for the Weir House is safely stored in the park’s maintenance shop.
The park should continue to store the Weir mailbox and install a replacement mailbox that matches the materials, size, and finish of the original. Replacing this small-scale feature enhances the historic character of the landscape when Weir Farm served as a residence and received rural mail service. To help maintain the replacement mailbox, the door should be screwed or riveted shut since the park receives mail at the Burlingham House and this replacement mailbox is not needed for functional service. Finding a replacement mailbox that matches the original in materials, size, and finish will be difficult given the increasing use of electronic communications instead of carrier mail service. When a source has been identified, multiple mailboxes should be acquired as future replacements.
Figure 25. Planking for the deck is visible on a stacked stone wall extending from the Weir Studio, the second building from the right. View looking south from the Chicken House, circa 1942 (WEFA, HP 150).

Figure 26. Weir Studio deck to be restored including resetting loose stones, adding wood joists on top of the stone base, and attaching decking to the joists. View looking southeast, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 27. Weir vegetable garden terrace walls to be stabilized. View looking southeast, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 28. Mahonri M. Young, “The Two Studios and the Tool House,” ink drawing, 1936. South of the two studios, Young’s sketch shows the upper terrace contained rows of low-growing plants and an arbor at the terrace’s northern end (Courtesy of Brigham Young University Museum of Art, No. 832070201, All Rights Reserved).

Figure 29. The upper vegetable garden terrace contained rows oriented in a north-south direction with low herbs bordering the eastern edge, peas or pole beans comprising a large portion of the garden, and grapes growing on a rustic arbor at the northern end of the terrace. View looking northwest, circa 1945 (Lewis Iselin, WEFA).
TREATMENT TASKS

Figure 30. The lower vegetable garden terrace, foreground, lacked the extensive planting seen in the upper terrace. View looking east, circa 1945 (Lewis Iselin, WEFA).

Figure 31. Install stabilized soil surface on the lower vegetable garden terrace and plant with a lawn turf mixture that matches the surrounding domestic lawns. View looking north, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 32. The Weir driveway entered from Nod Hill Road and curved into the south barnyard during the historic period. View looking north, circa 1910s (WEFA HP 265).

Figure 33. The Andrews’ family car, right midground, parked in the Weir driveway immediately south of the barn. View looking north with Cora Weir Burlingham on Pelham Lane, circa 1962 (Andrews Family Home Movies, WEFA 6830).
Figure 34. Current driveway surface of compacted earth and lawn throughout the south barnyard to be installed with a compatible and appropriate surface. View looking north, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 35. Diagrammatic plan showing the installation of a compatible and appropriate surface for the Weir driveway and south barnyard featuring a consistent, crushed stone aggregate surface and lack of a hard, geometric edge, 2012 (OCLP).
Figure 36. Install informal service route to Young Studio to improve existing grades that vary between ten and fourteen percent. View looking northeast across the lower vegetable garden terrace, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 37. Diagrammatic plan showing the installation of an informal service route to the Young Studio featuring consistent grading and a lawn surface to match the surrounding area, 2012 (OCLP).
Figure 38. Digital model showing the installation of an informal service route to the Young Studio with the existing topography between the two studios on the left and proposed topography with the service route highlighted a darker green on the right, 2012 (OCLP).

Figure 39. Historic pair of sugar maples to be replaced in kind at the stone walk leading to the Weir House. View looking northwest, circa 1960s (WEFA HP 260).
Figure 40. Historic Canadian hemlock to be replaced in kind north of the steps along the Weir House east facade. View looking northwest, 1889 (WEFA HP 233).

Figure 41. Historic Canadian hemlock to be replaced in kind north of the steps along the Weir House east facade. The hemlock’s advanced age required the park to remove the tree to limit impacts on the Weir House. View looking northwest, 2011 (OCLP).
Figure 42. Foundation plantings in narrow beds along the south facade of the Weir House including Boston ivy and autumn clematis trained on support structures east of the entry steps. View looking northeast, post-1901 (WEFA HP 347).

Figure 43. Foundation plantings left of the granite steps maintained below the height of the porch decking and small clay pots containing annuals present on the granite steps. View looking northwest, circa 1940 (WEFA HP 95).
Figure 44. Vines growing at the southwest corner of the porch and climbing the porch column and balustrade. View looking northwest, circa 1940 (WEFA HP 123).

Figure 45. Replant missing foundation plantings at the Weir House after completing building restoration work that includes utility upgrades and universal access. View looking northwest, 2012 (OCLP).
Hay-scented Fern (*Dennstaedtia punctilobula*)

**WEIR HOUSE PORCH**

- Wrought iron finials
- Carved granite splash block, typ.
- Espalier pears
- Clay pot planted with annuals, typ.
- Archeological resource area - limit planting to 7" deep
- Autumn Clematis (*Clematis paniculata*) trained to balustrade
- Hosta (*Hosta sp.*)
- Trumpet Creeper (*Campsis radicans*) trained to standard
- Weigela (*Weigela florida*)
- Autumn Clematis (*Clematis paniculata*) trained to balustrade
- Lilacs (*Syringa vulgaris*)
- Stone picnic table
- South Beds: Bearded Iris (*Iris x germanica*)
- Vinca (*Vinca minor*)
- Lambs' ear (*Stachys byzantina*)
- Geranium (*Geranium sanguineum*)

Figure 46. Diagrammatic plan showing replanted foundation plantings at the Weir House, 2012 (OCLP).
Figure 47. Seasonal vegetable plantings at the upper terrace during the Young tenure. View looking north, circa 1940 (WEFA HP 1040).

Figure 48. Seasonal vegetable plantings at the upper terrace featuring an earthen path on the west side of the terrace along the stone wall, foreground, and unmilled wood poles to support vegetables. View looking southeast, circa 1945 (Lewis Iselin, WEFA).
Figure 49. Diagrammatic plan showing the installation of seasonal vegetable plantings at the upper terrace featuring deer-resistant perennials and annuals, 2012 (OCLP).

Figure 50. Two roses are trained to the rose arbor and along the Weir Studio, a larger-leaved, course-textured vine covers the west trellis and a finer textured vine covers the east trellis. View looking north, circa 1945 (Lewis Iselin, WEFA).
Figure 51. Detail of Mahonri M. Young sketch, circa 1940. Young’s sketch shows a simple, ladder-like wood trellis on the west ell of the Weir Barn supporting a climbing vine (WEFA 306).
Figure 52. Diagrammatic plan showing perennial vines to be planted and trained to restored arbors and trellises near the Weir Studio, 2012 (OCLP).

Figure 53. Diagrammatic plan showing perennials to be planted at the Weir Barn trellis and rustic picket fence, 2012 (OCLP).
Figure 54. South of the Wagon Shed, left, the Bass family slaughtered and scalded hogs during the historic period. By the time of this photograph, a cast iron scalding vat had been moved to an undetermined location. View looking northeast, circa 1960 (WEFA HP 1150).

Figure 55. Scalding vat to be relocated to an area south of the reconstructed Wagon Shed. View looking southwest, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 56. Weir mailbox to be replaced. The mailbox captured in the foreground of this photograph is presently stored in the park’s maintenance shop and should be replaced with one matching the materials, size, and finish of the original. View looking northwest, 1995 (OCLP).
WEIR COMPLEX AGRICULTURAL ZONE

BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

WA-BL-1: Reconstruct Wagon Shed

George R. Bass and his sons, tenant farmers during the Youngs’ tenure, constructed the Wagon Shed in the early 1930s. Oliver Lay, architect and son-in-law of Mahonri Young, may have influenced the design of the structure (Figure 57 and see Figure 54). A 1941 aerial photograph documents that the Wagon Shed stood northwest of the corn crib during the circa 1940 treatment period. Around 1980, the Wagon Shed collapsed leaving wagons, farm machinery, and pieces of smaller equipment exposed to the elements.

Presently, four piles of farm machinery remain in a linear configuration paralleling a stone wall northwest of the corn crib. A closer examination of the area reveals the remnants of stone foundations and post holes that mark the footprint of the former Wagon Shed (Figure 58). The Wagon Shed is an important outbuilding that supported farming activities during the circa 1940 treatment period and reconstructing this structure is specified in the park’s General Management Plan.

Historic photographs and archeological fieldwork performed in September 2010 provide important dimensional and construction data to accurately reconstruct the Wagon Shed. The structure consists of four open bays along its south facade with vertical board siding on the east, west, and north facades. Foundation and framing evidence indicate interior dimensions of 36 feet long by 18 feet wide. Archeological evidence of a drip line documents that the roof extended 7 feet south of the interior framing and resulted in overall dimensions of 36 feet long by 25 feet wide. Logs varying from 5-1/2 to 9 inches in diameter were used for posts and framing members and the roof was clad with wood shingles (Figures 59 and 60). The architectural and archeological investigations include the documentation and identification of the exposed farm machinery which must be relocated prior to reconstructing the Wagon Shed. The archeological investigations concluded that no further archeological work was recommended for the Wagon Shed area. As specified in the 1997 programmatic agreement, the park submitted the report from the Wagon Shed archeological investigations to the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office. Continuing to follow the stipulations of the programmatic agreement, the park must submit 75 percent drawings and specifications to the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office for review and comment prior to implementing the reconstruction.
TOPOGRAPHY

WA-TP-1: Fine grade area around Pump House and add subsurface structures to improve drainage

North of the Weir Barn north barnyard and east of the Chicken House stands a gabled-roof Pump House, roughly four feet wide by five feet long. The Pump House occupies a level area approximately 50 feet by 110 feet that is bordered on the east by a stone wall paralleling Nod Hill Road. Recently, this level area was used for construction staging during restoration projects at the Weir House and Weir and Young studios. During storm events, the lack of major elevations changes across this broad area results in water collecting and continuing to persist once the storm has ended (Figure 61). Additionally, a low point along the west shoulder of Nod Hill Road collects runoff and can drain into the already saturated Pump House area (Figure 62).

In order to improve drainage and pedestrian access across the Pump House area, the park should fine grade the area and direct water at a consistent grade to a drain inlet or other subsurface structure located northeast of the Pump House (Figure 63). The Pump House sits on a concrete foundation that is exposed three to six inches above surrounding grades. Sterile topsoil should be added around the Pump House to meet the top of the concrete foundation and sloped away from the structure and blended into adjacent grades. Northeast of the Pump House, a drain inlet should be added with an outflow pipe that connects to an existing drainage structure to the southeast. The drain inlet should be rated for H2O loading and the outflow pipe should be schedule 40 PVC since both of these specifications are designed to withstand vehicular loads. The final location of the drain inlet should be reviewed in the field to maximize screening by Pump House of this contemporary element. In addition, an asphalt apron that extends west from Nod Hill Road into the Pump House area should be raised to prevent water from the flowing off the road and into the park. The apron is on park and Town of Ridgefield property, therefore, the park should coordinate with the town and remove, regrade, and replace only that portion of the apron on their property. Additional coordination with the town should address adding a drainage structure south of the apron in the west shoulder of Nod Hill Road to remove ponding water from an existing low point.

In September 2010, archeologists excavated nine shovel test pits in an area south and west of the Pump House. The area north and northwest of the Pump House had been investigated by previous archeological reconnaissance. Archeologists recovered a small artifact sample contained mostly in upper layers associated with filling activity. In addition a pre-contact artifact, a possible tip of a quartz point, was recovered. However, encountering no other pre-contact material, archeologists concluded the point tip was likely brought in as part of a fill episode. Based on the earlier investigations and September 2010 shovel test pits, no further archeological work was recommended for the Pump House area.25
VEGETATION

WA-VG-1: Replace missing or deteriorated historic trees

The Olmsted Center conducted an inventory of existing trees and shrubs in 1998 and incorporated the inventory and specific recommendations into the park’s Preservation Maintenance Plan. In the Weir Agricultural Zone the inventory recorded number WT-4-2, a white ash (*Fraxinus americana*), that had been removed in the northernmost portion of the property that wraps around the Beers family cemetery along Nod Hill Road. The inventory also recorded that west of the stone well along Pelham Lane, number WT-3-6, a red maple (*Acer rubrum*), was dead. The missing ash and dead maple should be replaced in kind along with other trees identified in the Preservation Maintenance Plan that date to the treatment period and have reached the end of their lifecycle (Drawing 5).

SMALL-SCALE FEATURES

WA-SSF-1: Restore missing haystack

Mahonri Young sketches from the late 1930s and early 1940s depict the preparation or transport of hay at the Branchville farm. One particular sketch dated March 15, 1943, shows a man working on top of a haystack that would typically be used for outdoor storage when the barn was full. The location of a haystack such as this is provided by an extremely sharp, wide angle photograph of Young walking north of his home circa 1942 (see Figure 25). Young’s sketches and the historic photograph document that outdoor hay storage was a common practice and landscape feature during the circa 1940 treatment period. The haystack is not presently extant and in order to provide a tangible connection to farming activities from the historic period, the park should restore the haystack.

Based on the circa 1942 photograph, the haystack should be located between the Secret Garden and the north barnyard. The haystack should be approximately 12 feet in diameter by 8 feet high. To limit the amount of hay needed to restore this feature, a 5-foot diameter by 5-feet tall hay bale should be used to form the core of the haystack. The hay bale should be wrapped with reinforced plastic to slow the decomposition of the material and moved into position using a skid steer tractor or similar piece of equipment. With the hay bale placed on its end in the center of the stack, a smaller quantity of hay should be placed over the hay bale to achieve the proportions seen in the historic photograph (Figure 64). Once restored, the haystack would have to be renewed every two to three years, however, the cost for hay is negligible and renewing the haystack may serve as a unique and enjoyable interpretive opportunity.24
Figure 57. Wagon Shed to be reconstructed featuring four open bays on its south facade and a wood shingled roof. Unmilled logs were used for posts and framing members and the roof extended south of the interior posts. View looking northwest, circa 1960 (WEFA HP 1148).

Figure 58. Site for the Wagon Shed to be reconstructed. Four piles of farm machinery help mark the four open bays of the former Wagon Shed. A closer examination of the area reveals the remnants of stone foundations and post holes that define the footprint of the missing structure. View looking north, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 59. Site plan for the Wagon Shed reconstruction. Based on archeological investigations and historic photographs, the Historic Preservation Training Center prepared a plan for reconstructing the Wagon Shed, 2011 (Historic Preservation Training Center, hereafter HPTC).
Figure 60. Elevations for the Wagon Shed reconstruction. In conjunction with the plan, the Historic Preservation Training Center prepared elevations based archeological and photographic documentation for reconstructing the Wagon Shed, 2011 (HPTC).
Figure 61. Area around Pump House to be fine graded. View looking northeast, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 62. West shoulder of Nod Hill Road to coordinate with Town of Ridgefield on adding a drainage structure. View looking northwest, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 63. Diagrammatic plan showing fine grading around the Pump House and the addition of subsurface structures to improve drainage, 2012 (OCLP).

Figure 64. Diagrammatic section showing missing haystack to be restored. To limit the amount of hay needed for restoring this feature, a core should be created using a 5-foot diameter round hay bale, 2012 (OCLP).
BURLINGHAM COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

BD-BL-1: Rehabilitate stone-lined beds and irregular stone flagging in the South Garden terraces

In the South Garden, the eastern perimeter of the lower and middle terraces feature planting areas defined by stone edging. The stones are set into the ground on their narrow edge and installed approximately eighteen to twenty-four inches away from the base of the terrace walls. West of the stone edging is a band of irregular stone flagging approximately two feet wide (Figure 65).

As a component of preserving and enhancing the South Garden terraces, the park should rehabilitate the stone-lined beds and irregular stone flagging. Loose stones should be reset and missing stones should be replaced with ones that match the existing in size, texture, and color range. Accumulated soil and vegetation growing on the irregular stone flagging should be removed and the walkway maintained free from new deposits (Figure 66). In conjunction with rehabilitating the stone work, the park should install one-quarter inch mesh hardware cloth in the planting beds to discourage voles. The mesh should be installed one foot below the finish surface of the bed and wrapped up six inches following the sides of the stone edging or walls. At these depths, the mesh will be hidden from view. While initially involving more effort, the park should consider resetting the flagging and on a stonedust setting bed installed over a compacted aggregate base. Installation with a setting bed and compacted base will reduce future maintenance requirements by lessen the chances of settling and limiting coverage by sediment and vegetation.

CIRCULATION

BD-CR-1: Rehabilitate and provide drainage for the Burlingham driveway

The Webb family purchased the fifty-acre farm property south of Pelham Lane in 1843 and at this time, the deed indicates the farmhouse and barn were part of the transaction. Current research has not discovered documentation for the installation of a driveway from Nod Hill Road heading west to the barn, however, by the Webbs’ 1843 purchase, this circulation feature likely existed due to the repeated traffic of wagons and animals.

Cora Weir Burlingham acquired the former Webb farm in 1931 from her sister Dorothy and during the next decade, directed major alterations to the house and construction of the Sunken Garden, Potting Shed, and hundreds of feet of stone boundary walls. A photograph from Burlingham’s tenure shows a narrow
driveway comprised of two parallel tracks separated by a higher, vegetated median. The tracks are surfaced with a mixture of crushed stone and soil and the vegetated median features an array of lawn and broadleaf weed species (Figure 67).

The Burlingham driveway is presently extant and extends for approximately 250 feet from a right-angle intersection with Nod Hill Road to a courtyard defined by the Burlingham barn and Woodshed. Immediately west of the Burlingham house, the driveway passes between the south meadow and the Sunken Garden on fill retained between two stone walls (Figure 68). Vehicular traffic has accentuated the driveway’s parallel tracks and resulted in low ruts in comparison to the higher central median. Both the tracks and median are surfaced with crushed stone and water often accumulates in the low points of the driveway’s tracks.

The park should rehabilitate the Burlingham driveway and provide proper drainage to remove standing water. The first step involves improving the longitudinal slope of the driveway, establishing a cross slope across the drive’s width, and resurfacing with a crushed stone aggregate. In the area between the south meadow and the Sunken Garden, the longitudinal slope of the current driveway is between 0.6 and 1.2 percent. Increasing the longitudinal slope to 2.0 percent will improve drainage and require removing roughly seven inches of the current surface material at the proposed low point (Figure 69). The current surface material forms the top layer of over thirty inches of artifact-free, stratified fill that archeological fieldwork confirmed in September 2010. In addition to increasing the longitudinal slope, a new cross slope should be established that pitches from the Sunken Garden to the south meadow at 2.0 percent. This new cross slope will direct water away from the driveway surface. The driveway should be surfaced with a ¾-inch crushed stone aggregate that has been successfully used at the park’s visitor and employee parking areas. The crushed stone surface will maintain the informal character of the driveway.

The second step involves the installation of a small drain inlet. The new longitudinal and cross slope of the driveway will direct water to a low point. At the low point a small drain inlet, less than one square foot in size, should be installed and an outflow pipe daylighted south of the driveway (Figure 70). The end of the pipe should be recessed from the face of the wall and gray in color to blend in with the random stone work. Installing the drain inlet will involve excavating in the imported fill behind the wall. Archeological investigations in this area recommended that an archeologist be present to monitor the installation of the drain inlet and outflow pipe.
**VEGETATION**

**BD-VG-1: Replace missing or deteriorated historic trees**

In 2010 the park removed a large sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), inventory number BT-1-15, that stood along Nod Hill Road during the historic period. The tree was nearing the end of its life and since it posed a hazard, its removal was necessary. The sugar maple stood in close proximity to a corner formed by the stone wall along Nod Hill Road and the Burlingham driveway stone wall. In order to minimize potential damage to the walls from tree roots and maintain the character of large deciduous trees along Nod Hill Road, the park planted a replacement maple six feet south of the Burlingham driveway wall in 2012 (Figure 71). The distance west from the edge of Nod Hill Road to the new planting remained the same as the historic location. In addition to the sugar maple, the 1998 inventory of existing trees and shrubs recorded a pear (*Pyrus* sp.), number BT-2-4, in poor condition to the west of the South Garden terraces. The pear has been removed and should also be replaced in kind (Drawing 6). Other trees identified in the 1998 inventory that date to the treatment period should be replaced in kind when they reach the end of their lifecycle.

**BD-VG-2: Replant missing foundation plantings at the Burlingham House**

Julian Alden Weir purchased the Webb farmhouse and its 50-acre property south of Pelham Lane in 1907. During Weir’s tenure, correspondence indicates the farmhouse was occupied by tenant farmers, however, no information has been discovered on ornamental or utilitarian plantings around the house.27 Dorothy Weir inherited the 238-acre Branchville farm, including the former Webb property, after her mother died in 1930. Following her marriage to Mahonri Young in 1931, she transferred the 50-acre Webb property to her sister, Cora Weir Burlingham.

Burlingham directed major alterations to the house and by the mid-1930s, the structure extended west with the additions of a new dining room and kitchen. The additions shifted the main entry of the house from the east elevation along Nod Hill Road to the newly elongated south elevation. Cora Burlingham, an avid gardener, also added foundation plantings surrounding the renovated house. Photographs from the 1930s to the 1950s document the architectural additions and foundation plantings (Figure 72).

In 2001, local landscape architect and park volunteer coordinator Norma Williams prepared a planting plan for the foundation plantings based on a review of historic photographs from the 1930s to the 1950s. Many of her 2001 recommendations have been implemented including a new row of boxwood planted along the north facade. Missing foundation plantings from the 2001 plan should be installed and mature plantings should be rejuvenated or replaced in kind if necessary.
Along all facades, mature plantings of lilac, mountain laurel, and pieris are presently too tall and have developed an open and loose habit. These plantings should first be lowered through a rejuvenative pruning that will encourage bud development lower on the plant stem. Should this technique fail for any individual plant, that plant should be replaced in kind (Figure 73).

Along the east facade, two boxwood should flank the stone landing at the door and presently only one boxwood survives. A new boxwood (*Buxus* ‘Varder Valley’) should be planted north of the landing and should match the width and height of the existing shrub. Boxwood are specifically selected as evergreen shrubs for the foundation planting due to their resistance to deer browsing. In the beds on either side of the door, lily of the valley should be removed and replace with English ivy (*Hedera helix* ‘Baltica’) and a blend of daffodils (*Narcissus* ‘Cheerfulness,’ *Narcissus* ‘Seagull,’ and *Narcissus* ‘Thalia’) (see Figure 73).

Along the north facade, two missing flowering dogwoods should be planted. In place of the American flowering dogwood (*Cornus florida*), the park should plant hybrid dogwoods that are resistant to anthracnose and have been introduced by Rutgers University. Two commercially available cultivars with white flowers and compatible growth characteristics are Constellation™ (*Cornus* × ‘Rutcan’) and Celestial™ (*Cornus* × ‘Rutdan’) (see Figure 73).

**BD-VG-3: Replant missing plantings in the South Garden terraces**

The garden terraces in the meadow directly south of the Burlingham House were constructed after the end of World War II, when Cora Burlingham abandoned her Victory Garden north of the house. Her son, Charles Burlingham, recalls that after the war, his mother became more interested in growing small fruits such as raspberries and strawberries in this new garden rather than vegetables. The garden contained three terraces defined by dry-laid stone walls. Starting with the lower terrace on the west, the terraces rose in elevation heading east and included the middle terrace and the upper terrace. The small meadow surrounding the garden terraces also included limited other plantings such as an asparagus bed, pear trees, and a small grape trellis (Figure 74).

In 2001, Norma Williams prepared a planting plan for the South Garden terraces based on a review of historic photographs from the 1950s and 1960s. Many of her 2001 recommendations have been implemented including removing non-historic shrubs such as forsythia, sassafras, and burning bush between the upper terrace and the stone wall along Nod Hill Road. In the middle terrace, the park planted a mixture of purple, pale pink, and yellow irises along with lavender (*Lavandula angustifolia* ‘Munstead’) along a stone wall that extends north from the terrace and connects to the south wall paralleling the Burlingham driveway. Also in the middle terrace, catmint (*Nepeta × faassenii* ‘Walker’s Low’) was planted in the east
bed and a mixture of peonies was planted in the west beds. In the lower terrace, staff planted lemon verbena (*Aloysia triphylla*) and purple-leaf culinary sage (*Salvia officinalis* ‘Purple’) in the east beds.

The addition of plant material called for in the 2001 plan has greatly enhanced the character of the South Garden terraces. Presently, the South Garden terraces are in good to fair condition with missing plant material in the middle and upper terraces (Figure 75). The park should replant the missing plantings in the South Garden terraces continuing to follow the 2001 plan (Figure 76).

In the upper terrace, the 2001 plan calls for a snowdrift crabapple (*Malus* ‘Snowdrift’) to be planted in a semi-circular bed lined with stones. In this bed, there is only six inches of soil present before ledge is encountered. Since there is an insufficient depth of soil for planting a small ornamental tree, the park should plant a snowdrift crabapple in a gray stoneware container and place the container in the semi-circular bed. Lambs-ear (*Stachys byzantina*) and the groundcover perennial snow-in-summer (*Cerastium tomentosum*) should be planted in the pockets formed between the upper terrace and large, exposed pieces of ledge. Larger openings among pieces of ledge should be planted with yucca (*Yucca filamentosa*). At the south end of the middle terrace, the park restored the raspberry trellis in the fall of 2010. The trellis consists of three rows of wire with each row supported by two end posts and a central post. Twelve new raspberries (*Rubus* ‘Heritage’) should be planted with two plants equally spaced between each set of posts. The cultivar ‘Heritage’ has been bred for resistance to common viruses that effect raspberry vigor and fruit production. ‘Heritage’ or another virus-resistant cultivar should be planted in order to establish a healthy planting and minimize maintenance requirements.

**SMALL-SCALE FEATURES**

**BD-SSF-1: Develop mounts or surrounds for park entrance sign consistent with the site’s artistic tradition**

Presently, the park entrance sign stands east of the Burlingham House near a stone wall bordering Nod Hill Road. The sign is supported by two 8-inch square pressure treated wood posts anchored into the ground (Figure 77). Elements of the park’s mission indicate the desire to enhance public understanding of the site’s cultural and natural heritage and to perpetuate its artistic tradition. Physical elements relating to these traditions may be creatively recombined in an entrance sign of a representational nature such as easels, palettes, or frames. The *Park and Facility Identity Sign Design Standards* offers considerable latitude in the design of park entrance signs allowing variations in structure and materials to reflect the character of the park and the sign’s setting. For Weir Farm National Historic Site’s entrance sign, special mounts or surrounds should be designed that reflect the interpretive themes of a park (Figure 78).
Figure 65. Stone-lined beds and irregular stone flagging in the South Garden terraces. Planting beds in the South Garden terraces extend from the terrace walls and are defined by stone edging and a band of irregular stone flagging approximately two feet wide. View looking east in the middle terrace, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 66. Stone-lined beds and irregular stone flagging in the South Garden terraces to be rehabilitated including the removal of accumulated soil and vegetation. Detail of stone flagging in the middle terrace, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 67. The Burlingham driveway consisted of two parallel tracks separated by a higher, vegetated median during the historic period. View looking west, circa late 1930s–1950s (WEFA HP 1123).

Figure 68. The Burlingham driveway to be rehabilitated with drainage deficiencies corrected. The driveway passes between two stone walls and pitches to a low point that traps water in a large puddle. View looking west, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 69. Schematic plan showing rehabilitated and improved drainage at the Burlingham driveway. The longitudinal slope of the driveway should be increasing in the area between the Sunken Garden and south meadow, 2012 (OCLP).

Figure 70. Schematic section showing rehabilitated and improved drainage at the Burlingham driveway. The service life of the driveway's paving can be increased by maintaining a cross slope from the Sunken Garden and by installing a small drain inlet at a low point between the south edge of the drive and the stone wall, 2012 (OCLP).
Figure 71. Replaced in kind sugar maple, Burlingham Complex domestic grounds. Trees that date to the historic period should be replaced in kind when they reach the end of their lifecycle. View looking south, 2012 (Greg Waters, WEFA).

Figure 72. Foundation plantings at the Burlingham House during the historic period. Note the single clump of lilacs at the southeast corner and evergreen shrubs flanking both doorways. View looking northwest, circa late 1930s–1950s (WEFA HP 673).
Figure 73. Diagrammatic plan showing missing foundation plantings to be replanted at the Burlingham House, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 74. Plantings in the South Garden terraces during the historic period. View looking east, circa late 1950s–early 1960s (WEFA HP 1128 and 1129).

Figure 75. Plantings in the South Garden terraces added based on the 2001 garden treatment plan. The addition of plant material has greatly enhanced the character of the South Garden terraces, however, plants are missing from the middle and upper terraces. View looking southeast, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 76. Missing plantings in the South Garden terraces to be replanted following the Treatment and Planting Plan for the Burlingham Complex, South of Stonewall prepared in 2001 (Norma Williams).
Figure 77. Park entrance sign to be developed with mounts or surrounds consistent with the site's artistic tradition. View looking southwest, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 78. Precedent image of a park sign mounted on a representational easel. The Arnold Arboretum, 1997 (OCLP).
BURLINGHAM COMPLEX AGRICULTURAL ZONE

The Burlingham Complex agricultural zone consists of five fields bordered by stone walls and the barn and woodshed located at the western end of the Burlingham driveway. Treatment recommendations for a majority of this area’s landscape characteristics and features are addressed in the park-wide tasks at the beginning of this chapter. Additionally, since publication of the Volume 2 report, the park completed a rehabilitation of the Burlingham orchard in 1998 and a rehabilitation of the Burlingham Barn in 2004. Both of these completed tasks are detailed in the subsequent Record of Treatment chapter.

VEGETATION

BA-VG-1: Replace missing or deteriorated historic trees

The Olmsted Center conducted an inventory of existing trees and shrubs in 1998 and incorporated the inventory and specific recommendations into the park’s Preservation Maintenance Plan. In the Burlingham Agricultural Zone, two trees were assessed in poor condition along Pelham Lane near its intersection with Nod Hill Road. Inventory numbers BT-7-3 and BT-7-8, both sugar maples (*Acer saccharum*), should be replaced in kind due to their poor condition. Along Nod Hill Road near the southeast corner of the Burlingham Complex stood a sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*) and a Shagbark hickory (*Carya ovata*) with inventory numbers BT-3-8 and BT-3-9, respectively. The trees were evaluated to be in good to fair condition in 1998, but have subsequently been removed. The sugar maple and Shagbark hickory should be replaced in kind and planted four feet away from the stone wall that parallels Nod Hill Road to limit potential impacts to the wall. Other trees identified in the Preservation Maintenance Plan that date to the treatment period should also be replaced in kind when they reach the end of their lifecycle (Drawings 5 and 6).
CARETAKER’S DOMESTIC GROUNDS

VEGETATION

CD-VG-1: Replant missing foundation plantings at Caretaker’s House

Based on deed and census records, a dwelling may have been present east of the Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane intersection as early as 1811. Lewis Beers, whose father owned much of the surrounding land that would become Weir Farm, received several acres on the east side of Nod Hill Road in the 1810s. An 1861 probate inventory of Lewis Beers’ estate lists a small dwelling house in addition to the main farmhouse, barn, and outbuildings that comprised his farm. In 1882, Julian Alden Weir purchased the former Beers’ land from Erwin and Emily Davis and a year later, directed improvements to the small dwelling house so the building could be used by his tenant farmers. Weir’s tenants performed daily farm operations and served as caretakers while he resided in New York City. An undated drawing by Weir looks southeast from the Weir House and shows the Caretaker’s House along Nod Hill Road (Figure 79).

Mahonri Young also captured images of the Caretaker’s House in sketches prepared during his tenure at the property. Two Young sketches from the 1940s show the north facade of the Caretaker’s House with limited foundation planting and a rustic, wood picket fencing north of the building (Figures 80 and 81). Photographs from the Bass family, who served as caretakers and lived in the house during the Young tenure, also show minimal foundation planting (Figure 82).

As a component of preparing a Preservation Maintenance Plan for the park, the Olmsted Center conducted an inventory of existing trees and shrubs in 1998. Consistent with the Young sketches showing the north facade, the inventory recorded three lilacs at the northwest corner of the Caretaker’s House. Presently, two clumps of lilacs are extant with one located at the northwest corner of the Caretaker’s House and the other standing along the west facade centered between the first and second windows from the northwest corner (Figure 83). To enhance the historic character of the Caretaker’s House, the park should replant the missing foundation plantings. A multi-stem lilac (Syringa vulgaris) should be planted centered between the windows on the north facade. Contemporary lilac cultivars should be selected that offer resistance to powdery mildew and the lilacs should be maintained at a maximum height of ten feet.
SMALL-SCALE FEATURES

CD-SSF-1: Preserve Caretaker’s mailbox

A large steel mailbox stands north of the driveway to the Caretaker’s House along Nod Hill Road. The mailbox is mounted on an unpeeled wood post set into the ground (Figure 84). The size of the mailbox, larger than ones currently commercially available, is indicative of residences that received rural mail service and contributes to the character of Weir Farm National Historic Site.

The park should preserve the Caretaker’s mailbox by maintaining the paint finish to match the existing color. The park should also screw or rivet shut the door since this operational feature is not needed. In conjunction with replacing the Weir mailbox (see task WD-SSF-2), the park should find a replacement mailbox for the Caretaker’s House that matches the existing in materials, size, and finish. The replacement mailbox should be acquired and stored for future use.
Figure 79. Julian Alden Weir, circa 1885. After purchasing the Branchville farm, Weir directed improvements to the small dwelling house so the building could be used by his tenant farmers (Private Collection).

Figure 80. Mahonri M. Young, “Home in Branchville,” graphite, 1942. Young’s sketch documents the north facade of the Caretaker’s House with limited foundation planting and rustic wood picket fencing north of the building (Courtesy of Brigham Young University Museum of Art, No. 832080118, All Rights Reserved).
Figure 81. Mahonri M. Young, sketch of the Caretaker’s House, conte, circa 1940. Rustic picket fencing, installed in the early 1900s, turned east from Nod Hill Road and followed the top of a stone wall along the northern edge of the Caretaker’s yard (Courtesy of Brigham Young University Museum of Art, No. 832120069, All Rights Reserved).

Figure 82. Minimal foundation plantings at the Caretaker’s House during the historic period. View looking north, circa mid-1930s (WEFA HP 1111).
Figure 83. Missing foundation plantings at Caretaker’s House to be replanted. View looking northeast, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 84. Caretaker’s mailbox to be preserved. View looking northeast, 2010 (OCLP).
POND AND WOODLAND AREA

CIRCULATION

PW-CR-1: Manage vegetation on historic stone causeway and install adjacent wetland crossing

Stone causeways are a common feature in southwest Connecticut that developed as farmers needed to cross wetland areas to access their fields. At Weir Farm National Historic Site, a stone causeway lies across a wetland at the base of the slope immediately east of the contemporary visitor parking lot. The causeway was constructed before Julian Alden Weir’s purchase of the property in 1882 and was formed by building up layers of stone in a strip at right angles to the wetland. Presently, the stone causeway is in poor condition due to vegetation growing among the stones (Figure 85).

The park should preserve the existing stone causeway and install an adjacent wetland crossing to connect visitors from the parking lot to the Wagon Road in the Pond and Woodland Area. Existing trees growing in the causeway should be removed to maintain the structural integrity of the piled stones. The trees should be cut as flush to ground level as possible and the stumps monitored to regularly remove any developing sprouts.

Pedestrian access should not be directed across the historic stone causeway. Instead, a contemporary wetland crossing should be installed south of the causeway. The wetland crossing should be constructed from sections of wood or synthetic decking attached to polyethylene floats underneath. The floats will support the decking on the water and minimize construction activity and disturbance in the wetland. The sections of the wetland crossing should be connected by hinges and should extend to an anchored section on either bank of the wetland. When water rises in the wetland in the spring and fall, the sections resting on the banks will float on the higher water level. In the summer and winter, the sections will return to resting on the banks (Figure 86). The proposed new wetland crossing will provide visitors an opportunity to view the historic stone causeway without directly impacting the resource. If deemed necessary in the future, the new wetland crossing could be easily removed.

A designated trail should be installed to lead visitors from the visitor parking lot to the new wetland crossing. The proposed route should begin at a paved apron that extends south near the entry to the parking lot. The route should then continue south from the apron and turn to the northeast to gradually descend the slope to the wetland. Archeologists performed tests along the proposed route in September 2010 and discovered no deposits or features that would require further investigation.31
PW-CR-2: Reset fieldstone steps leading from Ridgetop Meadow to Weir Pond

A series of fieldstone steps are set into a steep hillside that leads from the Ridgetop Meadow to Weir Pond and the construction history of the steps has not been determined. Their installation may be associated with construction of the pond and boathouse to serve as a more direct route down the hillside. Each step tread consists of one to three stones laid edge-to-edge, often reinforced on the sides by larger, rounded fieldstones (Figure 87).

The fieldstone steps comprise a portion of the visitor circulation system through the Pond and Woodland Area and presently, several stones have shifted and create uneven transitions. The park should reset the fieldstone steps to provide a level and consistent walking surface. The steps should be reset with a slight pitch from the back of the tread to the front in order to drain water from the tread.

VEGETATION

PW-VG-1: Remove successional woody vegetation from Triangular and Ridgetop meadows

Both the “Triangular Meadow” and the “Ridgetop Meadow,” open during the 1940s, are in need of rehabilitation due to the growth of woody plant species. Due to the development of neighboring properties just beyond the park boundary, these rehabilitated meadows will need to be of a smaller configuration than what appears in historic aerial photographs (Figure 88 and Drawing 4). The program of rehabilitating these overgrown meadows is detailed below in five phases. However, it is of special note that the extremely large “wolf” trees, which once defined the edges of these meadows, will be retained (Figure 89).

Phase One: Field Staking of Woodland Edges

Mapping based on historical aerial photography from the 1940s will be used to field stake the location of the rehabilitated woodland edges. The purpose of this is to identify a line on the ground past which successional trees, shrubs, and vines have extended beyond their circa 1940 limit. This may be approached on a project basis, undertaking the treatment one meadow at a time, as the availability of funding and labor permit. Once staked, this line will be reviewed in the field by a committee selected by park management.

Phase Two: Removal of Vegetation

During this second stage of treatment, all woody vegetation within the staked line will be removed. Woody vegetation should be flush cut and all stumps ground to a depth not to exceed 3 inches to minimize ground disturbance. Stump grinding
is necessary to remove woody material and allow seed contact with soil during the 
next phase. Woody vegetation removal should also include downed limbs within 
the staked line and the removal of deadwood, diseased specimens, and structural 
pruning along the newly defined edge. All diseased or hazard trees identified 
for removal beyond the staked line will be reviewed by a committee selected by 
park management. Via an on-site walk-through, the committee will examine the 
impacts on vegetative screening of contemporary off-site development. Certain 
young trees selected to remain may be protected with wire or nylon fencing to 
prevent animal damage. The remaining trees at the recovered woodland edge may 
be lightly thinned to promote healthy growth. All work beyond the staked line will 
be undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to natural and 
cultural resources.

Phase Three: Revegetation of Disturbed Area

The area between the contemporary woodland edge and the historic edge will be 
disturbed by the removal of young trees and will need to be reseeded to match 
the coarse textured meadow turf. To accomplish this, soil tests should be made 
to assess soil pH and fertility. Based on these tests, soil amendments should be 
incorporated using a tine-tooth harrow that will disturb the soil no greater than 
two inches in depth. While continued regular application of fertilizer is not 
anticipated for these restored areas of turf, a light application of fertilizer should 
be considered to help establish the new meadow turf. The fertilizer supplied 
should provide nitrogen in slow release, water insoluble form (WIN) to protect 
the adjacent environment. To insure quick and uniform growth of meadow turf, 
the park may elect to employ a hydro-seeding contractor to apply the specified 
seed mix with a wood fiber mulch. The removal of woody growth should be 
timed so that re-seeding operations may be accomplished in mid-September.

Phase Four: Disposal of Resultant Debris

Plant material waste removed from field edges will be piled in locations out of the 
immediate public view. Volume 1 of the Weir Farm Cultural Landscape Report 
mentions that the cutting, piling, and burning of brush was a common fall and 
winter activity. Burning remains the most economically feasible alternative for 
the disposal of the accumulated brush in the winter when there is sufficient snow 
cover to prevent the spread of fire. If conditions do not permit burning, then a 
program of chipping should be followed, including the spreading of resultant 
mulch on woodland paths to inhibit the spread of volunteer vegetation. The 
following spring, the bare areas below the burned brush piles will be cultivated 
and reseeded to match the surrounding turf. Burning should be performed 
according to local, state, and federal guidelines and applicable permitting will be 
obtained.
**Phase Five: Periodic Maintenance**

Upon exposure to sunlight, the restored woodland edge will in time develop a dense layering of trees, shrubs and vines. This edge will be made up of a variety of species all competing for sunlight, which will cause the edge to once again creep into the meadows. This natural tendency may be retarded by following a mowing pattern which rigorously follows the newly reestablished edge. Additional periodic maintenance will need to be directed at the management of invasive plants within the edge. The concepts of integrated pest management (IPM) will be applied to the management rather than eradication of invasive plants.

**PW-VG-2: Remove invasive non-native vegetation from Pond and Woodland Area**

Woodland areas, particularly around Weir Pond, served as the setting for paintings and sketches by Julian Alden Weir and Mahonri Young. Based on a 1941 aerial photograph, a mosaic of open meadows and woodland canopy comprised the Pond and Woodland Area during the circa 1940 treatment period (see Figure 88). Native plant species that define the historic character of the woodland areas are threatened by invasive non-native plants. Invasive non-native plants define “species that have been intentionally or accidentally dispersed via human activities to areas beyond their historical range.” These plants exhibit aggressive growth characteristics, abundant seed production and dispersal, and a lack of pathogens that result in their out competing native plants.33

In order to maintain native plant species and perpetuate the historic character of the woodland areas, the park should remove invasive non-native vegetation. Park staff has indicated a preference for using the “Bradley Method” of invasive vegetation management where areas with light infestation of invasives are treated first. Work continues incrementally from areas of dominant native vegetation toward more heavily infested areas. As an initial step, an inventory and mapping of areas containing invasive non-native species should be completed using GPS equipment. The inventory and mapping, as well as specific control techniques, should be developed in consultation with the Northeast Exotic Plant Management Team (NE EPMT) based at Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and may be pursued through an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract managed by the Denver Service Center.

**PW-VG-3: Restore pond view from the Ridgetop Meadow**

The Ridgetop Meadow is defined by several extant stone walls that run below a series of connected, topographic high points west of Weir Pond. Historic photographs and aerals show a cleared area to the west of the pond. Julian Alden Weir prepared his painting, “Afternoon by the Pond” from the open Ridgetop Meadow looking down to the pond surface below (Figure 90). Presently, the view
from the Ridgetop Meadow to the pond is obstructed by the growth of young trees along the water’s edge.

Weir Farm National Historic Site’s enabling legislation defines one of the park’s purposes as maintaining the integrity of a setting that inspired artistic expression. Following that mandate, the pond view from the Ridgetop Meadow should be restored as a specific location that inspired Weir and was documented in his art. Reestablishing the view will require selective removal of trees within five feet of the water’s edge having a diameter at breast height (DBH) less than twelve inches. Complete removal of the young trees in this zone is not recommended due to the possibility of resultant erosion. Heavy pruning instead will encourage suckering and reduce the height of the trees to a low enough level to recreate historic sight lines and a filtered view from the Ridgetop to the pond surface below (Figure 91).34

**PW-VG-4: Selectively remove woody vegetation to provide emergency access to Weir Pond dam**

Weir Pond and the Weir Pond dam were constructed in 1896 following Julian Alden Weir winning prize money for his painting “The Truants.” The dam extends for over 200 feet in a gentle arc along the northeast perimeter of the pond. On August 23, 2000, personnel from the Bureau of Reclamation inspected the Weir Pond dam as part of a National Park Service dam safety evaluation program. A subsequently issued report recommends a series of tasks to improve the condition of the dam and includes an item for providing vehicular access to the dam.35 The report highlights three compelling reasons for vehicular access: 1) to respond to an emergency condition; 2) to facilitate potential major repairs, and; 3) to provide an alternative to the existing trail to the pond that is not wide enough to accommodate vehicles. Park staff completed emergency repair work on the dam in 1998, however, this work required the inefficient process of moving materials in wheelbarrows along the narrow trail.36

In the interest of public safety and to preserve a constructed water feature from the historic period, the park should selectively remove woody vegetation to provide emergency access to the Weir Pond dam. The proposed access point is at the southeast corner of the park where an undeveloped Town of Wilton road extends from Thunder Lake Road and terminates at the Wilton-Ridgefield town line (Drawing 4). Based on a field assessment of this area and in close consultation with neighbors, a corridor ten to twelve-feet wide should be identified that minimizes environmental disturbance and can be selectively cleared for future vehicular access. In addition to accessing the dam, the corridor would provide an emergency route for first responders in the event of a fire or medical emergency in the southeast corner of the park or on the surrounding public and private land. Establishing and maintaining the access corridor would therefore benefit the Town of Wilton and adjacent property owners as well as the park.
**PW-VG-5: Replace missing or deteriorated historic trees**

As a component of preparing a *Preservation Maintenance Plan* for the park, the Olmsted Center conducted an inventory of existing trees and shrubs in 1998. The 1998 inventory identified a stump, inventory number PWT-3-3, on the east side of Nod Hill Road along the edge of the Truants’ Meadow. This former tree, a sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), should be replaced in kind to preserve the character of large deciduous trees lining Nod Hill Road. South of the Caretaker’s House another large sugar maple, inventory number PWT-1-3, stood near the north edge of the Caretaker’s driveway. South of the driveway, three additional trees extended along the stone wall that bordered Nod Hill Road and reinforced the linear corridor defined by the roadbed and its flanking stone walls. From north to south, the trees consisted of PWT-1-5, a slippery elm (*Ulmus rubra*); PWT-1-7, a sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*); and PWT-1-8, a sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*). The four trees are no longer standing and all should be replaced with sugar maples since slippery elm is susceptible to Dutch elm disease and could require future replacement or additional maintenance due to decline. Five additional sugar maples should be planted south of PWT-1-8 at approximately thirty feet on center paralleling Nod Hill Road. These trees will supplement a thin area of planting between the visitor parking lot and Nod Hill Road and improve the rural road character. All of the trees should be planted four feet off the inside face of the stone wall paralleling Nod Hill Road to limit potential impacts to the wall. Other trees identified in the *Preservation Maintenance Plan* that date to the treatment period should be replaced in kind when they reach the end of their lifecycle (Drawings 5 and 6).

**PW-VG-6: Restore planting of birches on island in Weir Pond**

A roughly circular island of land stood in the northeast section of the pond after its construction in 1896. It is likely workers left this circular section unexcavated and when the pond filled with water, an island was formed. As part of the recreational amenities added at the pond, Julian Alden Weir erected a Summerhouse on the center of the island. Weir’s older brother John, managing the farm while Weir resided in New York, recorded the structure in a 1904 letter describing, “We often go on the pond, and over to the summerhouse for tea, and stroll about the fields which never looked more beautiful.”37 Two 1919 photographs provide more detail about Summerhouse and show the island vegetated with multi-trunk trees. Based on the white trunks seen in the photographs, the trees are likely paper birches (*Betula papyrifera*) (Figure 92).

Interviews conducted with Weir’s granddaughter and Mahonri Young’s son indicate the Summerhouse was reduced to remnants or disappeared entirely in the 1930s.38 The Summerhouse is not discernable in a 1941 aerial photograph and on a sharper 1951 aerial photograph, the structure is clearly missing. Since the
Summerhouse cannot be documented as extant during the circa 1940 treatment period, the structure should not be restored. However, the ring of paper birches at the perimeter of the island likely survived into the historic period. Presently no mature paper birches exist, however, several low-growing, seedling paper birches are present on the island beneath a heavy canopy of woody vegetation.

The park should restore the birches in a sequence of three steps. First, the park should complete archeological testing on the island to avoid damaging subsurface remains of the Summerhouse. Second, selected existing trees should be removed to provide adequate space and light for the birches. Third, yellow birch (*Betula alleghaniensis*) should be planted around the perimeter of the island. Yellow birch will tolerate the wet edge condition around the island better than paper birch and reduce the need for additional maintenance and future replacements. Finally, in order to delineate a clear edge that defines the intentionally constructed island, semi-submerged shrubby vegetation along the island’s perimeter should also be pruned (Figure 93).

**CONSTRUCTED WATER FEATURES**

**PW-WF-1: Rehabilitate Weir Pond and dam**

Julian Alden Weir authorized the construction of Weir Pond and the Weir Pond Dam in 1896 using prize money won from a Boston Art Club exhibition. The pond covered approximately four acres and relied on an earthen dam along its northeast perimeter to retain water. During Weir’s tenure, the pond was regularly used as a recreational retreat for picnicking and fishing, documented in period photographs, and featured in Weir’s paintings. Based on notes maintained by Dorothy Weir Young, a second dam was constructed about twenty feet northeast of earthen dam in 1937. The second dam was constructed as a vertical concrete wall and finished with fist-sized rocks set into the top of the concrete.

Both the earthen dam and secondary concrete dam are presently extant (Figure 94). The earthen dam crest varies in width from eight to ten feet and extends for over 200 feet in a gentle arc along the northeast perimeter of the pond. The crest serves as a footpath that is part of a trail system around the pond and connects to a more extensive circuit throughout the park’s Pond and Woodland Area (Figure 95). The upstream face of the dam features placed boulders and is punctuated by a white quartz boulder located five stones in from the dam’s western end (Figure 96). The concrete dam is roughly twenty feet downstream from the earthen dam and mimics the larger structure’s gentle arc for a distance of eighty feet. The concrete extends approximately four feet above the ground surface and is ten and a half inches thick.
On August 23, 2000, personnel from the Bureau of Reclamation inspected the Weir Pond dam as part of a National Park Service dam safety evaluation program. A subsequently issued report recommends a series of tasks to improve the condition of the dam:

1. Raise the crest of the dam to a consistent grade with compacted backfill.
2. Drill horizontal drainage holes through the lower portion of the concrete wall. Excavate a trench at the upstream side of the wall, and backfill the trench with free draining materials, such as gravel and cobbles.
3. Remove large trees on the crest and downstream face of the dam. Remove the root systems, and fill the void created with compacted backfill.
4. Remove vegetation from the spillway approach channel.
5. Widen the spillway control section (adjacent to dam) to increase discharge capacity to minimize additional overtopping.
6. Consider providing vehicle access to the dam.
7. Prepare an Operations and Maintenance Manual for the dam, including a list of emergency contact numbers to downstream jurisdictions.\(^{19}\)

The Bureau recommendations should be developed into formal construction documents for rehabilitating the dam. The park should work with qualified engineers and balance the functional design of the dam with the historic character of the landscape. Factors include the careful consideration of mobilization and staging areas and archeological testing and monitoring requirements. In order to respect the changes to the dam through the treatment period, a rehabilitation of the dam should maintain the general arc shape of the earthen dam and the downstream concrete dam. The location of the white quartz stone should be maintained. If a “control structure” or inlet is needed on the surface of the pond, it would be prudent to design the placement of this new feature to be hidden by the small island southeast of the dam. Any dam rehabilitation project will require negotiation and cooperation with adjacent property owners and the park should initiate and maintain a dialogue with these stakeholders.

**PW-WF-2: Rehabilitate stone-lined water diversion system**

The stone-lined water diversion system appears to have been constructed in conjunction with the creation of Weir Pond in 1896. The system begins north of the Triangular Meadow carrying water from a wetland area. A stone-lined ditch runs from west to east and after approximately 250 feet, the ditch branches into a south fork heading to Weir Pond and a north fork leading around the pond. The system is presently extant and in fair condition (Figure 97). Some stones have collapsed into the ditch and certain sections are laden with debris. The park
should rehabilitate the stone-lined water diversion system by clearing debris and resetting stones lining the water channel.

**PW-WF-3: Rehabilitate spring box and circular pools**

Two constructed water features are present southwest of Weir Pond that may pre-date Weir’s purchased of the property or were developed during his tenure. A rectangular pool, lined with stones, captures water from a nearby spring and directs it to an outlet that leads to a stone-lined circular pool at a lower elevation. The circular pool is approximately twelve feet across, two feet deep, and drains into the small stream which flows to Weir Pond (Figure 98). These water features are in poor condition resulting from sedimentation and an accumulation of debris. The park should rehabilitate the spring box and circular pool by clearing sediment and debris. The rehabilitation work should be scheduled during the summer months when water levels are naturally lower.

**SMALL-SCALE FEATURES**

**PW-SSF-1: Regrade percolation test pits**

Prior to purchase of a key parcel of Weir’s former farm for preservation in the mid-1980s, the Pond and Woodland Area had been subdivided and made ready for subsequent sale and development. This work involved testing various areas of the property for adequate soil percolation that would make a septic field possible. While development of new homes on this parcel never came to pass, the mounds of soil and shallow pits created by the percolation tests remain. The existing shallow pits should be filled with the mounds of adjacent soil and regraded to blend in with the natural topography.

**PW-SSF-2: Stabilize open well**

An uncovered, stone-lined well is present south of the visitor parking lot. The origin and history of this well has not been documented. Future archeological investigations may reveal information on the feature and on the early history of Weir Farm. Since the well is presently open, the park should stabilize the feature and install a secure cover to prevent potential injury.
ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES

PW-AR-1: Complete archeological research of Boathouse site prior to erecting interpretive marker

Following construction of the dam and pond in 1896, Julian Alden Weir added amenities to support recreational activities at the pond. A Summerhouse was erected in the middle of the pond’s island and along the western shoreline Weir also constructed a Boathouse and dock. A photograph from Weir’s tenure shows the dock and two canoes in the foreground and the Boathouse further along the pond’s shoreline in the background (Figure 99). From the image, the Boathouse appears to be an open, wood frame structure. Oral histories indicate the Boathouse was retained through the end of the treatment period and that the structure was destroyed by arson or vandalism in the late 1960s.40

Restoring the Boathouse is not recommended since sufficient information is not available for an accurate restoration. In order to interpret the Boathouse and the Weir family’s use of the pond, the park should erect a marker or wayside. Prior to erecting the marker, the park should complete archeological research, including field excavations if deemed necessary, to accurately identify the location of the Boathouse.
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Figure 85. Vegetation on historic stone causeway to be managed. The stone causeway pre-dates Julian Alden Weir’s purchase of the property and is presently in poor condition due to trees growing among the stones. View looking north, 2011 (OCLP).

Figure 86. Diagrammatic section showing wetland crossing to be installed adjacent to historic stone causeway. The new wetland crossing is constructed from sections of wood or synthetic decking attached to polyethylene floats underneath, 2012 (OCLP).
Figure 87. Fieldstone steps to be reset leading from Ridgetop Meadow to Weir Pond. The stones should be reset so the treads provide a level and consistent walking surface. View looking west, 2011 (OCLP).

Figure 88. The Triangular and Ridgetop meadows documented as distinct spaces from the surrounding woodland canopy after the circa 1940 treatment period. Both meadows are presently overtaken by successional woody vegetation. Overlay of current park boundary and 1951 aerial photograph (OCLP).
Figure 89. Large "wolf tree" to be preserved during the removal of successional woody vegetation from the Triangular and Ridgetop meadows. View looking east along the perimeter of the Ridgetop Meadow, 2011 (OCLP).

Figure 90. Julian Alden Weir, “Afternoon by the Pond,” oil on canvas, circa 1908–09. Weir composed this filtered view of the pond looking down from the open Ridgetop Meadow (The Phillips Collection, Washington, DC).
Figure 91. Diagrammatic section showing restored pond view from the Ridgetop Meadow. Restoring the view will require selective removal of trees within five feet of the water's edge having a diameter at breast height (DBH) less than twelve inches, 2012 (OCLP).

Figure 92. Birches and summerhouse on the island in Weir Pond. View looking northeast, 1919 (WEFA HP 205).
Figure 93. Semi-submerged shrubby vegetation to be removed along the island's perimeter. The current vegetation obscures a clear edge that defines the intentionally constructed island. View looking north, 2011 (OCLP).
Figure 94. Site plan showing Weir Pond and dam. Weir Pond covers approximately four acres and relies on an earthen dam along its northeast perimeter to retain water. Approximately twenty feet downstream from the earthen dam, an eighty-foot long concrete dam was added to reinforce the earthen structure, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 95. Weir Pond and dam to be rehabilitated. The earthen dam crest serves as a footpath that is part of a trail system around the pond. In the foreground, a stump remains from a tree removed from the crest. View looking southeast, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 96. White quartz boulder to be preserved in its current location during the rehabilitation of Weir Pond and dam. View looking northeast at the western end of the dam, 2011 (OCLP).

Figure 97. Stone-lined water diversion system to be rehabilitated including resetting collapsed stones and removing debris from the system’s water channel. View looking east, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 99. Complete archeological research of Boathouse site prior to erecting interpretive marker. An open, wood frame Boathouse is visible in the background of this photograph and restoring the structure is not recommended since sufficient information is not available. View looking northeast, circa 1915 (WEFA HP 167).

Figure 98. Spring box and circular pool to be rehabilitated including the clearing of sediment and debris. View looking east, 2010 (OCLP).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Treatment Task</th>
<th>Retained From 1997 Report</th>
<th>Reviewed Under 1997 Programmatic Agreement</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-BL-1: Preserve stone walls and barway gates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Priority for Action&lt;br&gt;1 – high priority&lt;br&gt;2 – medium priority&lt;br&gt;3 – low priority&lt;br&gt;4 – no action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-VG-1: Preserve character of vegetation along public roads</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 – medium priority, but requires ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-VG-2: Renovate domestic lawns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Task listed individually in 1997 report for the Weir, Burlingham, and Caretaker’s domestic areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-VG-3: Rehabilitate meadow turf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-VG-4: Screen views of contemporary development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8: SUMMARY OF WEIR COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-BL-1: Restore deck at Weir Studio</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-BL-2: Stabilize Weir vegetable garden terrace walls</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-CR-1: Install stabilized soil surface on lower Weir vegetable garden terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-CR-2: Install compatible and appropriate surface for Weir driveway and south barnyard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-CR-3: Install informal service route to Young Studio</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-VG-1: Replace missing or deteriorated historic trees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-VG-2: Replant missing foundation plantings at the Weir House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-VG-3: Install seasonal vegetable plantings at upper terrace</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-VG-4: Plant perennial vines and train to restored arbors and trellises</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-SSF-1: Replace missing wood pile between Weir and Young studios</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-SSF-2: Relocate scalding vat to area south of reconstructed Wagon Shed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-SSF-3: Replace Weir mailbox</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Moved from Pond and Woodland section of 1997 report</td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 9: SUMMARY OF WEIR COMPLEX AGRICULTURAL ZONE TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-BL-1: Reconstruct Wagon Shed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-TP-1: Fine grade area around Pump House and add subsurface structures to improve drainage</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-VG-1: Replace missing or deteriorated historic trees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-SSF-1: Restore missing haystack</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 10: SUMMARY OF BURLINGHAM COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-BL-1: Rehabilitate stone-lined beds and irregular stone flagging in the South Garden terraces</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-CR-1: Rehabilitate and provide drainage for the Burlingham driveway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Updated from 1997 task to preserve driveway</td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-VG-1: Replace missing or deteriorated historic trees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-VG-2: Replant missing foundation plantings at the Burlingham House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-VG-3: Replant missing plantings in the South Garden terraces</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-SSF-1: Develop mounts or surrounds for park entrance sign consistent with the site’s artistic tradition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 11: SUMMARY OF BURLINGHAM COMPLEX AGRICULTURAL ZONE TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-VG-1: Replace missing or deteriorated historic trees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 12: SUMMARY OF CARETAKER’S DOMESTIC GROUNDS TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-VG-1: Replant missing foundation plantings at Caretaker’s House</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Scale Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-SSF-1: Preserve Caretaker’s mailbox</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Moved from Pond and Woodland section of 1997 report</td>
<td>2 – medium priority, but requires ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-CR-1: Manage vegetation on historic stone causeway and install adjacent wetland crossing</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Managing vegetation is retained from the 1997 report</td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-CR-2: Reset fieldstone steps leading from Ridgetop Meadow to Weir Pond</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-VG-1: Remove successional woody vegetation from Triangular and Ridgetop meadows</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-VG-2: Remove invasive non-native vegetation from Pond and Woodland Area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-VG-3: Restore pond view from the Ridgetop Meadow</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-VG-4: Selectively remove woody vegetation to provide emergency access to Weir Pond dam</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-VG-5: Replace missing or deteriorated historic trees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-VG-6: Restore planting of birches on island in Weir Pond</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Coordinate with rehabilitating dam</td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructed Water Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-WF-1: Rehabilitate Weir Pond and dam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-WF-2: Rehabilitate stone-lined water diversion system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-WF-3: Rehabilitate spring box and circular pools</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-SSF-1: Regrade percolation test pits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-SSF-2: Stabilize open well</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archeological Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-AR-1: Complete archeological research of Boathouse site prior to erecting interpretive marker</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – high priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Cultural Landscape Report and Treatment Plan for Weir Farm National Historic Site, Ridgefield and Wilton, Connecticut, outlines the site's cultural landscape preservation efforts, including a detailed map with topographic survey data and sources. The diagram highlights various features such as park boundaries, canopies, wetlands, and different types of vegetation, emphasizing the importance of accurate delineation and the use of orthophotos for planning.
6. RECORD OF TREATMENT

During the past fifteen years, the park has undertaken a number of projects recommended in the *Cultural Landscape Report for Weir Farm National Historic Site, Volume 2: Analysis and Treatment* (Olmsted Center, 1997). This chapter documents the completed treatment work for the historical record and future reference. Each record of treatment narrative contains a brief overview of historic condition during the circa 1940 treatment period and existing conditions prior to treatment to provide background and a rationale for treatment decisions. For contemporary park infrastructure and support facilities not present during the treatment period, the narrative reviews the operational issues that treatment addressed. The narratives then describe the as-built physical work and where available, are supported by plans, sections, elevations, and details that were developed as part of the treatment.

This chapter is organized according to six landscape character areas. Also included is a section that addresses park-wide (PK) tasks followed by the Weir Complex Domestic Grounds (WD), Weir Complex Agricultural Zone (WA), Burlingham Complex Domestic Grounds (BD), Burlingham Complex Agricultural Zone (BA), Caretaker’s Domestic Grounds (CD), and finally the Pond and Woodland Area (PW). Treatment codes were not identified with the specific tasks in the 1997 Volume 2 report. To aid in the organization of this chapter treatment codes have been assigned, such as WD-BL-RT-1, where the first two letters represent a character area. The next two letters specify a landscape characteristic such as buildings and structures (BL), circulation (CR), vegetation (VG), and small-scale features (SSF). The “RT” designation indicates a record of treatment task to differentiate completed work from remaining tasks. Finally, each code concludes with a sequential number to identify different tasks in each landscape characteristic. Using this system, WD-BL-RT-1 identifies the first record of treatment task in the buildings and structures landscape characteristic within the Weir Complex Domestic Grounds character area.

Implementing treatment tasks from the Volume 2 report required that the park comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The act requires federal agencies to review undertakings that effect properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. In October 1997, after reviewing the content and recommendations of the Volume 2 report, the park, the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation entered into a site-specific programmatic agreement for compliance with Section 106. The programmatic agreement helped facilitate the completion of landscape treatment tasks at Weir Farm National Historic Site.
PK-BL-RT-1: Preserve stone walls

Stone walls at Weir Farm National Historic site include walls that pre-date Julian Alden Weir’s purchase of the property, walls built with dressed stones, battered sides, and irregularly shaped coping stones during Weir’s tenure, and split-face granite walls with stone rubble infill added under Cora Weir Burlingham’s direction between 1931 and 1940. The present walls parallel the roadbeds of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane and roughly follow many of the park boundary lines. In addition, the walls define distinct spaces within each of the complexes with these spaces historically serving as separate fields or animal pastures. Wall conditions throughout the park varied from sections in good condition to sections in disrepair that had collapsed.

Between 1997 and 2012, park staff, volunteers, and youth programs have repaired or restored sections of stone walls park wide with their efforts concentrated on walls routinely viewed and encountered by the public. The work completed addresses boundary walls and not garden terrace walls or the stone pig pens since the treatment of these features is documented in separate record of treatment sections. In addition, the completed work does not cover stone wall repairs or restoration completed by contractors, for example, the retaining wall north of the Caretaker’s House. These separately contracted projects are also covered in individual record of treatment sections.

In 1997, park staff repaired a section of the retaining wall along Nod Hill Road west of the Truants’ Meadow. The following year, staff completed work on walls south of the masonry well that separate the Burlingham Complex’s domestic grounds from its agricultural zone. Repair work continued between 1999 and 2001 on stone walls south of the visitor parking lot located along Nod Hill Road. Responding to interest from local residents and dedicated volunteers, the park initiated its first stone wall workshop in 2001 and restored the retaining wall west of the Young Studio. The stone wall workshops have continued every year since and completed multiple sections of stone walls throughout the park. Between 2003 and 2004, the park hired a seasonal employee primarily for work on stone wall repair and restoration. In addition the park has collaborated with youth from Groundwork Bridgeport—an environmental education and job training program—to continue stone wall repair and restoration and between 2009 and 2010, completed the wall west of the Artist-in-Residence Studio located along Nod Hill Road (Figure 100).

The park’s stone wall repair and restoration efforts involved incrementally dismantling unstable sections of a wall until reaching a stable footing or base. In some instances, workers had to establish a new compacted base before setting the
first course of stones. The dismantled stones were sorted according to size and the wall rebuilt to match the composition of adjacent sections in terms of stone sizes, shapes, colors, and patterning. In the Burlingham Complex domestic grounds, the park has designated three sections of stone wall that will remain unaltered and in their present state. The walls are stable and provide an example for future projects and also for interpretation of common farm wall character (see Figure 100).

Figure 100. Stone walls repaired and restored site wide. Red lines designate repairs or restorations completed between 1997 and 2012 and blue line show stone wall control samples that should remain unaltered. The graphic does not include garden terrace walls, the stone pig pens, or work completed by contractors since these projects are covered in separate record of treatment sections, 2012 (OCLP).
WEIR COMPLEX

WEIR COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

WD-BL-RT-1: Stabilize the Tool Shed

Located northwest of the Weir House and east of the vegetable garden, the Tool Shed was built sometime between 1900 and 1930. The Tool Shed’s construction likely occurred in concert with the building of the rustic gate structures at the Secret Garden. Late 1930s sketches by Mahonri Young show the octagonal building and circa 1945 photographs by Lewis Iselin record the Tool Shed was extant during the circa 1940 treatment period (Figure 101). Similar to many wood framed outbuildings at Weir Farm National Historic Site, the Tool Shed was in declining condition due to a failing foundation and deteriorating wood members. The park entered into a cooperative agreement with the Institute for Preservation Training and in 1999, the Institute completed work to stabilize the Tool Shed. The work performed included foundation repairs, replacing in kind the deteriorated sill, floor framing, and flooring, and installing new cedar roof shingles, side-wall shingles, and flashing to match the historic materials (Figure 102).1

Figure 101. Tool Shed and Vegetable Garden terraces. View looking northwest, circa 1945 (Lewis Iselin, WEFA).

Figure 102. Stabilized Tool Shed. View looking northeast, 2010 (OCLP).
Correspondence from Julian Alden Weir and his older brother John record that horses, cattle, oxen, and pigs were raised on the Branchville farm. During their tenure, the Youngs continued raising pigs and in a December 1943 letter to Jack Sears, Mahonri Young writes of slaughtering a pig. In addition to the written accounts from Weir and Young, an undated photograph shows five pigs contained in a pen bound by stone walls (Figure 103). When the National Park Service acquired Weir Farm, the pig pens were largely concealed by successional woody vegetation. In 2006, the park completed a project to clear woody vegetation from inside and immediately around the pig pens.

The pig pens are located about sixty feet west of the Young studio and feature two to four feet high stone walls forming two rectangular pens. During a March 2010 review, the pig pens appeared in poor condition with fully collapsed sections and gaps created by missing stones (Figure 104). In the autumn of 2010, the Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc., stabilized the pig pens by repairing approximately 220 linear feet of collapsed or unstable stone wall. Workers completed all repairs using extant stones from the collapsed or unstable sections (Figure 105).
**WD-CR-RT-1: Install universally accessible route to the Weir House**

In 2009, the park began restoration of the Weir House and upon completion of infrastructure, exterior, and historic furnishings projects, the park plans to open the building to guided tours. As a component of the restoration, and following the General Management Plan’s direction to make facilities and services at the park accessible, the park and regional staff explored options to install a universally accessible route to the Weir House. The selected plan balanced alterations to the landscape and to architectural components and created a route that provided a similar entry to the Weir House for able-bodied visitors and visitors with mobility issues (Figure 106).
In August 2012, the park completed a universally accessible route to the Weir House. The route began off of Pelham Lane and proceeded north through a gate in the rustic picket fence. The apron section to the gate was finished with a chip and seal or rolled stone surface set on an asphalt base. From the gate, the route changed to a walk of new granite pavers and began a gentle rise in grade with the slope not exceeding five percent. The new granite replaced historic granite pavers too narrow for an accessible route. The new granite matched the old in color and composition and exposed surfaces were natural cleft finish instead of sawn. Irregularities in the cleft surface were bush hammered and the combination of the cleft surface and hammering created a rough, flaked texture that more closely resembled naturally weathered granite. The new granite pavers varied in width from 37 to 40 inches and varied in length from 18 to 48 inches. Workers set pavers of different sizes next to each other with joints varying from 3/8 to 3/4 inches to create a meandering edge and a walk consistent with the character of the historic granite pavers (Figure 107). The new granite walk then turned in a consistent radius to the west and continued to rise with the slope not exceeding five percent to meet the east edge of the Weir House porch. At the porch, a section of inset decking, roughly 7 feet 6 inches in length, rose approximately 4 inches and made a flush transition with the surrounding decking (Figure 108).

Figure 107 (top left). Weir House Accessible Walk. Plan view, 2012 (OCLP).

Figure 108 (bottom left). Construction of universally accessible route to the Weir House. View looking northwest, 2012 (OCLP).
WD-VG-RT-1: Restore the Secret Garden

By circa 1915, a series of photographs indicate that the Weir family expanded a garden north of the Weir Studio to include extensive perennial planting, a perimeter hedge, a fountain, a sundial, and two rustic roofed gates (Figure 109). Flower gardening was not an area of intense interest for Mahonri and Dorothy Weir Young and during their tenure at Weir Farm the plantings, particularly the perimeter hedge, became overgrown. Obscured by the perimeter hedge, the Youngs christened the garden the “Secret Garden.” Between the late 1930s and early 1940s, Mahonri Young prepared several sketches that included the Secret Garden. The sketches confirm that in addition to the hedge, the fence, roofed gates, and sundial continued as defining elements of the garden during the circa 1940 treatment period (Figure 110). The garden’s wood fence and roofed gates came down some time following Dorothy Weir Young’s death in 1947.

In the mid-1990s, the Ridgefield Garden Club, the Olmsted Center, and the park worked together to prepare plans for restoring the Secret Garden’s fence, roofed gates, perimeter hedge, perennial plantings, fountain, and sundial. The Ridgefield Garden Club led the implementation efforts that initially focused on removing successional woody vegetation (Figures 111 and 112). The restoration plans specified new rustic roofed gates and perimeter fencing that were constructed from peeled Atlantic whitecedar (Chamaecyparis thyoides) poles. The outside of the new fencing was framed with a deutzia hedge reestablished by rejuvenating several surviving shrubs and planting thirty-nine new plants. New honeysuckle and clematis vines were planted and trained onto the rustic roof gates and adjacent fencing. Inside the Secret Garden, Kenneth Lynch and Sons leveled and waterproofed the fountain pool. Lynch also recast a new fountain pedestal...
from the original and provided a new cast stone pedestal and sundial that matched the character of these missing historic features. The fountain pedestal and sundial were installed and new plumbing and electrical service provided for the fountain. Finally, the Ridgefield Garden Club led the effort to plant new perennials that were selected based on documentation in historic photographs (Figure 113).

In 2010, the fence posts and rails and poles used to construct the rustic roof gates showed early signs of decay. Following the restoration plans prepared in the mid-1990s, the park replaced all the fence posts and rails in 2012 with peeled eastern red cedar (Juniperus virginiana). The park selected eastern red cedar instead of Atlantic whitecedar due to the former’s resistance to rot and decay. The same year, the park fabricated new gates and new rustic roof structures for a planned installation in 2013 (Figures 114–116).
Figure 115. Secret Garden arbor, gate, and fence details, 1994 (OCLP).
Figure 116. Secret Garden fountain and sundial details (OCLP, 1994).
WD-SSF-RT-1: Restore rustic picket fencing at Weir House

Rustic picket fencing lined a portion of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane in front of the Weir House and was historically used as a consistent motif to unite the house, Barn, and Caretaker’s House across Nod Hill Road. In the early 1900s, Weir had the rustic fence installed to replace a more classically designed fence that featured white painted pickets made of sawn lumber (Figure 117). Both the earlier painted fence and the rustic fence featured wrought iron pins set into the exposed stone ledge to provide support for the vertical posts. Two historic photographs dating to the 1940s reveal that rustic fencing with split, triangular pickets was retained through the historic period.7

In April 2003, the park installed rustic picket fencing at the Weir House following restoration plans prepared by the Olmsted Center (Figure 118). Identical

![Figure 117. Rustic picket fencing at the Weir House. View looking west across Nod Hill Road, pre-1900 (WEFA HP 27).](image)

![Figure 118. Restored rustic picket fencing at the Weir House. View looking northwest across the Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane intersection, 2003 (OCLP).](image)
fencing was installed along Nod Hill Road at the Caretaker’s House, however, fence sections north of the house were not added as part of the 2003 project. The Olmsted Center determined the layout for fence posts based on surviving iron pins and drill holes present in the exposed stone ledge. New fence posts were cut from eastern red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*) logs approximately 6 inches in diameter. Horizontal rails were selected from rough sawn white oak (*Quercus alba*) and the rustic pickets were crafted from split Atlantic whitecedar (*Chamaecyparis thyoides*). Each picket varied in width from 1-3/4 to 2-1/4 inches and was attached to the rails at 4-1/2 inches on center (Figures 119 and 120).
Figure 120. Layout plan of the rustic fence and gates, 1994 (OCLP).
WD-SSF-RT-2: Stabilize well cover

Between 1890 and 1905, a stone well house was built west of the Weir House and near Pelham Lane. The well house featured an Adirondack-style twig-framed canopy attached to a stone cover (Figure 121). According to interviews with Bill Young, Mahonri Young’s son from his first marriage, it is uncertain that the canopy survived into the 1940s. Interviews with Doris Andrews indicate that when she and her husband purchased the Weir property in 1958, the canopy was not present. Since it is uncertain the canopy survived to the circa 1940 treatment period, the park has not restored this feature. Instead, the park replaced the deteriorated stone cover in 2005 and securely fastened the new cover to the well house (Figure 122). For the cover, the park selected a salt-and-pepper granite two inches thick. The granite featured saw cut edges and measured three foot square in size.

Figure 121. Stone well house with Adirondack-style twig-framed canopy. View looking southwest, no date (WEFA HP 284).

Figure 122. Stabilized well cover. View looking northwest, 2010 (OCLP).
WD-SSF-RT-3: Restore Garden Arbor at upper terrace vegetable garden

Two sketches by Mahonri Young from the late 1930s show that a rectangular wooden arbor stood at the north end of the upper terrace (Figure 123). An arbor remained in this location during the circa 1940 treatment period and is documented in circa 1945 photographs by Lewis Iselin (see Figure 101). The Iselin photographs show lobed leaves, characteristic of grapes, growing on the arbor. Both sets of graphics show a structure comprised of six vertical posts with one at each corner and two central posts on either side of the arbor’s long axis. Horizontal rails ran from the corner posts and overlapped at the central posts. The rails were positioned at the top, middle, and bottom. However, Iselin’s photographs show an arbor that is taller, wider, and generally more substantial than the rudimentary structure depicted in Young’s sketches. It is likely that by the time of Iselin’s photographs, the original arbor had been replaced with a similar, but more substantial model. Fieldwork performed in the spring of 2010 documented several pieces of stone set on edge that protruded out of the ground to the north of the upper terrace. The spacing between the stone pieces, approximately eight feet, appears to be in proportion with the post spacing in the historic images.

To better convey Weir Farm National Historic Site as the rural home of two artists, the Historic Preservation Training Center restored the arbor in the fall of 2010 (Figure 124). The arbor’s wood posts and rails were prepared from naturally rot-resistant black locust. The new pieces were treated with Tim-Bor Professional™, a water-soluble borate powder that provides additional protection against wood decay and insect damage. The borate application does not affect the finish color and the locust pieces will naturally weather. Based on the historic images and existing stone pieces, the posts were set at eight feet on center forming an overall length of sixteen feet. The arbor’s height was set at approximately five feet, below the roof line of the existing Tool Shed to the east, and its width at approximately four feet (Figure 125).
Figure 125. Restored Garden Arbor plan and elevation, 2010 (HPTC).
WD-SSF-RT-4: Restore Rose Arbor at upper terrace vegetable garden

The Mahonri Young sketches and Lewis Iselin photographs document a second, smaller arbor in the vicinity of the upper terrace. Southwest of the Tool Shed, a simple Rose Arbor stood constructed from two posts and two rails (Figure 126 and see Figure 123). In conjunction with the restoring the Garden Arbor, the Historic Preservation Training Center restored the Rose Arbor in the fall of 2010 (Figure 127). The arbor posts were black locust logs, approximately 5 inches in diameter. Black locust was also used for the two rough sawn rails. The top rail consisted of 2x3 lumber and was set at a slope as indicated in the historic images. The southern end of the top rail was attached at a lowered elevation than the northern end. A piece of larger 2x6 lumber was installed as the bottom rail. All the locust components were treated with Tim-Bor Professional™ (Figure 128).

Figure 126 (left). Rose Arbor, Tool Shed, and Weir Studio. View looking north, circa 1945 (Lewis Iselin, WEFA).

Figure 127 (right). Restored Rose Arbor. View looking north, 2011 (OCLP).

Figure 128 (bottom). Restored Rose Arbor elevation, 2010 (HPTC).

Red dashed lines show as built condition — top rail installed at an incline and not level or parallel to bottom rail
WD-SSF-RT-5: Restore trellises on Weir Studio

In the summer of 1885, Julian Alden Weir completed a studio north of the main house and west of the barn. In 1901, Weir added a water tower to the south facade of the studio and around the same time, but no later than 1915, he added a lean-to addition off of the west facade. Instead of modifying the Weir Studio, Mahonri Young directed the construction of an independent studio on the property to support his sculpting. The Young Studio, located west of the Weir Studio, was completed in 1932.

Historic images from the Young tenure show vines growing on the south facade of the Weir Studio. Specifically, Young’s sketches from the late 1930s show vines on the lean-to addition of the Weir Studio (see Figure 123). The vines on the addition remained during the circa 1940 treatment period and are documented in circa 1945 photographs by Lewis Iselin (see Figure 101). The Iselin photographs also document vines under the windows of the projecting water tower and reveal the vines were trained on to trellises constructed from narrow, unmilled wood poles set perpendicular to each other (Figure 129).

Working with the Historic Preservation Training Center, the park restored the trellis on the lean-to and on the water tower of the Weir Studio in the fall of 2010 (Figure 130). The trellises were constructed from black locust logs for both the posts and rails. The posts measured ±4 inches in diameter and the rails measured ±3 inches diameter. All the locust components were treated with a water-soluble borate powder sold as Tim-Bor Professional™. Due to concerns about encountering utility lines near the Weir Studio, the posts were not set into the ground but attached to the studio with inconspicuous “L” brackets. Workers at Woodbury Forge in Woodbury, Connecticut, fabricated the brackets and finished them with a black exterior paint. The Historic Preservation Training Center mortised the brackets into the back of each post and secured the brackets to the Weir Studio with 2-1/2 inch stainless steel screws (Figure 131).
Figure 131. Restored trellises on the Weir Studio elevations, 2010 (HPTC).
WD-SSF-RT-6: Construct and install reproduction dog house

Mahonri Young sketches from the late 1930s and early 1940s show dog houses in various locations around the Weir House. The dog houses are small in size, simple wood construction, and may have been moved to various locations around the house during the circa 1940 period. Fieldwork performed in 1995 documented a dog house located south of the Weir House deck concealed among clumps of lilacs (Figure 132). The origin of the dog house near the deck is unknown and the feature is no longer extant.

The park completed major utility and infrastructure upgrades in 2009 that required excavations around the Weir House and with this activity completed, the Historic Preservation Training Center constructed a reproduction dog house in the fall of 2010 (Figure 133). The reproduction dog house assists in restoring the domestic character of the circa 1940 landscape that included small-scale features in the Weir Domestic Complex. The dog house measures 25 inches wide, 37 inches long, and 32 inches high. The frame was constructed out of pressure treated 2x4 lumber and clad with 5 inch wide mahogany boards for the siding. The siding was painted to match the red exteriors of the Weir House and the two studios. The roof was covered with cedar shingles featuring a 4-1/2 inch exposure. The Historic Preservation Training Center placed the open frame dog house over a protruding well head northwest of the Weir House.

Figure 132 (top). Dog house near the Weir House deck. View looking north, 1995 (OCLP).

Figure 133 (bottom). Reproduction dog house. View looking northeast, 2010 (OCLP).
WEIR COMPLEX AGRICULTURAL ZONE

WA-BL-RT-1: Restore Weir Barn and Tack House

An 1861 probate inventory for Lewis Beers’ estate lists a “barn, cow house, wash house, and carriage house” on the property that Julian Alden Weir purchased in 1882. It is likely the Beers family built the barn during their tenure and expanded the structure with two wings that extend south to create a connected, U-shaped building in plan. Before 1903, a small multi-sided structure stood to the south of the southeast wing of the barn. By 1918, a new structure with a taller overall height and pronounced peak roof occupied a similar location and was used as a separate tack house to store saddles, harnesses, and riding equipment. Both the Barn and Tack House appear in a late 1930s panoramic sketch by Mahonri Young and were extant when the property was donated to the National Park Service. Between 1992 and 1993, the park performed emergency stabilization measures and installed temporary structural supports to prevent the Barn from collapsing (Figure 134). In 1996, the park completed restoration work on the Weir Barn and Tack House. Foundations and rotted sills were repaired and replaced where necessary. Five non-historic maple trees, growing in close proximity to the two structures’ foundations, were also removed. Restoration work included finishing the buildings’ exterior walls and roofs with unpainted wood shingles and painting all window trim white (Figures 135 and 136).11
Figure 136. Plan for Weir Barn and Tack House, 1993 (D. Anthone).
WA-BL-RT-2: Stabilize Chicken House

During the Weir tenure, the family directed the construction of an ice house in circa 1891. Mahonri and Dorothy Weir Young continued to use the ice house during their years at the farm. However, around 1941, the Youngs converted the structure to a chicken house because they were at the property more frequently, could use a contemporary electric refrigerator, and wanted to increase the size of their flock pending rationing for World War II. When Weir Farm became a unit of the National Park Service, the Chicken House rested on a deteriorated stone foundation with rot affecting the wooden sills and vertical board siding (Figure 137). In 2008, the park stabilized the Chicken House by repairing the foundation and replacing the rotted sills and siding (Figure 138).12

Figure 137. Chicken House to be stabilized. View looking west, 2008 (Greg Waters, WEFA).

Figure 138. Stabilized Chicken House. View looking west, 2013 (Greg Waters, WEFA).
WA-BL-RT-3: Stabilize Animal Shelter

The Animal Shelter is thought to have been built circa 1932 to replace a chicken coop removed by the construction of the Young Studio. It appears that the Animal Shelter served as a chicken coop until the early 1940s when the nearby Ice House was converted for use as a chicken house. Fieldwork performed in 1995 recorded the Animal House in very poor condition and teetering on an inadequate foundation (Figure 139). In 1998, the Institute for Preservation Training stabilized the Animal Shelter by salvaging original fabric and replacing in kind other material. Institute workers reset the dry-laid stone footings at each of the structure’s four corners and constructed a new floor platform consisting of 4x4 white oak sills and 2x4 pressure treated pine joists. The platform was covered with a layer of wire screening and finished with new southern yellow pine flooring. Original and replacement lumber were used to reframe the walls and roof and the exterior received new vertical board siding. Workers installed roof sheathing using random width, 1-inch thick white oak boards and topped the sheathing with red cedar shingles laid at a 5-1/2 inch exposure. New wire screening was installed over window and vent openings, and on the south facade, plexi glass was secured behind the wire to better seal a window opening 2 feet 5-1/2 inches high by 3 feet 4 inches wide (Figure 140).
WA-BL-RT-4: Restore Corn Crib

Following Julian Alden Weir’s death in December 1919, property tax records prepared in 1920 recorded a corn crib along with several other agricultural outbuildings. Additional information on the construction of the Corn Crib during the Weir tenure has not been discovered. In 1932, Mahonri Young prepared a drawing entitled “Shingling the Corn Crib” that depicts two men nailing shingles to a roof and shows the east and south exterior walls of a small building. Fieldwork performed in 1995 reported the Corn Crib in such poor condition that the structure posed a safety hazard to park visitors (Figure 141). In 1996, park staff installed temporary bracing to prevent the structure’s imminent collapse and pursued plans to restore the Corn Crib. The park entered into a cooperative agreement with the Institute for Preservation Training and in 1998, the Institute completed the restoration (Figure 142). The extremely poor condition of the structure necessitated that approximately ninety percent be replaced in kind including sills, joists, framing, flooring, and siding (Figure 143).15

![Figure 141. Corn Crib in very poor condition. View looking north, 1995 (OCLP).](image1)

![Figure 142. Restored Corn Crib. View looking northeast, 2010 (OCLP).](image2)
Figure 143. As-built drawings for the restoration of the corn crib, 1998 (Institute for Preservation Training).
WA-VG-RT-1: Stabilize Weir apple orchard

Northeast of the Secret Garden and northwest of the Chicken House, the Weir apple orchard is comprised of a dozen trees in a roughly rectangular arrangement. Mahonri Young’s drawing “Apple Picking at Branchville” dated October 1936, indicates that at this late date, the Weir orchard was still large enough in extent to employ a gang of five men in its harvest. After World War II, agriculture became less important to the well-being of the Young family and self-sown non-orchard tree species began to grow in the orchard.

Following the park’s enabling legislation, staff recorded the orchard’s condition and documented only five surviving apple trees (Figure 144). In addition, staff mapped stumps and declining apple trees so that future replacements could be planted accurately. In 1994, staff collected cuttings from the five surviving trees in order to propagate replacement trees from the historic plant material. One of the surviving trees was identified as Newtown Pippin and another as Baldwin. Varieties for the remaining three trees were not determined and in subsequent years, have not been identified. Park staff shipped the cuttings to the Arnold Arboretum in Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts, and the arboretum’s staff raised the propagules. Fieldwork conducted in 1995 recorded only five surviving apple trees and in 1998, the park and the Olmsted Center’s preservation maintenance team stabilized the orchard (Figure 145). Work performed included the removal of young woody vegetation from the orchard and planting nine propagated trees in the exact location of former trees. The nine propagated trees arrived in three sets of three each from the Arnold Arboretum and have the accession numbers AA# 124-94, AA# 125-94, AA# 127-94, AA# 128-94, and AA# 129-94. In order to be prepared for future replacement needs, the park planted additional propagated trees from the Arnold Arboretum in the Burlingham Orchard. In 2007, the park transplanted three trees from the Burlingham Orchard to replace trees in the Weir Orchard that had declined (Figure 146).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Year Planted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WO-2-3</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO-2-7</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>AA # 127-94</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO-2-10</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>AA # 129-94</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO-2-15</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>BO-3-14</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO-2-16</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>BO-3-14</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO-2-17</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>BO-3-13</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 146. Weir orchard existing conditions plan, 2012 (OCLP).
WA-SSF-RT-1: Restore Weir Barn fencing and gates

Photographs from the Weir family’s tenure show fencing south of the Weir Barn similar to the rustic picket fencing found on the site along Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. A circa 1940 panoramic sketch by Mahonri Young shows the barn and the rustic fencing with its distinctive slats in place during the circa 1940 treatment period (Figure 147). As a component of the fence restoration project in April 2003, the park installed a rustic picket fence south of the Weir Barn utilizing wider triangular split pickets. The larger pieces create a fence with a coarser appearance than is seen in the historic documentation (Figure 148). The new fence posts were cut from eastern red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*) logs approximately 6 inches in diameter. Horizontal rails were selected from rough sawn white oak (*Quercus alba*) and the rustic pickets were crafted from split Atlantic whitecedar (*Chamaecyparis thyoides*). Each picket varied in width from 2-3/4 to 3-1/4 inches and was attached to the rails at 7 inches on center (Figure 149 and see Figure 120).17

Figure 147. Rustic picket fence at Weir Barn in detail of Mahonri M. Young sketch, circa 1940 (WEFA 306).

Figure 148 (right). Restored rustic picket fence at the Weir Barn. View looking northwest, 2003 (OCLP).
Based on the historic images, the Historic Preservation Training Center restored the trellis on the west ell of the Weir Barn in the fall of 2010 (Figure 152). Constructed from black locust, ±5 inch diameter posts were erected as the vertical members of the trellis and spanned by five, ±3 inch diameter horizontal rails. The black locust pieces were treated with Tim-Bor Professional™, a water-soluble borate powder that provides protection against wood decay and insect damage. The borate application does not affect the finish color and the locust pieces will
naturally weather. The overall height of the trellis was set just below the eave of
the west ell’s roof and the posts were attached to the structure with inconspicuous
“L” brackets. Workers at Woodbury Forge in Woodbury, Connecticut, fabricated
the brackets and finished them with a black exterior paint. The Historic
Preservation Training Center mortised the brackets into the back of each post
and secured the brackets to the Weir Studio with 2-1/2 inch stainless steel screws
(Figure 153).

Figure 152. Restored trellis on the
west ell of the Weir Barn. View
looking northeast, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 153. Restored trellis on the
west ell of the Weir Barn. Elevation,
2010 (HPTC).

Red dashed lines show as built
condition — bottom rails installed
at an incline and not level or
parallel to other rails
WA-SSF-RT-3: Restore north barnyard sapling fence

North of the Weir Barn, animals grazed in an enclosed, rectangular area defined by the north facade of the barn, the stone wall along Nod Hill Road, and a sapling fence. The sapling fence originated at the northwest corner of the barn and extended approximately eighty feet to the north before turning ninety degrees and proceeding east to the stone wall. The fence is documented in a circa 1942 photograph of Mahonri Young walking between the barn and the Secret Garden (Figure 154). The photograph shows the fence comprised from larger-diameter wood posts set into the ground with smaller-diameter sapling rails set perpendicular to the posts. The saplings attach to the posts in an alternating fashion with one set of three rails on the inside of the barnyard and the next set on the outside. Some sections in the photograph have a double rail—mounted on inside and outside—near the top of the fence.

As one of several of carpentry tasks completed at Weir Farm National Historic Site, the Historic Preservation Training Center restored the north barnyard sapling fence in the fall of 2010 (Figure 155). Black locust logs were used for both the fence posts and rails. Workers erected ±5 inch-diameter posts at approximately 10 feet on center. Three rails, each ±3 inches in diameter, were attached to the posts with a vertical spacing of 12 inches on center. All the locust posts and rails were treated with a water-soluble borate powder sold as Tim-Bor Professional™ (Figure 156). In order to enter the barnyard, the Historic Preservation Training Center attached a section of rails with horseshoes driven into the posts as brackets. This technique is identical to the system used on some of the park’s barways and allows a person to create a temporary opening by sliding the rails through the horseshoes.

Figure 154. North barnyard sapling fence extending north from Weir Barn. View looking south from the Chicken House, circa 1942 (WEFA HP 150).

Figure 155. Restored north barnyard sapling fence. View looking southeast, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 156 (top). Restored north barnyard sapling fence. Elevation, 2010 (HPTC).

Figure 157 (middle). Poultry fencing and Animal Shelter. View looking west, post-1932 (WEFA HP 661).

Figure 158 (bottom). Restored poultry fencing. View looking northwest, 2010 (OCLP).

WA-SSF-RT-4: Restore poultry fencing

During the Young tenure, poultry were housed in an Animal Shelter, constructed circa 1932, and later in a larger Chicken House converted from the farm’s Ice House. A historic photograph and patterns discerned from historic aerial photographs indicate the Youngs erected poultry fencing around the two structures (Figure 157). Fieldwork conducted in 1995 recorded five extant posts in the area of the Chicken House and the Animal Shelter. The posts stood six to seven feet in height above the ground and contained staples and fragments of poultry wire on their surfaces. Based on the extant posts and information gleaned from the historic aerial photographs, a layout for poultry fencing at the circa 1940 treatment period was presented in the 1997 Volume 2 report.18

The poultry fencing is an important small-scale feature associated with agriculture activities in the Weir Complex. As part of the restoration treatment of the Weir Complex, the Historic Preservation Training Center restored the poultry fencing in the fall of 2010 (Figure 158). The Historic Preservation Training Center used ±6 inch-diameter black locust logs for the posts and installed them at 12 feet on center. The black locust was treated with Tim-Bor Professional™ to help prevent wood decay and insect damage. Workers attached galvanized chicken wire to the outside of the posts. The top of the chicken wire was tensioned with a galvanized wire and the bottom was reinforced with two rows
of 1x4 pressure treated lumber (Figure 159). Following installation, differential settling and the natural expansion and contraction of the wood has resulted in gaps between the ground and 1x4 lumber along the bottom of the fence. The park should correct gaps by removing pieces of 1x4 lumber and either reattaching sound pieces to a lower position or replacing warped pieces with new material.

Figure 159. Restored poultry fencing. Elevation and bracing detail, 2010 (HPTC).


**BURLINGHAM COMPLEX**

**BURLINGHAM COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS**

**BD-BL-RT-1: Stabilize South Garden terrace walls**

South of the Burlingham House, Cora Burlingham directed the construction of the South Garden terraces which were completed by about 1946 or 1947. The South Garden is divided into three terraces laid out from east to west at three different heights. Each terrace is framed by dry-laid stone walls. Furthest east is a narrow upper terrace bounded by exposed ledge on its south side. To the west is a wider and longer middle terrace. In the center of the middle terrace, a set of monolithic stone steps descend to the west to the lower terrace (Figure 160). All three terraces are presently in good condition, however, individual stones and short sections of walls are displaced due to frost heave, wash out, and visitors walking on top of the structures. In 2012, the Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc., stabilized the South Garden terrace walls (Figure 161). Workers from the Dry Stone Conservancy incrementally dismantled individual stones and short sections of displaced walls. The dismantled stones were sorted according to size and the wall rebuilt to match the composition of adjacent sections in terms of stone sizes, shapes, colors, and patterning.

**BD-CR-RT-1: Repair stone paved terrace at Burlingham House**

Cora Weir and Charles Burlingham directed the construction of a stone paved terrace south of their home between 1933 and 1938. The paving consisted of irregular, rough-faced granite slabs with wide, soil-filled joints to support the growth of aromatic herbs. Near the Burlingham House’s porch, larger planting pits were created for vines to establish and climb up the porch’s columns. Along the terrace’s south perimeter, the...
paving was supported by a low stone retaining wall that varied in height from six to eighteen inches above the grade of the Burlingham drive (Figure 162).

The stone paved terrace was extant when the National Park Service acquired the property, however, annual freeze-thaw cycles and settling had greatly shifted the stones. In some instances, a two-inch difference in elevation occurred between stones and presented a significant tripping hazard. In 2001, the park completed repairs to the stone paved terrace with assistance from an Acadia National Park masonry team. Masons reset individual stones to provide for positive drainage and to create as even a walking surface as possible. At the terrace’s south perimeter, workers removed an approximate two-foot wide band of paving stones adjacent to the stone retaining wall. The base material below the paving stones was removed, a layer of filter fabric was installed, and sand fill was added to reduce expansion against the retaining wall and provide a consistent bed to reset the paving stones. Masons reset loose stones in the retaining wall and filled large voids with appropriately-sized stone flakes called chinks. Throughout the repairs, the wide joints between paving stones and the planting pits were retained (Figures 163 and 164).\footnote{20}

Figure 162 (top). Stone paved terrace at the Burlingham House. View looking northwest, circa 1940s (WEFA HP 124).

Figure 163 (middle). Repaired stone paved terrace. View looking northeast, 2011 (OCLP).

Figure 164 (bottom). Repaired stone paved terrace cross section (Acadia National Park masonry team).
**BD-VG-RT-1: Rehabilitate the Sunken Garden**

Originally designed by Vera Breed and built under the direction of Cora Weir Burlingham between 1932 and 1940, the Sunken Garden is two feet below the surrounding ground plane and located immediately west of the Burlingham House (Figure 165). Local mason Joseph John Knoche built massive stone walls to both enclose the garden and to retain the adjacent grade. In 1969, Cora Weir Burlingham directed a revised planting design for garden, prepared by Friede R. Stege, which emphasized spring and early summer flowering plants.

The Sunken Garden continued as a defining feature in the Burlingham Complex during the National Park Service administration, however, the shrub plantings were overgrown and few perennials remained (Figure 166). Based on plans prepared in 1997 by Norma Williams, the park rehabilitated the Sunken Garden. The rehabilitation reused as much of the existing plant material as possible.

---

**Figure 165. Sunken Garden. View looking northwest, circa 1940s (WEFA HP 128).**

**Figure 166. Sunken Garden. View looking west, late 1990s (Greg Waters, WEFA).**
and incorporated new plants specified in the 1969 plan of the garden (Figure 167). Where it was determined unwise to use plants because of maintenance requirements or potential deer damage, other plants of similar form and color were substituted consistent with the rehabilitation approach selected for the entire Burlingham Complex (Figures 168 and 169).^22

Figure 167. Rehabilitated Sunken Garden. View looking west, 2012 (Greg Waters, WEFA).
Figure 168. Sunken Garden existing conditions plan, 1997
(Norma Williams).
Figure 169. Sunken Garden planting plan, 1997 (Norma Williams).
BD-SSF-RT-1: Repair brick border north of Sunken Garden

As a component of rehabilitating the Sunken Garden, the park repaired an existing brick border north of the garden. The brick border defines the north edge of a planting bed, approximately five feet wide, that contains several lilacs. The western end of the border starts at a rock outcropping and the eastern end terminates at the bulkhead entrance to the Potting Shed. The border extends for approximately 50 linear feet and the majority of the border runs in a straight line paralleling the Sunken Garden. On the eastern end, the final 7 linear feet curve to the north and end at the southwest corner of the Potting Shed’s bulkhead. To repair the brick border, workers reset the existing bricks directly into the soil. The bricks were set on edge at an angle, approximately 45 degrees, which matched the existing angle. The entire border was reset using a combination of existing bricks and in-kind replacements for broken bricks (Figure 170 and see Figures 168–169).

Figure 170. Repaired brick border north of the Sunken Garden. View looking south, 2010 (OCLP).
BD-SSF-RT-2: Modify outdoor light fixtures

In conjunction with constructing the visitor parking lot in 1993, the park installed outdoor light fixtures to illuminate a pedestrian route from the lot to the Burlingham House. The fixtures extended above the stone walls along Nod Hill Road and were too visually prominent in the landscape (Figure 171). In 2011, the park completed installation of new fixtures that are lower in height, use a smaller light source, and a design that directs the light to the ground (Figure 172). Sladen Feinstein Integrated Lighting, based in Boston, Massachusetts, designed the new fixtures. The fixtures feature a wedge-shaped downlight purchased from Bega Lighting, Carpinteria, California, and mounted into a 6-inch round cedar post. The cedar posts were not treated and will weather naturally. Each post was set into the ground and extends 2 feet above the finish grade. Lighting contractors mounted the top of the wedge-shaped downlight at a height of 32 inches. The catalog number for the wedge-shaped downlight is 2228 LED BRZ. This catalog number references Bega’s downlight using a 3.4-watt LED luminaire in a bronze finished housing (Figure 173). Following installation, contractors added a hammered copper sheet over the top of each post for better weather protection.
Wall luminaires with cutoff optics

**Housing:** Constructed of copper free die-cast aluminum alloy. The housing uses stainless steel inserts for enclosure attachment. Mounts over a standard 3 3/4" or 4" octagonal wiring box.

**Enclosure:** Clear tempered glass lens with a linear spread pattern. One piece die-cast, copper free, louvered, aluminum face plate secured to the housing with three captive socket head, stainless steel screws. Fully gasketed for water tight operation using a silicone rubber gasket.

**Electrical:** 3.4 W LED luminaire, 4.4 total system watts, -20° C start temperature. Integral 120 V through 277 V electronic LED driver, dimming not available. The LED and driver are mounted on a removable plate for easy replacement. Standard LED color temperature is 3000K (available in 4000K; add suffix K4).

**Note:** Due to the dynamic nature of LED technology, LED luminaire data in this catalog is subject to change at the discretion of BEGA-US. For the most current technical data, please refer to www.bega-us.com.

**Finish:** Available in four standard BEGA colors: Black (BLK), White (WHT), Bronze (BRZ), Silver (SLV). To specify, add appropriate suffix to catalog number. Custom colors supplied on special order.

UL listed, suitable for wet locations. Protection class IP 65.

**Options:**
- FSC: Fusing

**Weight:** 1.4 lbs.

---

Figure 173. Modified outdoor light fixture catalog specification sheet. Lights ordered for Weir Farm match catalog number 2228 LED BRZ. This catalog number references Bega Lighting’s wedge-shaped downlight using a 3.4-watt LED luminaire in a bronze finished housing (http://bega-us.com/downloads/2228LED_sub.pdf).
BD-SSF-RT-3: Replace in kind wood cold frame

Cora Weir Burlingham, an avid gardener, directed the construction of two cold frames north of the South Garden terraces. She used both cold frames to grow and harden off plants for transplanting (Figure 174). Fieldwork performed in the spring of 2010 recorded a wood cold frame, measuring four feet wide by twelve feet long, located immediately north of the South Garden’s middle terrace (Figure 175). The wood components were in a deteriorating condition and the sashes were not present. In the fall of 2010, the Historic Preservation Training Center replaced the wood cold frame in kind.

The Historic Preservation Training Center assembled the wood frame using 1-1/8 inch thick mahogany lumber. The north end of the cold frame consists of two boards stacked on top of each other to achieve an overall height of 14-1/4 inches. The bottom board is 6-1/2 inches high and the top board is 7-3/4 inches high. A single board, 7-1/2 inches high, was installed at the south end. The connecting west and east ends feature two stack boards with the top board cut to form a taper from the higher north end to the south. On both sides, the bottom board is 6-1/2 inches high and the top board is 7-3/4 inches high at the north end and 1 inch high at the south end. The four corners were connected using angle irons and hardware that matched the original connectors present on the cold frame. Four sashes were constructed from 1 inch thick mahogany and fitted with 1/4-inch thick plexi glass. The plexi glass over hangs the frame at the bottom by 1/2 inch and acts as a drip edge. Each sash measures 3 feet-3/4 inches wide by 6 feet long. The long pieces of each sash are held in rectangular recesses notched into the cold frame’s north and south boards (Figure 176).

Figure 174. Concrete cold frame, wood cold frame, and the wood posts of the raspberry arbor in the South Garden terraces. View looking southeast, 1963 (WEFA HP 243).
Figure 175 (bottom). Wood cold frame to be replaced in kind. View looking northeast, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 176. Wood cold frame replaced in kind. View looking east, 2010 (OCLP).
BD-SSF-RT-4: Restore sashes on concrete cold frame

North of the wood cold frame, a concrete cold frame stands that measures five feet square (Figure 177). The concrete is in fair condition, however, the cold frame lacks sashes to cover plant material and provide additional protection during marginal weather. In addition to restoring the wood cold frame, the Historic Preservation Training Center restored sashes to fit over the concrete cold frame in the fall of 2010. The Historic Preservation Training Center constructed the two sashes, each with a 1 inch thick mahogany frame, and fitted them with 1/4-inch thick plexi glass. The plexi glass over hangs the frame at the bottom by 1/2 inch and acts as a drip edge. Each sash measures 3 feet wide by 6 feet long and are supported in the center of the cold frame by an iron bracket. The bracket rests in recessed slots on the north and south edges of the concrete and spans the length of the structure (Figure 178). Park staff report that the plexi glass sashes are flimsy and difficult to move. The park should replace the plexi glass with double-walled, hollow channeled polycarbonate sheets that are more rigid and still provide good light transmission.
RecoRd of TreatmenT

BD-SSF-RT-5: Restore raspberry arbor in South Garden terrace

Charles Burlingham, Cora Weir Burlingham’s son, recalled that after World War II his mother became more interested in growing small fruits such as raspberries and strawberries in the South Garden versus vegetables in her Victory Garden. Photographs from the 1950s and 1960s show wooden poles supporting plants in the middle terrace and remnants of this wire trellis system survived in fair to poor condition through the National Park Service’s administration (Figure 179 and see Figure 174).

As a component of preserving and enhancing the South Garden terraces, the park worked with the Historic Preservation Training Center to restore the raspberry arbor in the fall of 2010 (Figure 180). The existing wood posts, braces, and stakes were removed and replaced with naturally rot-resistant black locust logs. Three rows of three posts each were installed in the holes of the removed posts. The posts measured ±5 inches in diameter. The six end posts were braced with ±2 inch-diameter logs. A small notch was cut into each end post and the narrower brace was set at a diagonal into the notch. The end of each diagonal brace was attached to a stake driven into the ground. All the black locust pieces were treated with Tim-Bor Professional™, a water-soluble borate powder that provides additional protection against wood decay and insect damage. Workers completed the raspberry arbor by stringing 12-gauge galvanized wire between each set of posts. The galvanized wire was looped and twisted around each end post and secured with galvanized staples.

Figure 179 (top). Raspberry arbor to be restored. View looking north, 2010 (OCLP).

Figure 180 (bottom). Restored raspberry arbor. View looking southwest, 2010 (OCLP).
**BURLINGHAM COMPLEX AGRICULTURAL ZONE**

**BA-BL-RT-1: Rehabilitate Burlingham Barn annex to provide accessible restrooms**

The 1995 General Management Plan identified rehabilitating the Burlingham Barn to support visitor and educational programming at Weir Farm National Historic Site. The rehabilitation plans included accessible restrooms in the small annex extending off the north side of the barn since universally accessible restrooms were not then available at the park (Figure 181). The park rehabilitated the Burlingham Barn between 2002 and 2004. Originally added to the barn as a shed, rehabilitating the annex included the addition of partition walls to define two restrooms and an interior corridor to provide passage to the main room of the barn. The northern restroom measured approximately 10 feet long by 6 feet wide and located fixtures to meet the clearance, maneuvering, and reach requirements for an individual in a wheelchair. The southern restroom measured approximately 7 feet long by 6 feet wide and at its western end, featured a secured door for park staff to access a janitor’s closet. All newly installed exterior and interior doors in the barn and annex provided a minimum clear width of 3 feet. To provide exterior access to the annex, the park used imported soil to create a subtle incline along the east facade. The graded incline terminated at a roughly 6-foot long wood ramp. Finished with wood decking, the top of the ramp matched the finish floor elevation of the annex. The ratio of the new incline and wood ramp was less than 1 foot vertical per 5 feet horizontal and therefore did not have to be designed as an accessible ramp with visually intrusive handrails (Figure 182). The wood ramp replaced irregular stone paving and a stone cheek wall in the design drawings (Figures 183 and 184).
Figure 183. Rehabilitated Burlingham Barn first floor plan. The upper right of the plan shows the accessible restrooms in the annex. Plan view, 2002 (NPS).

Figure 184. Rehabilitated Burlingham Barn east elevation. The right side of the elevation shows the entry to the accessible restrooms in the annex. View looking west, 2002 (NPS).
BA-BL-RT-2: Repair west facade and northwest corner of the Burlingham Woodshed

The Burlingham Woodshed is thought to have been built circa 1850 based on extant framing comprised of rough-hewn timbers connected with pegged mortise-and-tenon joints. This framing is similar to framing in the Burlingham Barn and the Woodshed may have been one of the buildings mentioned in the 1843 property deed. By 1931, when Cora Weir Burlingham acquired the property, the Woodshed had attained its current size and roof line. The Woodshed is open along the south facade and features a saltbox roof. The east facade is wood framed and the north and west facades are assembled from dry-laid stones (Figure 185). The structure appears in Mahonri Young sketches from the mid-1930s and based on a circa 1933 photograph, the west stone wall appears to have been rebuilt. Later images document larger stones and an overall more finished appearance that is consistent with wall construction undertaken by Cora Weir Burlingham during the 1930s and 1940s.

Along the Woodshed’s west facade and at the northwest corner, the dry-laid stones have shifted and resulted in a bulging section approximately seven feet long. In the fall of 2010, the Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc., repaired the west facade and northwest corner (Figure 186). Workers braced the Woodshed’s roof and incrementally removed the bulging section until structurally sound stonework or a stable footing was identified. The removed stones were cleaned and sorted for reuse according to their original location in the wall. The Dry Stone Conservancy rebuilt the wall using the original stones and matching the alignment and batter of the adjacent sections. No new stones were incorporated into the rebuilt wall and masons reset the sorted stones to match the existing appearance of stone sizes, shapes, colors, and patterning. To improve the structurally integrity of the rebuilt wall, masons added tie stones at regular intervals. A tie stone has a smaller exposed face and extends through the width of the wall to help hold adjacent face stones into the wall interior. The Woodshed’s northwest corner was rebuilt using slightly larger stones than the west facade with longer and shorter stones alternating from course to course.
BA-CR-RT-1: Install limited staff parking area to alleviate parking demand on visitor lot

Following the transfer of Weir Farm to the National Park Service in 1992, the park constructed a fifteen-car visitor parking lot on the east side of Nod Hill Road across from the Burlingham House. Since the construction of that lot, full time staffing has nearly doubled and park visitation has been increasing, surpassing 19,000 visitors in both 2009 and 2010. To assist staff and provide a positive visitor experience, the park hires many seasonal employees to aid in routine operations and maintenance. The increase in visitation, full time staff, and seasonal employees regularly exceeds the capacity of the fifteen-car parking lot.

Installing a second parking area dedicated for staff and limited in size is supported by the park’s General Management Plan that states, “Small ‘pods’ of soft-surfaced, limited parking with extensive vegetative screening will be the prototypical parking style for the site.” “Extensive vegetative screening” is specifically called for to support the General Management Plan goal of protecting the scenic and rural qualities of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. Without screening, a parking area and its cars would spoil the historic character of a driver’s view along Nod Hill Road or Pelham Lane. In addition to screening, the rural character of the road corridors can also be preserved by relocating the parking to an appropriate area in the interior of the park.

In order to alleviate a parking demand on the visitor lot, the park installed a limited staff parking area west of the Burlingham Barn in 2011. Working with the Olmsted Center to produce schematic designs, the area west of the Burlingham Barn was selected due to favorable topography, an existing access route, and screening created by existing buildings, walls, and vegetation. The relatively flat area had existing vehicular access via the Burlingham driveway and constructing an additional access route to this location was not required. In addition, the area west of the Burlingham Barn was free from major surface obtrusions of ledge and standing water and plant species associated with wetlands. The area was also screened by the Burlingham Barn, the Woodshed, and existing vegetation to the north and south (Figure 187).
In September 2010, archeologists excavated thirty-one shovel test pits across the proposed area for limited staff parking. Tests in the western portion of the proposed area revealed twentieth-century fill activities over exposed ledge and bedrock. A mixture of recovered artifacts included contemporary items such as plastic, Styrofoam, and a light bulb. Tests in the southern and eastern portions of the proposed area terminated at either bedrock or sterile subsoil and contained few artifacts. The archeological investigations concluded that the twentieth century fill had no additional research value and no further work was recommended for the parking area. In 2011, the park contracted with Watermark Environmental, Inc. for design/build services to install the parking area. Three stalls for the parking area were set perpendicular to the stone wall off the northwest corner of the Burlingham Barn. An additional twelve stalls, six on each side, were laid out to the west along a twenty-four foot wide central aisle. From the northeast corner to the southwest corner, the parking area slopes at 3.3 percent and was surfaced with a ⅜-inch crushed stone aggregate (Figures 188 and 189).

Figure 188. Construction of the limited staff parking area west of the Burlingham Barn. Crews are spreading a ¾-inch crushed stone aggregate, darker material on the left, over a compacted aggregate base. View looking north, 2011 (OCLP).
Figure 189. As-built plans for the employee parking area west of the Burlingham Barn, 2011 (Watermark Environmental, Inc.).
BA-VG-RT-1: Rehabilitate Burlingham orchard

Historic aerial photographs from 1941 and 1951 indicate a geometrically arranged orchard that contained ten to thirteen trees in the southeast portion of the Burlingham Complex. An existing conditions inventory prepared for the Volume 2 report recorded five extant apple trees in this area with all five being in poor condition (Figure 190). In 1998, the park rehabilitated the Burlingham orchard by first removing volunteer trees and vines that encroached upon the orchard. Existing trees received rejuvenative pruning to decrease their overall height and stimulate bud development and growth on their lower branches. Staff established a regular mowing regime and using propagated trees from the nearby Weir orchard, additional trees were planted in the exact locations of missing trees to complete the geometric arrangement of the orchard (Figure 191). The Arnold Arboretum raised the propagated trees and six of the Burlingham orchard trees share the accession number AA# 33-99. Three additional trees are identified as AA# 124-94, AA# 127-94, and AA# 128-94 (Figure 192).30

Figure 190. Burlingham orchard. View looking southwest, 1997 (OCLP).

Figure 191. Rehabilitated Burlingham orchard featuring fencing installed around the trees in order to protect them from deer. View looking north, 2010 (OCLP).
Figure 192. Burlingham orchard existing conditions plan, 2012 (OCLP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Year Planted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-10</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Unknown Propagation Number</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-11</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-13</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-14</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-18</td>
<td>Malus 'Newtown Pippin'</td>
<td>Newtown Pippin Apple</td>
<td>AA # 124-94</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-19</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>AA # 33-99</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-20</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>AA # 127-94</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-21</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>AA # 33-99</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-23</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>AA # 33-99</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-24</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>AA # 125-94</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-25</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>AA # 33-99</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-26</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>AA # 33-99</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-27</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>AA # 33-99</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO-3-28</td>
<td>Malus species</td>
<td>Apple Clone of BO-3-14</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POND AND WOODLAND AREA

CARETAKER’S DOMESTIC GROUNDS

CD-BL-RT-1: Rehabilitate Caretaker’s Garage

An 1861 probate inventory of Lewis Beers’ estate lists a “carriage house” as one of several buildings that comprised his farm complex. Although the inventory does not specify a location, current research indicates this carriage house was associated with the Caretaker’s House on the east side of Nod Hill Road. During the early 1930s the Bass family, living at the Caretaker’s House, added a three-car garage to the north of the carriage house. The three bays formed a rectangular structure, one story high, that was topped with a saltbox roof. Bass family photographs show the two connected structures in the 1940s and a circa 1940 Mahonri Young sketch shows the south elevation of the carriage house (Figure 193). Based on a review of aerial photographs, the carriage house was demolished between 1970 and 1975. The three-bay garage remained as a freestanding structure and by the mid-1990s, was in poor condition with a bowed ridgeline and failing exterior cladding (Figure 194).

The park’s General Management Plan outlined rehabilitating the Caretaker’s Garage and adding to it a compatible, new addition to serve the needs of the park’s artist-in-residence program. The addition would occupy the footprint of the carriage house removed in the 1970s. The park began design and project compliance in 2005 and in 2009, completed the rehabilitation of Caretaker’s Garage (Figure 195). The rehabilitated garage and new artist’s studio are open in plan with the garage approximately 25-feet long by 19-feet wide. The studio
measures approximately 23-feet long by 21-feet wide and opens along its east facade on to a 6-foot wide cut stone terrace. The west facade of both buildings features wood garage doors on sliding tracks. The north and east facades of the garage are clad in cedar shingles with a 6-inch exposure. The studio exterior is finished with 1x8 tongue-and-groove vertical cedar siding punctuated by a bank of windows on the east facade. The roofs of both buildings were finished with cedar shingles featuring a 5-inch exposure (Figure 196).
Figure 196. Plan, sections, and elevations of the Carriage House and Caretaker's Garage (Fasey Smith Architects, PC).
**CD-BL-RT-2: Repair retaining wall north of Caretaker’s House**

North and east of the Caretaker’s House, a steep embankment descends to a low-lying, wetland area. Approximately twenty feet north of the house, a dry-laid stone wall retains a lawn area that slopes away from the house. The wall may have been installed in conjunction with the original construction of the Caretaker’s House or be associated with modifications Julian Alden Weir directed shortly after purchasing the property in 1882. A Mahonri Young sketch from circa 1940 shows the wall in place and topped with a rustic, wood picket fence (Figure 197). In 2010, an approximate twenty-five foot section, extending east from Nod Hill Road, appeared severely deteriorated with large stones displaced and strewn down the embankment.

In December 2010, the Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc., repaired the deteriorated wall section using only extant stones from the collapsed or unstable sections. Workers incrementally dismantled unstable sections of the wall until reaching a stable footing or base. The collected and dismantled stones were sorted according to size and the wall rebuilt to match the composition of adjacent sections in terms of stone sizes, shapes, colors, and patterning (Figure 198).

**CD-SSF-RT-1: Restore rustic picket fencing at Caretaker’s yard**

In the early 1900s, Julian Alden Weir had rustic picket fencing installed to replace a more classically designed fence at the Weir House. He directed the installation of the same fencing along the east side of Nod Hill Road in front of the Caretaker’s House. A Mahonri Young sketch from circa 1940 shows the rustic picket fencing turned east from Nod Hill Road and followed the top of a stone wall along the northern edge of the Caretaker’s yard (see Figure 197).

As part of carpentry work completed in 2003, the park restored the rustic picket fencing at the Weir House and along Nod Hill Road in front of the Caretaker’s House. The fence at the northern edge of the Caretaker’s yard...
was not restored. Working with the Historic Preservation Training Center, the park restored two sections of rustic picket fencing at Caretaker’s yard in the fall of 2010 (Figure 199). The Historic Preservation Training Center project did not restore an approximate twenty-five-foot section of fencing due to pending repairs of the stone retaining wall north of the Caretaker’s House. The wall repairs have been completed and the remaining section of fence will be restored in a future project (Figure 200).

The rustic picket fencing completed in the fall of 2010 utilized new fence posts that were cut from eastern red cedar (Juniperus virginiana) logs approximately 6 inches in diameter. Horizontal rails were selected from rough sawn white oak (Quercus alba) and the rustic pickets were crafted from split Atlantic whitecedar (Chamaecyparis thyoides). Each picket varied in width from 1-3/4 to 2-1/4 inches and was attached to the rails at 4-1/2 inches on center (see Figure 120).

**POND AND WOODLAND AREA**

**PW-BL-RT-1: Install septic system leach field**

The original cesspool serving the Burlingham house failed during the National Park Service’s administration. In 2001, the park installed a new septic system to serve the needs of visitors and staff and comply with health and environmental codes (Figure 201). Engineers located the septic leaching field south of the visitor parking lot off Nod Hill Road. The park maintains the leaching field area free of woody vegetation and this practice is consistent with the character of the area in circa 1940.34
Figure 201. Plan of replacement septic system for Burlingham House and Barn with leach field installed south of visitor parking lot (e-TIC, WEFA_413_81406_[id95777]).
**PW-BL-RT-2: Stabilize dressed stone wall along Nod Hill Road**

Following Julian Alden Weir’s 1896 purchase of additional land east of Nod Hill Road, a stacked stone wall paralleling the road and opposite the Weir House was likely rebuilt. Constructed with dressed stones, battered sides, and irregularly shaped coping stones along the top course, this wall was distinct in its construction and appearance among the common, stacked fieldstone walls that marked parcel and field boundaries throughout Weir’s property (Figure 202).

The dressed stone wall remained through the historic period and was extant when the National Park Service acquired the property. Fieldwork conducted in 2010 identified three sections where the dry-laid stones had shifted and resulted in bulging portions varying in length from twelve to seven feet. In the fall of 2010, the Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc., stabilized the three bulging sections. Workers from the Dry Stone Conservancy incrementally dismantled each bulging section of the wall until reaching a stable footing or base. The dismantled stones were sorted according to size and the wall rebuilt to match the composition of adjacent sections in terms of stone sizes, shapes, colors, and patterning.

No new stones were incorporated into the rebuilt wall and to improve structurally integrity, masons added tie stones at regular intervals. Tie stones have a smaller exposed face and extend through the width of the wall to help tie adjacent face stones into the wall interior (Figure 203).

**PW-CR-RT-1: Delineate parking stalls at visitor parking lot**

In 1993, the park constructed a fifteen-car visitor parking lot on the east side of Nod Hill Road across from the Burlingham House. The lot was surfaced with graded crushed aggregate and since the lot’s completion, park staff routinely paint stripes on the lot’s surface to indicate the fifteen parking stalls. Given the
relatively loose surface material, vehicles driving over the painted lines quickly obscured or removed them resulting in confusion for visitors and an inefficient use of the lot.

Following completion of a resurfacing project in 2011, the park installed marking whiskers to clearly delineate the parking stalls (Figure 204). Marking whiskers are tufts of brightly colored nylon attached to a metal clip that are used in surveying and construction. Vehicles can drive over the nylon tufts without damaging them and the markers are a preferable environmental and longer-term alternative to painting the ground. For the visitor parking lot, staff attached a six-inch nail to each marker’s metal clip and drove six markers into the lot to form a line for one stall. Yellow markers were used to delineate the stall lines and blue markers, along with signage, were installed to designate the parking lot’s one van accessible handicap spot.

![Figure 204. Delineated parking stalls at the visitor parking lot featuring yellow marking whiskers. View looking northwest, 2012 (OCLP).](image)

**PW-CR-RT-2: Install stone steps and connecting trail to provide dedicated route across Truants’ Meadow**

On the east side of Nod Hill Road opposite the Weir House, a series of seven monolithic granite steps lead through a dressed stone wall and down to a lawn terrace. From the terrace, visitors choose their own route down a steep grade change that leads to a mown path through the Truants’ Meadow (Figure 205). The park needed a dedicated route, utilizing stone steps for consistent footing down the existing grade change, that connected the terrace and mown path through the Truants’ Meadow. In September 2010, archeologists completed fieldwork in the proposed area for the stone steps and trail and reported no deposits or features. Consequently, the archeologists recommended no further archeological investigations in this area.35
In 2012, the park completed the installation of the stone steps and connecting trail. The trail, roughly two feet wide, extended north from the terrace and connected to four sets of stone steps. Each set of steps consisted of native stone slabs, approximately three feet long, two feet wide, and between two and six inches thick, that were set on a mixture of compacted earth and aggregate. Workers repositioned existing boulders on the downhill side of the trail to retain the trail bed and create a level surface. The trail was surfaced with a mixture of compacted earth and aggregate (Figure 206).
PW-CR-RT-3: Construct wetland crossing south of Fishing Bridge remnants

As a component of the circulation to the pond, Weir added a small, rustic wooden bridge to cross a wetland area east of the Truants’ Meadow. The bridge appears in an 1896 photograph and features a narrow walking surface with a single handrail on its northern side (Figure 207). Weir also captured the bridge in his circa 1915 painting entitled “The Fishing Party” and as a result, the feature is presently referred to as the Fishing Bridge. The bridge persisted into the 1940s, but only fragments remained when the National Park Service acquired the property. The stone steps and boulders which once served as bridge abutments are still present, however, all wooden components are missing.

Restoring the Fishing Bridge was not recommended due to safety issues raised by the narrow walking surface and single handrail. Instead, the park constructed a low and wide boardwalk across the wetland to the south of the Fishing Bridge site (Figure 208). The non-historic boardwalk permits access to and from the pond, allows the stone remains at the Fishing Bridge site to be interpreted, and keeps pedestrians out of the wetland. Park staff constructed the boardwalk using pressure treated lumber for the posts, beams, and joists and a synthetic lumber product for the decking. The boardwalk rests on 4x4 posts driven into the ground with the span between the posts reinforced by 2x6 beams. Workers attached 2x8 joists to the beams and secured 2x6 plastic decking to the joists. The outer edges of the boardwalk were delineated by 2x4 plastic toe boards attached to the decking (Figure 209).
During Weir’s tenure and very likely before, repeated trips from the house to the fields and pond east of Nod Hill Road created a circulation feature known as the Wagon Road. The road, a compacted earth trace, began near the northwest corner of the Truants’ Meadow at a barway entrance from Nod Hill Road. The road continued along the eastern edge of the meadow and entered the woodland area to the south. Regular use of the Wagon Road decreased after the Young family’s tenure and as a result, woody vegetation has encroached on the edges of the route and emerged from the roadbed. In 1999 and periodically since, park staff preserves the Wagon Road by removing small trees less than twelve inches diameter at breast height to a distance of five feet on either side of the road’s centerline (Figure 210).17
PW-CR-RT-5: Develop typical bogwalks for wet areas

Photographs taken during the Weir family tenure document tree limbs and simple bridge-like fixtures used for dry passage over narrow, wet areas in the Pond and Woodland complex (Figure 211). These ephemeral features were not present when the National Park Service acquired the property, however, seasonally wet areas persisted in the Pond and Woodland Area. Visitors and staff seeking a route to and from the pond had to cross several wet areas and as a result, the park supported two Eagle Scout projects that installed bogwalks in 1998 and 2003 at necessary points (Figure 212). The scouts constructed the bogwalks from rot-resistant black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*) logs. Bed logs, a minimum of 2 feet long, were cut and partially buried into the ground. In order to provide a level walking surface tread logs, roughly 8 to 12 feet long, were sawn to create one roughly milled face. The rounded base of the tread logs was notched at either end and the recessed area placed over the bed logs. The tread logs were secured to the bed logs with galvanized spikes (Figure 213).38

![Figure 211. Simple wood-constructed crossing from the Weir tenure, circa 1900 (WEFA HP 1).](image1)

![Figure 212. Installed bogwalk along the trail to Weir Pond. View looking east, 2010 (OCLP).](image2)
Following the construction of the dam and pond in 1896, Weir added a Summerhouse on the pond’s island and a separate Boat House along the western bank to support the family’s recreation activities. With the pond and these additional amenities drawing people to this portion of the property, it is likely that a circumferential path was created over time by persistent pedestrian traffic. When the National Park Service acquired Weir Farm, the path around the pond, similar to other circulation features in the Pond and Woodland Area, was obscured by young woody vegetation. The park rehabilitated the path around Weir Pond by removing the volunteer vegetation to define a dedicated route (Figure 214). Working with a trails team from Acadia National Park, the park

**Figure 213. Bogwalk construction diagram.** The bogwalk consists of two tread logs attached to two bed logs set into the ground, 2006 (*Acadia Trails Treatment Plan*).
installed a band of native stones in 2001 to create a designated, dry route along the south side of the pond. Selected stones for the route varied in size and shape and featured a flat or nearly flat face between 1 and 6 square feet in area. To prevent the stones from sinking into soft ground, a layer of stone rubble was first installed as a base. Workers set the stones on the base with gaps less than 12 inches between adjacent stones to permit seasonal water flow through the path (Figure 215).39

PW-VG-RT-1: Remove young woody vegetation in the Truants’ Meadow

A meadow area east of the Weir House and Barn served as the setting for Julian Alden Weir’s 1895 painting “The Truants.” In the painting, two youngsters hide in a low pocket of the meadow beyond a stone wall. The painting won first prize at the Boston Art Club the following year and with the prize money, Weir purchased ten acres east of his current property and constructed the “Boston Art Club Pond” on the newly acquired land. Aerial photographs from the 1940s show the meadow depicted in “The Truants” remained open through the circa 1940 treatment period. Following the Young family’s tenure, young woody vegetation emerged in the meadow. By 2004, the park removed the woody vegetation in the Truants’ Meadow and established a regular mowing regime to maintain its historic character (Figure 216).40
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### TABLE 14: RECORD OF TREATMENT SUMMARY, PARK-WIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-BL-RT-1: Preserve stone walls</td>
<td>1997–2012</td>
<td>Park staff, volunteers, and youth from Groundwork Bridgeport performed work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 15: RECORD OF TREATMENT SUMMARY, WEIR COMPLEX DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-BL-RT-1: Stabilize the Tool Shed</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Institute for Preservation Training performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-BL-RT-2: Stabilize the Pig Pens</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc. performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-CR-RT-1: Install universally accessible route to the Weir House</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-SSF-RT-1: Restore rustic picket fencing at Weir House</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-SSF-RT-2: Stabilize well cover</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-SSF-RT-3: Restore Garden Arbor at upper terrace vegetable garden</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-SSF-RT-4: Restore Rose Arbor at upper terrace vegetable garden</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-SSF-RT-5: Restore trellises on Weir Studio</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-SSF-RT-6: Construct and install reproduction dog house</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-BL-RT-1: Restore Weir Barn and Tack House</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Institute for Preservation Training performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-BL-RT-2: Stabilize Chicken House</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-BL-RT-3: Stabilize Animal Shelter</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Institute for Preservation Training performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-BL-RT-4: Restore Corn Crib</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Institute for Preservation Training performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-VG-RT-1: Stabilize Weir apple orchard</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-SSF-RT-1: Restore Weir Barn rustic fencing and gates</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-SSF-RT-2: Restore trellis on west ell of Weir Barn</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-SSF-RT-3: Restore north barnyard sapling fence</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-SSF-RT-4: Restore poultry fencing</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 17: RECORD OF TREATMENT SUMMARY, BURLINGHAM COMPLEX
#### DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-BL-RT-1: Stabilize South Garden terrace walls</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc. performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-CR-RT-1: Repair stone paved terrace at Burlingham House</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Acadia National Park masonry team performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-VG-RT-1: Rehabilitate Sunken Garden</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-SSF-RT-1: Repair brick border north of Sunken Garden</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-SSF-RT-2: Modify outdoor light fixtures</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Sladen Feinstein Integrated Lighting prepared design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-SSF-RT-3: Replace in kind wood cold frame</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-SSF-RT-4: Restore sashes on concrete cold frame</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD-SSF-RT-5: Restore raspberry arbor in South Garden terrace</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 18: RECORD OF TREATMENT SUMMARY, BURLINGHAM COMPLEX
#### AGRICULTURAL ZONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-BL-RT-1: Rehabilitate Burlingham Barn annex to provide accessible restrooms</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-BL-RT-2: Repair west facade and northwest corner of the Burlingham Woodshed</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc. performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-CR-RT-1: Install limited staff parking area to alleviate parking demand on visitor lot</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Watermark Environmental, Inc. served as design/build contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-VG-RT-1: Rehabilitate Burlingham orchard</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 19: RECORD OF TREATMENT SUMMARY, CARETAKER’S DOMESTIC GROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-BL-RT-1: Rehabilitate Caretaker’s Garage</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-BL-RT-2: Repair retaining wall north of Caretaker’s House</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc. performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-SSF-RT-1: Rehabilitate rustic picket fencing at Caretaker’s yard</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Training Center performed work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 20: RECORD OF TREATMENT SUMMARY, POND AND WOODLAND AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-BL-RT-1: Install septic system leach field</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-BL-RT-2: Stabilize dressed stone wall along Nod Hill Road</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Dry Stone Conservancy, Inc. performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-CR-RT-1: Delineate parking stalls at visitor parking lot</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-CR-RT-2: Install stone steps and connecting trail to provide dedicated route across Truants’ Meadow</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-CR-RT-3: Construct wetland crossing south of Fishing Bridge remnants</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-CR-RT-4: Preserve Wagon Road</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Park staff continue to periodically remove young woody vegetation from the roadbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-CR-RT-5: Develop typical bogwalks for wet areas</td>
<td>1998 and 2003</td>
<td>Two Eagle Scout projects constructed and installed bogwalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-CR-RT-6: Rehabilitate path around Weir Pond</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Acadia National Park trail crew performed work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-VG-RT-1: Remove young woody vegetation in the Truants’ Meadow</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Park staff incrementally performed the work and completed the task by 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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