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Chapter 1
Introduction

The 2013 Brandywine Battlefield Preservation Plan (2013 Plan) identifies and prioritizes significant battlefield areas and battle elements, which contribute to the overall battlefield cultural landscape and are well suited for further study, planning, and possible protection and/or interpretation. Battlefield areas, termed ‘strategic landscapes’, encompass key battle events and features, the latter broadly categorized as physical geography (terrain, land areas used by troops and civilians and natural features such as wetlands, watercourses, and landforms) and cultural topography (settlement patterns and built features such as roads, fords, buildings, farms, and villages). The 2013 Plan identifies and recommends 13 battlefield strategic landscapes for further consideration and planning.

Strategic landscapes are being examined in phases due to the complexity of the battle and large size of the battlefield (approximately 35,000 acres). This plan for Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Strategic Landscapes (Map 1-1), along with plans for Marshallton and Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Strategic Landscapes, represents phase one battlefield strategic landscapes planning. Together the four Landscapes form the northern Brandywine Battlefield (Map 1-2), where tactical battle staging occurred during the morning and into the afternoon the day of the battle, September 11, 1777. Strategic landscapes and their features are areas to focus battle-related local planning, land conservation, historic resource protection, and heritage interpretation efforts. Collectively, such planning efforts within the battlefield honor and preserve areas that exhibit Chester County’s role in American history and our nation’s founding, and simultaneously maintain sense of place and enhanced quality of life for residents and visitors.

Plan Purpose

The purposes of this plan are to examine and delineate the following for Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes:

- Role in the battle as part of the northern battlefield, location of the British flanking maneuver, and association with American reconnaissance, military activity, and local civilian community.
- Historic context, extant structures, roads, and lands that contribute to a still readable battlefield landscape.
- Strategies for resource, land/open space, and heritage interpretation planning, including highlighting nearby Marshallton village as a center for interpretation of the northern battlefield.

An overview of the Landscape (this Chapter), its significance to the battle (Chapter 2), and battle history, battlefield importance, and recent planning (Appendix A) provide perspective for this plan. This plan examines particular battle events via study of physical geography and cultural topography and review of reference materials (Chapter 3), and identifies battle-era built features (Chapter 4). This plan clarifies battle elements from the 2013 Plan for these Landscapes and develops locally oriented strategies for planning (Chapter 5) and heritage interpretation (Chapter 6). Appendices supplement plan chapters: battle-era properties documentation (Appendix B), themed heritage tour (Appendix C), and interpretive signage and displays (Appendix D).

1 Battle elements include battle events, e.g. a skirmish, and features, e.g. a historic building.
2 For planning purposes, features can be correlated with natural resource, open space, historic resource, land, and road planning.
3 Tactical battle staging in the northern battlefield includes American reconnaissance (Marshallton and Trimble’s Ford Landscapes), northern British tactical flanking advance (Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes), and last leg of the flanking advance/preparation for battle (Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Landscape). Osborne Hill Landscape is related to Strode’s Mill as an area of battle staging/preparation; however, it will be discussed in earnest as part of the core battle in a future battlefield strategic landscapes plan.
Strategic Landscape and Plan Names

Focused examination of these two Landscapes made clear that their story is interrelated and best addressed in one plan. Both Landscapes form the middle stage of the British flanking advance of Gen’l Washington’s position along Brandywine Creek. Both entail Crown Forces\(^1\) fording at the Creek’s branches and traversing similar difficult craggy terrain. These common elements led to the plan name, ‘Breaching the Fords and the British Advance’.

Strategic Landscape outlines (Maps 1-1 and 1-2) provide generalized areas for study and planning. Based on analysis for this plan, Landscape outlines changed from the 2013 Plan, a shift anticipated by the 2013 Plan when recommending further landscape studies. Trimble’s Ford Landscape area starts near modern Red Lion and Marlboro Roads, at the mid flank marching route of the British Line. Jefferis’ Ford Landscape area ends near modern West Miner Street and Birmingham Road, where the British Line completed crossing the Creek’s east branch.

Examination of Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes in concert with that of neighboring landscapes also led to further grouping of related landscapes for planning and interpretive purposes. Hence, while all four landscapes form the northern battlefield (Map 1-2), Marshallton\(^3\), Trimble’s Ford, and Jefferis’ Ford Landscapes form the ‘American reconnaissance and successful tactical northern British flanking march’ of the battle (Map 1-1).

---

\(^1\) During the Philadelphia Campaign of 1777, British troops along with Hessian soldiers and local loyalists can together be referred to as ‘Crown Forces’.

\(^2\) Strategic Landscapes represent generalized areas for study and planning purposes and their mapped outlines do not denote firm boundaries.

\(^3\) See ‘Behind the Lines’ – Marshallton Strategic Landscape Plan.
Plan Need

The 2013 Plan provides a foundation and framework for ongoing battlefield planning. Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes’ role in the overall battle is touched upon in the 2013 Plan as British flanking and battle conflict areas where Crown Forces under Gen’l Howe bypassed to evade the bulk of the American Army arrayed along Brandywine Creek’s main stem using a flanking maneuver. They advanced north to cross the Creek at unguarded fords, first fording the Creek’s west branch at Trimble’s Ford and then turning east to ford the Creek’s east branch at Jefferis’ Ford. During the maneuver, there were skirmishes with American troops and conflicts with local civilians whose properties were impacted.

The 2013 Plan indicates there remains significant historic landscapes in these areas, describing the Landscapes’ modern-day context as significant historic and enduring rural settings with open lands, historic structures, and roads that retain 18th century character. The 2013 Plan recommends the role of both Landscapes in the battle be further explored, and this plan implements that recommendation. This plan analyzes, clarifies, and expands upon assumptions in the 2013 Plan, furthering the understanding of the battlefield, and specifically these Landscapes, for continued planning, education, interpretation, and preservation. It provides a focused and locally implementable supplement to the 2013 Plan.

To facilitate understanding, analysis, and planning, the northern British flanking advance is examined in three stages, which together encompass Gen’l Howe’s flanking tactic. The flank began well west (left) of the American array positioned along the Creek, traveling far enough north and then east to cross the Creek at unguarded fords and forming a northwestern-arcing march (aka the ‘British Left Hook’ for battlefield strategic planning purposes). ‘Stage I’ entails the Crown Forces encampment the eve before battle in and near present-day Kennett Square Borough and the start of the flanking march north. ‘Stage II’, the topic of this plan, comprises the bulk of the flanking march advance. ‘Stage III’ entails the final stage of the flank advance through Sconnellstown to Strode’s Mill, where the flanking march ends to prepare for battle and the approach to Osborne Hill.

Plan Contributors

This project is largely funded through a grant to Chester County from the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP), which provides competitive funding for battlefield studies and planning nationwide. Created in 1991 and signed into law by Congress in 1996, this National Park Service program is a federal partnership initiative to assist communities in identifying and planning for interpretation and protection of the nation’s significant historic battlefields and related resources, as well as raise awareness of their importance for future generations. ABPP addresses wars that occurred on American soil.

Chester County Planning Commission staff completed this project, with input from East Bradford, West Bradford, and Pocopson Townships, Friends of Martin’s Tavern, Friends of Strode’s Mill, and ABPP representatives. A team of local volunteers and Chester County Archives staff conducted research using original primary source materials in Chester County’s Archives. John Milner Associates (JMA), a historical and archeological consultant with expertise in military terrain analysis, historic and archeological resources, physical geography land study, and cultural and military history (specifically the Revolutionary War in the Philadelphia region), conducted geophysical field study, provided battle interpretation, and vetted technical plan information. Landowners voluntarily offered to work with the project team. This project could not have occurred without this extensive and skilled team working collaboratively and alongside local residents.
Chapter 2

‘Statement of Significance’ to the Battlefield

This plan looks to National Park Service guidelines for historic American battlefields1 and 2013 Plan methodology to describe the specific significance (termed ‘Statement of Significance’) of Trimble’s and Jeffries’ Fords Landscapes in relation to the battlefield and battle. Outlining significance provides a context by which to examine and evaluate battle events and features for their role in the Landscapes and battlefield overall. Information about the battle and battlefield, including recent planning efforts, can be found in Appendix A.

Brandywine Battlefield, a National Historic Landmark (NHL) since 1961, is among the most precious and important treasures in our nation. As related to the northern battlefield, NHL information states: “Washington’s defeat at the Battle of Brandywine was a consequence of his failure to appreciate the geography of the region. The stream itself had little defensive value for, although it necessitated fording, the fords were so numerous that it was almost impossible to defend all of them. The British realized this, and after a forced march crossed upstream of Washington’s army at a ford Washington did not even realize existed.” It further states: “The significance of the Battlefield...is increased as a consequence of the degree to which the area has remained unchanged.”

Firsthand accounts provide insight on the role of the Landscapes in the northern battlefield, and in particular the British flanking advance and related American reconnaissance. Lt. Col. Ross’ message (reprinted here) informs Washington about the British advance through the northern battlefield. It is one of the known reports Washington received the day of the battle. Ross and his men were patrolling roads in the area (Trimble’s Ford Landscape) when they spotted and skirmished with the Crown Forces rear line, sending the message to alert Washington of their findings.

The significance of these Landscapes’ to the battlefield is threefold. 1) They are the part of the northern battlefield where Gen’l Howe was able to successfully flank the American Army by tactically navigating approximately 9,000 troops on a 9-hour circuitous march through difficult terrain that included two fordings of Brandywine Creek, while encountering few skirmishes. 2) Trimble’s Ford Landscape is the location of conflicting accounts about British activity, leading Gen’l Washington to be uncertain about his military strategy and ultimately failing to understand, until it was too late, that he was being outflanked to the west and north by half the Crown Forces. Jefferis’ Ford Landscape is the location of the Ford and an uphill narrow passage (‘defile’) east of the ford, which to the surprise of Crown Force were not and could have been defended by a relatively small number of American troops. 3) Both Landscapes continue to display the Brandywine Valley colonial landscape (including structures and lands American and Crown Forces viewed) and retain cultural roots and identity (including local Quaker community and continuously used 18th century structures and properties).

Sept. 11 ‘77 Great Valley Road
Eleven o'clock AM —
Dear General,

A large body of the enemy—from every account 5000, with 16 or 18 field pieces, marched along this road just now. this Road leads to Taylor’s & Jeffries ferries on the Brandywine, and to the Great Valley at the Sign of the Ship on the Lancaster Road to Philada. There is also a road from Brandywine to Chester by Dilworth’s Tavern. We are close in their rear with about 70 Men. Capt. Simpson lay in ambush with 20 men, and gave them three rounds within a small distance, in which two of his men were wounded, one mortally. I believe Genl. Howe is with this party, as Joseph Galloway is here Known by the inhabitants, with many of whom he spoke, and told them that Genl Howe was with him.


---
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‘The British Left Hook – Breaching the Fords and the British Advance’

Trimble’s & Jefferis’ Fords Strategic Landscapes Plan

Relationship to the NHL

The intent of the Brandywine Battlefield National Historic Landmark designation is to recognize the significance of the battle in the founding of the U.S. and in determining the course of American history. Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes are not included in the NHL boundary as their significance to the battle was not understood when the boundary was originally delineated. The 2013 Plan and 2010 Battle of Brandywine Historic Resources Survey and Animated Map Study (2010 Study) are the first planning documents that brought forth the area’s importance for local planning. These Landscapes are located northwest of core battle combat areas, which the NHL generally captures in its bounds. These Landscapes contribute to the intent of the NHL for their largely intact Brandywine Valley colonial landscape that still reflect the story of the battle (military events and local community impacts) and the battle’s contribution to American independence. These Landscapes today still retain landforms, topography, buildings, roads, and structures that existed at the time of the battle and played a pivotal role in the battle and its outcome.

Historic Context and Setting

Trimble’s Ford Landscape is located mostly in modern Pocopson1 Township and (historic and modern) West Bradford Township, with a small area in Newlin Township. Jefferis’ Ford landscape is located in (historic and modern) East Bradford Township.

The ability to successfully cross Brandywine Creek is highly relevant to both Landscapes and the battle overall. In 1777, this was a rural area where bridges over the Creek, as we know them today, did not exist and fords (or in some cases ferries) often provided the only means of crossing. The 2013 Plan indicates that the nine fords2 along the Creek are key features to understand the battle, and in the military sciences are known as ‘significant terrain features’. Of those fords, seven were guarded and monitored by American Forces as possible crossings by Crown Force, and two were unguarded - Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords, both of which along with their approaches and surrounding lands are key features related to the battle and its outcome and as such are strategic landscapes and the topic of this plan. This plan also adds a tenth ford, the further north unguarded Taylor’s Ford, as also relevant to the battle for its reference in a firsthand account.

Trimble’s Ford Landscape includes Trimbleville, a battle-era crossroads that lies in a broad valley at the confluences of Brandywine Creek’s west branch and its Broad Run tributary. Trimbleville lies south of colonial-era Marshallton village (which played a behind the lines of combat role in the battle)3 near the Trimble’s Ford and at a colonial intersection hosting two major roads, both Roads to the Great Valley4. Such roads were ‘highways’ of their day, and there were multiple ‘roads to the Great Valley’ that connected Brandywine Valley’s fertile fields in the south with the industrial corridor to the north in Chester County’s ‘Great Valley’. At the time of the battle, Trimbleville held at least a farmhouse, blacksmith shop, miller’s house, mill, and barn.

1 Pocopson Township was formed in 1849 from portions of West Bradford, Pennsbury, East Marlborough, and Newlin Townships.
2 From south to north – Pyle’s, Gibson’s, Chad’s, Brinton’s Jone’s/Painter’s, Wistar’s, Buffington’s, Trimble’s, and Jefferis’ Fords. There were also other fords along the Creek, of which only Taylor’s Ford is known at this point to be relevant to the battle. ‘Chads’ is the 18th century family name, which differs from present-day spelling of the locale ‘Chadds Ford’.
3 See ‘Behind the Lines’ – Marshallton Strategic Landscape Plan.
4 In the Colonial era, roads generally did not have discrete names as moderns roads do today. Roads generally leading north towards the County’s Great Valley were all called ‘Roads to the Great Valley’ or in sometimes abbreviated historical accounts to ‘Great Valley Road’. It should be noted that this is not to be confused with the east-west road through the Great Valley itself that was the ‘official Great Valley Road’.
In addition to its relevance for the second fording by Crown Forces, Jefferis’ Ford Landscape contains the ‘Forks of the Brandywine’ Creek, where the Creek’s main stem splits into east and west branches. This context is important as the ‘fork’ resulted in two branches, or obstacles, rather than one if they instead had crossed the main stem, for Crown Forces to tackle, and both were left unguarded by Gen’l Washington thinking the Crown forces would not embark on such a long, difficult, and circuitous route. The northernmost American guarded ford, Buffington’s Ford, near the ‘forks’ also falls within Jefferis’ Ford Landscape.

The Clayton family (related to Squire Thomas Cheyney by marriage) and Trimble family (for whom the ford is named) held property in Trimble’s Ford Landscape as did fellow prominent Quaker families of Marshall, Baily, and Eckhoff. The Jefferis family (for whom the ford is named) held property in Jefferis’ Ford Landscape along with fellow prominent Quaker families of Worth, Jones, and Taylor. These families lands and buildings remain today as significant intact features that continue to characterize both Landscapes.

**Existing Conditions and Integrity**

Both Landscapes contain expanses of rural lands that convey the colonial-era setting. Both Landscapes are largely undeveloped and contain agricultural uses as they did in 1777, including original associated historic buildings. Though located only a short distance from West Chester Borough, both Landscapes have retained a colonial-era character due to intact rural and farmland surroundings. The 2013 Plan indicates the Landscapes contain a high potential for historic resource protection and interpretation, particularly given the open farmlands along roadways that provide a unique opportunity for interpretation. As well, the extensive undeveloped floodplains in Trimble’s Ford Landscape and lands in Jefferis’ Ford Landscape, particularly in ford areas where Crown Forces would have had to slow and possibly stop awaiting their turn to cross, provide a unique opportunity for archeological investigation. The 2013 Plan also indicates that both Landscapes exhibit characteristics, such as historic and current farmlands, that make them especially well-suited for land conservation, agricultural preservation, and open space protection.

Trimbleville has roots in the 18th century, forming due to its key location at the convergence of well-traveled roads and the only crossing of the Creek for miles. It continued to develop into the early 19th century and then dissolved into a hamlet when bridges, such as at Northbrook, were built and drover’s roads, such as the Strasburg Road, flourished. Today, it retains historic integrity as a hamlet, and its roots are still evident with its rural landscape and 18th and early 19th century buildings still in use. This is reflected in Trimbleville National Register Historic District that spans lands in West Bradford and Pocopson Townships.

---

1 Chapter 4 provides more discussion on historic context.
To the south lies colonial-era Marshall’s Mill (family homestead and mill complex) that later grew into the 19th century village of Northbrook. Northbrook’s roots are still evident in its rural landscape and structures that remain in use today, as is reflected in Northbrook National Register Historic District that spans lands in Pocopson, West Bradford, and Newlin Townships. (Of the areas along the west branch of the Creek associated with Lenni-Lenape Indians, Northbrook has a strong association containing several significant sites that would have been present at the time of the battle) West Branch Brandywine Creek Multiple Resources and Thematic National Register Area ties together numerous resources related to Brandywine Creek, including both historic districts.

Jefferis’ Ford Landscape is a rural setting that does not contain any villages or hamlets. It remains a relatively rural area with farmsteads and large rural tracts. Worth/Jefferis Rural Historic District comprises a good portion of Jefferis’ Ford Landscape. This district is quite large containing nearly 2,000 acres including 10 farms that are prominent features. While the landscape has undergone change, namely residential development, it has been designed in a way to be sheltered from public views and not intrusive to the district. Several newer barns are built on historic foundations of their predecessors and have compatible same size, shape, and materials as historic barns. A pattern of farmsteads, fields, and rolling country delineated by hedgerows and small tree groves remains and reflects the history of the district.

Property owners generally value the historic resources and open lands in the Landscapes and actively work to keep both viable. Active local historical commissions in West Bradford and East Bradford Townships and Historical Committees in Pocopson and Newlin Townships promote continued viability and preservation of the area. Important to the Trimble’s Ford Landscape is the presence of Brandywine Red Clay Alliance, which has significant land holdings in Pocopson Township near the location of the ford and on the route of the British flank.

**Historic Contextual Themes**

The significance and analysis of these Landscapes to the battle speaks to several overarching battlefield themes, broadly categorized as ‘military events’, ‘18th century landscape’, and ‘local community’. Under (one or more) of those broad categories fall specific themes for this plan of:

- British advance and tactical flanking maneuver
- American military activity and reconnaissance
- Battle impact on local residents
- Brandywine Valley in the 18th century
- Still readable battlefield landscape
- Quaker roots and Peace Testimony

The Landscapes history also mirrors major themes in the overall history of Chester County: multi-generational rural agricultural tradition, Brandywine Valley Quaker settlement, prosperous commerce/industry foundation, and the American Revolution. Landscape themes are found throughout this plan and are the basis for heritage interpretation (Chapter 6).

Themes for the comprehensive battle, and this plan as appropriate, relate to and are being coordinated with Museum of the American
Revolution’s (MAR) Revolutionary War interpretative theme. MAR’s major themes can be summarized as: ‘Citizens turned Revolutionaries’, ‘Surviving the Darkest Hours’, ‘Radical Nature of Revolution’, and ‘Lasting Meanings’. As Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes are just one part of the much larger Revolutionary War, and have a unique cultural background as part of the Brandywine Valley’s largely Quaker roots, not all MAR themes speak directly to the Landscapes. For these two Landscapes, themes of American reconnaissance and military activity could fall under ‘Citizens turned Revolutionaries’; the British flanking advance and battle impact on local citizens under ‘Radical Nature of the Revolution’; and a still readable Brandywine Valley colonial landscape and Quaker roots/Peace Testimony under ‘Lasting Meanings’. The overarching theme for the entire Brandywine Battlefield as a pivotal moment in the American Revolution, discussed in the 2013 Plan speaks to all MAR’s themes.
This chapter uses geophysical field study of features (land area, natural, landform, built, below-ground) and reference materials to analyze prior assumptions1 from the 2013 Plan/2010 Study about the battle and battlefield in and near the Landscapes. This includes reviewing the: 1) Landscapes’ roles as part of the northern battlefield, 2) American military activity and reconnaissance, 3) civilian involvement and the battle’s impact, and 4) Crown Forces’ advance under Gen’l. Howe’s flanking strategy. This chapter takes a holistic historical view of the battle in these Landscapes and provides related recommendations, while Chapter 4 focuses on distinct built features and the battle impact on local civilians. For local planning purposes, this analysis seeks to clarify the Landscapes’ roles as to where and what battle events occurred to develop planning strategies (Chapter 5) and speak to heritage interpretation themes (Chapter 6).

Various analytic methods were used, including the 2010 Study KOCOA analysis, 2013 Plan defining features and historic resources inventories, reference maps (historic atlases, aerial photographs, topographic maps), primary sources (firsthand accounts, road petitions, deeds), secondary sources (battle histories), field study, and historic archeological assessment, as well as review of battle-era cultural topography and settlement patterns in Chapter 4. Historic and military archeological consultant, John Milner Associates (JMA), conducted this analysis with assistance from researchers in Chester County Archives.

**KOCOA Military Terrain Analysis**

KOCOA2 analysis evaluates physical geography and cultural topography and identities defining features that help explain a battle and inform about its events and outcomes. ABPP describes defining features as those natural and built features named in battle accounts, historic maps, or other sources that help locate and ground-truth battle events in the modern landscape. Physical geography (natural) feature examples include terrain, watercourses, ridges, or ravines. Cultural topography (built) feature examples include places/settlement patterns (villages or farms); structures (mills, houses, or meetinghouses); or other manmade features (roads, paths, woodlots, or farm fields). The 2010 Study KOCOA analysis is used in the 2013 Plan, which takes a further look at defining features for planning and interpretation purposes. Both analyses are the starting point for this plan.

This plan uses KOCOA to analyze, update, and/or interpret previously understood battle events related to these Landscapes - where the middle stage of the British flank took place, as did American military activity/reconnaissance and civilian involvement/impacts. For example, this plan uses KOCOA to better understand the battle event of the British flanking march route via mapping and comparing locations of reported civilian losses, battle-era properties and owners, and battle-era roads, through which the path of the march becomes evident. However, battle events are not isolated activities, and so to understand how both Landscapes fit into the overall

---

1 Appendix A blue italics wording shows assumptions being studied from a battle timeline perspective.
2 Appendix A further describes a KOCOA analysis. Cultural topography encompasses the built environment and is addressed in Chapter 4.
battle from a military and physical terrain perspective, analysis at times stretches beyond Landscapes’ bounds. Figure 3-1 provides updated defining features related to military activity within and related to both Landscapes.

Roadways - as communication routes and avenues of approach for military troop movements - are critical KOCOA defining features for battlefield military strategy analysis as well as cultural topography and battle-era settlement pattern analysis. Understanding where roadways were located at the time of the battle is necessary for understanding primary reports from the field of battle and locations where battle activities would likely have occurred. One of the extraordinary outcomes of this project (Chapter 4) is the research undertaken by Chester County Archives, whereby an approximated battle-era road network has been mapped for this project using the best-known primary source material at the time of this plan. Map 3-1 depicts battle-era known public roads, fords, and Figure 3-1’s defining features. Map 3-2 depicts an approximation of these features in today’s landscape.

JMA further explains KOCOA in terms of military terrain analysis from an on-the-ground view: a soldier looks at fields, woodlots, ridges, buildings, waterways, etc., for their military value, how they could be integrated into offensive or defensive positions, and how they fit into potential for offensive or defensive military action. This is not only important for understanding why a commander would (or would not) position infantry, artillery, or cavalry at a certain place on the terrain or at a certain point during the engagement (why faulty positioning could have disastrous consequences), but also helps to interpret the authenticity of battlefield maps. Further, evaluation of terrain from a military point of view can help provide reasonable explanations to ‘fill in’ gaps in current knowledge of battle events caused by a scarcity of primary sources. For example, military usage of terrain would demand troops be deployed under the cover of landforms and natural features, such as ridges, woodlots, or low-lying ravines, shielding troops from the enemy’s view. Similarly, depending on the task assigned during any stage of an engagement, troops might be deployed

---

1 1777 Fords of the Brandywine Map depiction by Clifford Parker, Chester County Archives. Base map is 1847 Map of Chester County, Pa: from original surveys by S.M. Painter & J.S. Bowen, projection and drawing by J.S. Bowen, engraved by Edw’d Yeager, Philadelphia. Battle-era roads provide a delineation of best available primary source information in Chester County Archives as researched by Archival staff.

---

### Figure 3-1: Trimble’s Ford and Jefferis’ Ford Landscapes and related KOCOA Military Terrain Defining Features (updated from the 2010 Study and 2013 Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING FEATURE</th>
<th>KOCOA CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley aka Great Valley Road (modern Red Lion Rd, Broad Run Rd)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Col. Ross’ patrol’s probable location and skirmish site on the 1728/1771 Road of the Great Valley (modern Red Lion Rd) near the 1742 Road (modern Corinne Rd)</td>
<td>Observation, Fields of Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742 Road, 1742 Trace, and 1706 Road to American Guard Posts at Wistar’s, Jone’s/ Painter’s, and Brinton’s Fords as probable as Ross reconnaissance report route (modern Corrine Rd to Street Rd Bridge, and archaeological battle-era road sites from Corrine Rd to Street Rd with visible road bed on Denton Hollow Rd)</td>
<td>Key Terrain, Observation, Obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728/1771 Trace of Road to the Great Valley to/from Trimble’s Ford (archaeological battle-era road sites from modern Red Lion Rd to secondary ford, primary ford, and the Creek with areas of visible road beds, e.g. on a Township trail/former Bragg Hill Rd)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Baily House</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimble’s Ford(s) Primary and Secondary archaeological sites</td>
<td>Key Terrain, Obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705 Spur and Trace to/from Trimble’s Ford (modern Camp Linden Rd and archeological battle-era road site to the primary Ford)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746 Spur to/from Marshallton village (modern Northbrook Rd) of 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Clayton House</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754 Trace Road (archaeological battle-era road sites from modern Camp Linden Rd to Lucky Hill Rd)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725/1764 Road to Turk’s Head village/ Philadelphia (modern Strasburg Rd, Lucky Hill Rd, Allerton Rd, W. Miner St)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferis’ Ford archaeological site (County Bridge #111 on modern Allerton Rd)</td>
<td>Key Terrain, Obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705 Road to Dilworthtown village/ Chester city to American Guard Posts at Buffington’s Ford and nearby Wistar’s Ford (modern N. Wawaset Rd, Bridge Rd, Creek Rd)</td>
<td>Key Terrain, Observation, Obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham/1719 Road (modern Birmingham Rd)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine Creek, east branch, west branch</td>
<td>Obstacle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: use of ‘Road’ indicates the approximate battle-era roadbed and road alignment still exist. ‘Spur’ is the approximate road extension of a battle-era road that still exists. ‘Trace’ indicates a former battle-era road that today is largely an archeological site.
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'The British Left Hook - Breaching the Fords and the British Advance'  
Trimble’s & Jefferis’ Fords Strategic Landscapes Plan

Map 3-2  
Northern Battlefield Landscapes Analysis  
(overlaid on present-day landscape approximated)

Map Features: (Battle-era)

- **A** Sign of the Ship Tavern  
- **B** Martin's Tavern  
- **C** Welch's Tavern  
- **D** Dilworth Village  
- **E** Strode's Mill  
- **F** Eddington, Boardman & Smith's Mill  

Unguarded Fords:
- Trimble's Ford  
- Taylor's Ford  
- Jefferis' Ford  

- Hypothesized location of Ross' patrol & initial skirmish

Guarded Fords:
- American Army positions on east side of Creek as commanded by Gen'l Washington  
- Buffett's Ford  
- Wistar's Ford  
- Jones/Painter's Ford  
- Brinton's Ford  
- Chad's Ford  

- End of defile/Beginning of high ground near Bradford Heights (approx.)
via a road if speed is of the essence or via a woodlot or circuitously if the element of surprise is paramount. Taking these and similar military aspects into consideration, terrain becomes an integral part of the reconstruction of battle events and ‘the stage’ in which the events unfold.

A KOCOA analysis is a valuable tool for planning and interpretation purposes, as it identifies extant features that still define the battle/battlefield and that are paramount to protect for all efforts in preserving the battlefield and history of the battle in the American Revolution and as part of Chester County’s legacy. Future actions should be made with a focus on protection of such features, including lands and structures.

Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes Battlefield Analysis

The analysis discusses the Landscapes from a military battle perspective using field/geophysical study and reference materials. It also takes into account Landscape significance (Chapter 2) and the broader battle (Appendix A), as well as historic context (Chapter 4) and themes (Chapters 2 and 6) of military events (British tactical flank and advance and American reconnaissance and military activity); settlement patterns (Brandywine Valley in the colonial era through 1800 and a still readable battlefield landscape); and battle impact on the local community (civilians at large and specifically Quaker community). This analysis explores battle-related events that took place within and/or are related to these Landscapes. This includes: 1) the flanking route, 2) Lt. Col. Ross’ patrol and skirmish site and reconnaissance report route, 3) Trimble’s Ford location, and 4) Jefferis’ Ford location. This analysis was completed by project consultant, JMA so prose may read differently than other plan sections. Refer to Map 3-1 for analysis parenthetical references and Figure 3-1 for battle-era roads approximate correlation to modern roads.

Crown Force Flanking Route

This analysis examines the Crown Forces route under Gen’l. Howe’s tactical flank in their endeavor to circumvent and outmaneuver Gen’l. Washington and the American Forces main position near Chad’s Ford in defense against the British 1777 campaign to capture Philadelphia.

1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley and 1746 Spur to Marshallton village

Key to locating the Crown Force route through the northern battlefield is identifying which ‘Road to the Great Valley’ is being referred to in historic accounts and as the approach route north to cross the Brandywine Creek at the unguarded Trimble’s Ford. Through examination of historic maps, locations of places referenced in historic accounts, and locations of reported battle-losses by civilians (depredation and claims, and Quaker Sufferings) for this project, the 1728 Road is identified as the Road to the Great Valley (relevant for this plan) and the flanking march route used by Crown Forces. Depredation and plunder claims and Sufferings in Trimble’s Ford Landscape along the part of the flanking route approaching Trimble’s Ford from the south associated with these roads include those recorded by: John Battin (Plunder, Suffering), Francis Trimble (Depredation), Joel Baily (First Person Account, Plunder, Depredation, Suffering), Jonathan Buffington (Plunder, Depredation), Richard Baker (Plunder, Depredation), Abner Cloud (Depredation), and David Eckhoff (Depredation). Chapter 4 provides discussion about these families, location of their properties, and the listing of specific losses recorded in depredation claims.

In 1728, residents of Caln and Bradford Townships petitioned the Court of Quarter Sessions for a road to be laid out from Conestoga Road in the Great Valley (in Caln Township) to Abraham Marshall’s mill which was “lately built.” (ORP Vol. 2 pg. 37) From there, the road was extended south into Marlborough Township where it...
connected with a road laid out in 1723. The original purpose of the road was to provide access for farmers located north and south of Abraham Marshall’s property to be able to reach his newly constructed mill.

In 1746, a road spur of the 1728 Road was laid out connecting the 1705 Road to Dilworthtown village/Chester city and the 1725 Road/Marshallton village via Trimbleville and the merchant mill then operated by Robert Mendenhall, James Trimble, and William Trimble. (ORP Vol. 5, pg. 16)

By the 1770s there were several roads leading to the Great Valley north of Trimble’s Ford in West Bradford. One of these roads was laid out in 1771 and connected the 1728 Road with the Lancaster Road near Sign of the Ship Tavern in present-day Caln Township just west of Downingtown. (ORP Vol. 12, pg. 31)

In Trimble’s Ford Landscape, Crown Forces ‘began’ at the southern border of modern Pocopson Township marching north on the 1728 Road (modern Red Lion Road) to its junction with modern Unionville-Wawaset Road (that did not exist in 1777). The Crown Force march continued north to the Ford on a portion of the 1728 Road that was closed in the early 1900’s and thus is referred to as a Trace in this plan. Following the 1777 property lines of Richard Baker, Joel Baily, Samuel Marshall and Humphrey Marshall (petitioners for the 1728 Road) and road dockets, the Trace as the road Crown Forces traveled north to Trimble’s Ford begins opposite modern Red Lion Road’s juncture with modern Unionville-Wawaset Road. The 1728 Road’s road bed is still clearly visible today (although overgrown) to the extent that it can be traced to the point where it joins former Bragg Hill Road - this portion of the 1728 Road is intact exemplifying its 1777 character and is preserved and publically accessible as a Township trail. The 1728 continues north to steeply sloping lands along the Creek’s bank and floodplain lands and wetlands leading to Trimble’s Ford. This plan identifies the portion of the 1728 Road from modern Unionville-Wawaset Road to the Creek, today a Trace, as archeological sites.

After crossing Trimble’s Ford, Crown Forces depart the 1728/1771 Road, which continued northwest on modern Broad Run Road via Trimbleville toward the Sign of the Ship Tavern (A) and the transportation and industrial corridor of the Great Valley in Caln Township. Instead, Crown Forces turned east toward the 1725/1764 Road to Turks Head/Philadelphia that led to their second crossing of the Creek, at the unguarded Jefferis’ Ford.

**1705 Road to Dilworthtown village/ Chester city, 1754 Road, and 1725/1764 Road to Turk’s Head village/ Philadelphia**

After crossing the Creek’s west branch at Trimble’s Ford, the Crown Forces flanking column turned east, on a 1705 spur of the Road to Dilworthtown village/Chester city, towards Jefferis’ Ford for their second crossing of the Creek on its east branch. The 1705 spur leading from Trimble’s Ford is today both a Trace (likely the current driveway of a residence on the Creek) and the modern Camp Linden Road. The 1705 spur provided connection to the 1725/1764 Road via a 1754 Road (today a Trace discussed below) that led across the Creek at Jefferis’ Ford. Through examining the same documents for this project (discussed above under 1728/1771 Road), the 1705 spur, 1754 Road, and 1725/1764 Road are identified as the flanking march route used by Crown Forces. Depredation and plunder claims and Sufferings in Trimble’s Ford Landscape along the part of the flanking route leaving Trimble’s Ford associated with these roads include those recorded by: John Highfield (Depredation), James Trimble (Plunder, Suffering), and James Marshall (Plunder, Depredation, Suffering). In Jefferis’ Ford Landscape along the flanking route approaching Jefferis’ Ford associated with these roads, claims and Sufferings include those recorded by: George Carter (Suffering), Richard Jones (Suffering), and James Jefferis (Depredation).

It was not until 1764 after several additions to existing roads that the 1725/1764 Road became known as the “Road to Philadelphia”. The original road laid out in 1725 was an attempt to connect the residents of western
Bradford Township and Newlin Township with the “Great Road” leading to Birmingham. (ORP Vol. 2, pg. 3) A road was added in 1754 connecting the 1725 Road with the 1705 Road to Dilworthtown village/ Chester city. In 1764, a petition was placed before the Court of Quarter Sessions for a road to Philadelphia “as there is no road that passes from that part of Bradford, Newlin & part of Marlborough to nor from Goshen which is by much the most Direct Way to Philadelphia from those part.” The new 1764 Road connected both the 1725 Road to a road laid out in Goshen in 1734 which led towards Philadelphia.

Originally laid out in 1705 as a road leading from the Forks of the Brandywine to Naaman’s Mill in Concord Township, the 1705 Road quickly become the surrounding area’s access to Chester (city), then the county seat of Chester County. (ORP Vol. 1, pg. 24) Road papers for 1746 Road (ORP Vol. 5, pg. 46) refer to the 1705 Road as “the Road to Chester”. Since the 1705 Road also led to the guarded Buffington’s and Wistar’s Fords (that are the next fords directly south of Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords), it remains a puzzle as to why Gen’l. Washington did not send American Forces via the 1705 Road to also guard Trimble’s Ford.

The 1754 Road that served as the avenue of approach for the Crown Force flank, connecting modern Camp Linden Road with Lucky Hill Road, is no longer a public road. Analysis using historic maps, aerials, and field study revealed three road traces – a Northern Trace, Middle Trace, and Southern Trace – as the possible Crown Force route. Research undertaken to delineate the battle-era road network indicates the route as the Middle Trace, which was a 1754 Road. This is reinforced via a geophysical topographic assessment of the three traces, which indicates the Northern Trace is a farm lane today and historically, and the Southern Trace was a farm lane c.1790 becoming a road c.mid-1800s and continuing as such into the early 1900s. The Middle Trace is depicted on the 1847 Map of Chester County, but was no longer shown as a public road by the time 1904 U.S.G.S. Map (West Chester quadrangle) was published. The property boundary that coincides with the Middle Trace still exists today. Local residents, who are intimately familiar with the area (through fox hunting, horseback riding, hiking, multigenerational family roots, etc) also describe an old road bed associated with the property line. The location of the road is still defined by a tree line for nearly its length. This plan identifies the 1754 Road as well as the 1705 spur from the Creek to modern Camp Linden Road, today both Traces, as archeological sites.

**Lt. Col. Ross’ Patrol, Skirmish Site, and Reconnaissance Report Route**

Whether Lt. Col. Ross’ detachment of light infantry began the morning at Martin’s Tavern (B) in Marshallton village is not known. Perhaps more likely is that this 70-man detachment was positioned south of the Creek’s west branch, patrolling roads for sightings of ‘the enemy’ as were other light detachments. The documentation (for this plan) of the 1742 Road to Jone’s/Painter’s Ford and its intersection with the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley supports the latter conjecture. Ross’ patrol would have logically crossed the Creek at a known ford north of the Great Nottingham Road and the 1742 Road led toward Jone’s/Painter’s Ford (6), Wistar’s Ford (5), and Brinton’s Ford (7). It is known however, that at 11am, Ross – identifying his position on the Great Valley Road and listing his unit affiliation as D.P.R, or Dunlap’s Partizan Regiment, elements of which were attached to Maxwell’s Light Corps – penned a message to Washington (Chapter 2).

By about 8am, the advance guard of Cornwallis’ flanking column reached and began to march north on today’s Red Lion Road in Pocopson Township. Within half an hour of starting the march, Hessian Capt. John Ewald (who led the advance guard) reports encountering American Forces that skirmished with his advanced guard until midday. Based on Ross’ message, at least one of these skirmishes was with Ross’ patrol. Ross’ message can be read as a warning to Gen’l. Washington that the road he found the Crown Forces on – the 1728 Road to the Great Valley – presented multiple avenues of approach to the American position. He says that from this road the Crown Forces can reach Jefferis’ Ford (3) or Taylor’s Ford (2), or go even further north and strike the Lancaster Road at the Sign of the Ship (A), or head southeast towards Dilworth village (D). His message suggests that his detachment
was patrolling the area south of the Creek’s west branch when they encountered the Crown Forces column as it moved north towards Trimble’s Ford (1). Ross’ detachment is on the south side of the Creek, along modern Red Lion Road (the 1728 Road to the Great Valley) likely near its intersection with modern Corinne Road in historic Locust Grove (red star on Map 3-1 depicts the surmised position). His position was previously identified and incorporated into the 2010 Study and 2013 Plan as being north of Trimble’s Ford. The proximity to Jone’s/Painter’s Ford (6) and the American Army from this surmised location supports the fairly timely delivery of his message to Gen’l. Washington. The rear of the Crown Forces column came under fire from a portion of Ross’ command, wounding two, one mortality, but the column was not seriously impeded. In carrying out orders to patrol for British activity, it is thought Ross’ detachment may have also engaged the rear of the line prior to this skirmish but is unknown whether they or another patrol hung onto them after, until ‘midday’ as Ewald recounts. It is known that Ross and his men are reported in East Bradford that night (McGuire 2006:264).

Trimble’s Ford Location

The importance of Trimble’s Ford as a key component of the colonial road infrastructure can be seen in the number of roads, destinations, and places it served. From the south, many primary roads heading toward the Great Valley converge at the floodplain and wetlands that formed the ford. In addition, ‘feeder’ roads, such as the 1742 Road that merged with the 1728 Road to the Great Valley further south of the ford, brought goods and people across the ford from East Bradford and Birmingham Townships to points north.

Geophysical and topographic assessments were completed for this project in order to identify with a high degree of certainty the location of Trimble’s Ford and its immediate access roads. Trimble’s Ford is identified as ‘Key Terrain’ under KOCOA for understanding the military history of the battle, as the ford offered an important crossing of a major obstacle, Brandywine Creek’s west branch. If Crown Forces had been halted or delayed in crossing Trimble’s Ford, the outcome of the Battle of Brandywine may have been different. The ford itself also provided an ‘Obstacle’ under KOCOA, since crossing a river with 9,000 infantry plus significant artillery, horses, and support baggage/wagons at a single tight location, a ‘choke point’, would significantly delay a march.

Identifying the ford is thus a critical research query for the Landscapes and understanding of the battle overall.

Empirical results of a ground-penetrating radar (GPR) survey and geomorphic testing combined with the historical road system research conducted by the Chester County Archives staff indicates that there is a road trace still extant along the floodplain east of the Creek, likely attributed to the 1777 Trimble’s Ford and lies buried within the floodplain of the Creek’s west branch (Figure 3-2). Based on the presence of high amplitude geophysical reflections creating a linear pattern, the presence of compacted deposits seen in auger tests and cinder-type material recovered in a number of the auger tests, the road trace appears to be a single alignment trending from the bank of the Creek’s west branch generally southeast across the floodplain to an unnamed channel of the Creek, which cuts through the floodplain. This trace then likely crosses the channel and trends to the southwest toward the floodplains’ Creek bank. Upon crossing the channel, the data suggests that there are actually two buried potential road traces that are found at different depths (at 2ft and 4ft below ground surface) that trend at an eight degree difference, thus spreading from one another as both traces move southward.

When the northern trace is extended southeast across the Creek’s west branch toward the buried surface (Figure 3-2 top gray area/red outline) found in the Creek’s historic bank (current floodplain lands), the trend of the buried potential road trace is maintained and thus the buried surface found likely represents a remnant of Trimble’s Ford. When the trace is extended south across the Creek’s unnamed channel toward another buried surface (Figure 3-2 bottom gray area/red outline) found in the Creek’s current floodplain, the trend of the buried potential road trace is maintained (albeit in two potential road traces) and thus the buried surface found likely represents a remnant of another ford. As this other ford crosses a small waterway of a channel, it is identified as a secondary ford of Trimble’s Ford that allowed access to the primary Trimble’s Ford. Based on these evidences, it is highly likely that this is the location of Trimble’s Ford(s).
Figure 3-2: Results of Geophysical Assessment of the Trimble's Ford Area
Key: gray areas with red outlines are the GPR grid locations and show primary (top) and secondary (bottom) fords. Yellow and orange lines depict the location of the Trace.
Jefferis’ Ford Location

As with Trimble’s Ford, there are few first-person descriptions of the ford crossing itself. Von Muenchhausen comments that the waters at Jefferis’, like those at Trimble’s, were up to three feet deep (von Muenchhausen 1974:31). Perhaps the most detailed known description of the Jefferis’ Ford area is provided by local resident Joseph Townsend. A Quaker, he was attending a week-day meeting at a local wheelwright shop when he heard a disturbance caused by several local people who were visibly upset because the Crown Forces were coming. As Townsend and a few others sought to calm down local residents, "...our eyes were caught on a sudden by the appearance of the army coming out of the woods into the fields belonging to Emmor Jefferis, on the west side of the creek, above the fording-place. In a few minutes the fields were literally covered over with them, and they were hastening towards us. Their arms and bayonets, being raised, shone as bright as silver, the sky being clear and the day exceedingly warm...."(Townsend 1846, quoted in Futhey and Cope 1881:75).

An examination of historic documents and maps indicates that the current location of the Jefferis’ Ford Bridge on Allerton Road as the location of Jefferis’ Ford. The 1832 petition to construct a bridge on the state road to Baltimore notes that a bridge is to be built at Jefferis’ Ford. An 1863 map (prepared for American Civil War defenses around Philadelphia by a Union Forces engineer Henry Whiting) depicts a wooden bridge at the Jefferis’ Ford crossing of State Road and also notes that the bridge is at the location of the earlier Jefferis’ Ford.

Historic Military Archeological Potential

Based on the battle and landscape analysis by JMA, historic archeological potential related to battle military events in both Landscapes was assessed.

Fields of conflict are temporary, albeit seminal, events, superimposed on preexisting cultural landscapes. These Landscapes witnessed a variety of cultural actions - transportation systems, agricultural development, settlement patterns, population change – that exerted influence on the land prior to the engagement on 11 September 1777 and that continue to exert influences on the field after the battle. Land uses, such as pasture and field patterns, farmsteads and husbandry buildings, change as they give way to ultimate progression: roads are altered, vacated, rerouted, or widened, woodlands are reduced or removed from the landscape, and structures are expanded, modified, or razed. Despite these transformations, the archeological evidence of conflict is often quite resilient and can be discovered through archeological investigation.

Archeological character of the flanking march is different than a formal battle combat situation. In Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes, no temporary or short-term encampments are present along the march route, and no major combat occurred during the march. Archeological potential for this project varies according to what type of archeological remains are being considered. There are two principal types of potential archeological remains that may be expected to be present; 1) Flanking march artifacts and/or features, and 2) Built feature landscape elements (ford crossings, road traces).

Flanking March Artifacts and/or Features

Trimble’s Ford Landscape

Potential to yield significant military archeological evidence associated with the flanking march in Trimble’s Ford Landscape is considered to be low. The principal military action that occurred on 11 September 1777 in both Landscapes was the movement of nearly 9,000 men, artillery, horses, and baggage through the rolling terrain of the Brandywine Valley. Such a movement, while extremely impressive to witness, was likely fairly ephemeral in regard to the physical evidence (e.g., military artifacts) that it would leave as an archeological ‘footprint’. Crown
Trimble's & Jefferis' Fords Strategic Landscapes Plan

Forces formations did slow and halt/rest while waiting to traverse the Trimble's Ford (and Jefferis Ford) Creek crossings, but such actions were of short duration and would leave comparatively small archeological signatures. The troops relatively short duration at and near the fords themselves is unlikely to have resulted in substantial lost accoutrements - buttons, buckles, bullets, etc. This is not to say that such items are not at all present, just that these are not likely to be in great numbers nor likely contribute a great deal to the understanding of the battle. This is the situation regardless of whether the areas have been plowed or unplowed. While from an archeological perspective the flank movement had short-term impact, it did have significant impact on the immediate physical surrounds in the form of damaged personal property as recorded by civilians through Depredation Claims, Plunder Claims, and Sufferings (Chapter 4).

The possible exception for low military archeology potential would be the skirmishing of Ross's detachment with the Crown Forces column. First-person accounts (Ewald and von Muenchhausen, for example) indicate that skirmishing began soon after the Crown Forces column started its flanking march. This action would have generated dropped and fired lead balls (musket balls) and may exhibit an archeological signature in the location where the skirmishing was most intense, perhaps in the vicinity of modern Red Lion Road (1728 Road to the Great Valley) and Corinne Road (1754 Road). On a comparative basis with the main combat that occurred later in the day at Street Road, Birmingham Meeting, Sandy Hollow, Chad’s Ford, and the Painter-Craig Farm, the number and density of military-related artifacts would be low. However, in comparison with a skirmish situation, archeological evidence may be possible.

Jefferis' Ford Landscape

At Jefferis’ Ford, a similar situation exists – the movement and temporary halt of a large body of soldiers is unlikely to leave a strong archeological signature. Both the march and halt were short-term events, not lasting long enough to have a significant archeological footprint. Once again, while soldiers did wait in the fields to cross, the potential for dropped buttons, buckles, buttons, or other military artifacts is likely low as they were not present for a long enough duration to yield lasting significant archeological evidence. Potential to yield significant military archaeological evidence associated with the flanking march in Jefferis’ Ford Landscape is considered to be low. Again, civilian recorded property damages caused by the Crown Forces did have a significant impact on the area but the archeological signature of that effect is considered to be low.

Built Feature Landscape elements

Trimble’s Ford Landscape

Archeological evidence of built features landscape elements is considered to be high in Trimble’s Ford Landscape. This is especially true at the ford and the road trace leading to it from the south (a portion of the 1728 Road to the Great Valley) and the north (a portion of the 1705 spur). A combination of the historical record, topographical information, and geophysical testing were used to examine the ford location along the Creek. The geophysical testing identified that there were two fords at Trimble’s - a secondary and primary ford - and their actual locations as well as portions of the road traces leading to them. The ford is an important archeological resource and highly significant element as a built defining feature of the Trimble’s Ford Landscape and the Brandywine Battlefield overall. Preservation of the fords, road traces, surrounding lands, and the open field character of the area are highly important considerations for Landscape and battlefield planning.

Jefferis’ Ford Landscape

Archeological evidence of built features landscape elements is mixed in Jefferis’ Ford Landscape. It is considered to be high at the road trace (1754 Road) leading from Trimble’s Ford to Jefferis Ford. Based on the historical record, the location of Jefferis’ Ford itself is at the current bridge crossing, and thus likely resulted in considerable ground alteration since its use in 1777. The placement of the bridge directly at the ford makes recovery of archeological evidence low potential.
Recommendations

Using the analysis undertaken in this chapter, the following recommendations were developed. Parties that may carry out a recommendation are noted after the related recommendation.

3-1. Further verify the location of the skirmish between Ross’s patrol and the Crown Forces and consider archeological evaluation after a location has been determined. (Military historian working with municipal historical commissions)

3-2. Research whether Ross’ patrol followed and skirmished with the Crown Forces rear line prior to and/or after the skirmish at modern Red Lion and Corinne Roads. Verify which road and ford Ross took to deliver his message to Washington. (Military historian working with municipal historical commissions)

3-3. Update 2013 Plan mapping to reflect the findings in this chapter. This includes the: probable location of Ross’ patrol, probable skirmish site between Ross’s detachment and the Crown Forces; probable route Ross would have taken to warn Gen’l. Washington of the Crown Forces northern presence and flank; updated 1777 road network approximation; and other information depicted on Map 3-1. As well, update the 2013 Plan mapping based on Behind the Lines Marshallton Strategic Landscape Plan’s probable location of Squire Cheyney and Col. Hannum’s observation of the British advance. (CCPC)

3-4. Update 2010 KOCOA analysis and mapping to reflect the findings in this chapter. This includes: defining features and KOCOA categories in Figure 3-1, archeological evidence of Trimble’s Ford actual location in Figure 3-2, and items listed in Recommendations 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3. (CCPC)

3-5. Provide updated information to battlefield communities, particularly West Bradford, Pocopson, Newlin, and East Bradford Townships where the Landscapes are located. This information can be used in municipal histories, for historical commission resources identification and documentation purposes, and for educational and outreach efforts (e.g. Chester County Towns Tours & Village Walks). (CCPC)

3-6. Provide updated information to BBTF members, in particular its Steering Committee members who guide and lead the BBTF. (CCPC)

3-7. Provide updated information to local heritage sites (e.g. Friends of Martin’s Tavern, Chester County Historical Society, and Brandywine Battlefield Park) and environmental stewardship organizations (e.g. Brandywine Red Clay Alliance), so they can incorporate the information into their historic interpretation, education, and stewardship outreach and efforts. (CCPC, municipal historical commissions, BBTF)

3-8. Provide updated information to land conservation groups (e.g. Brandywine Conservancy and Natural Lands Trust) and Chester County Open Space Department for their use in coordinating and bolstering land conservation and open space preservation to enhance quality of life, and possible public access and interpretation of historic landscapes. (CCPC, municipalities, BBTF)
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Chapter 4

Historic Context and Built Features Inventory

The 2010 Study provides a preliminary (‘windshield’) inventory of all historic resources (battle and non-battle era) in the battlefield and preliminarily identifies battle-era roads. Building on the 2010 Study, the 2013 Plan refines the historic resource inventory, identifies historic landscapes, and provides a preliminary inventory of evident defining features. The 2013 Plan recommends further evaluation of identified battle-era historic resources and defining features, particularly in strategic landscapes.

This plan takes the next step to ‘fine tune’ identification of battle-era built features of historic resources and roads in and near the Landscapes. To do this, features are considered as to whether and how they support each Landscape’s significance in the battlefield. Specifically, this chapter 1) reviews previously identified battle-era historic resources (2013 Plan) and roads (2010 Study), 2) evaluates whether they are also KOCOA built defining features, 3) considers their relationship in the contemporary landscape, and 4) provides related recommendations. Analytic methods used include the 2010 Study KOCOA analysis, 2013 Plan historic resource and defining features inventories, reference maps (historic atlases, aerial photographs), primary sources (firsthand accounts, road petitions, deeds, civilian property loss records), secondary sources (battle and township histories), and field study. Specific property deed information is found in Appendix B.

KOCOA Cultural Topography Analysis

Appendix A describes the 2010 Study’s KOCOA analysis and Chapter 3 focuses on aspects of KOCOA related to military strategy and geophysical battlefield analysis. This chapter focuses on aspects of KOCOA related to the built environment or cultural topography – places and built features found in battle accounts, historic maps, or other sources that help locate and identify the same in the modern landscape. Cultural topography (or built) feature examples are places/settlement patterns (villages, milling seats, farmsteads, or properties); structures (mills, houses, meetinghouses, or barns); or other manmade features (roads, fords, traces, woodlots, earthworks, or farm fields). For local planning purposes, KOCOA built features can generally be considered ‘historic resources’.

This plan uses KOCOA to review, update, and/or interpret previously identified built features in or near these Landscapes. As early areas in colonial West Bradford, Newlin, East Marlborough Townships (Trimble’s Ford Landscape), and East Bradford Township (Jeffers’ Ford Landscape), these Landscapes contain extant battle-era military-related and civilian built features. Today, Trimble’s Ford Landscape is located in Pocopson, West Bradford, and Newlin Townships, and Jeffers’ Ford Landscape is in East Bradford Township. Figures 4-1a (Trimble’s Ford Landscape) and 4-1b (Jeffers’ Ford Landscape) provide updated KOCOA cultural topography in and/or related to the Landscapes.

---

1 See ‘Statement of Significance’ in Chapter 2.
Historic Context

Historic context is an element of Landscape significance. This section goes into further discussion about Landscape context summarized in the ‘Statement of Significance’ (Chapter 2). Historic context shows patterns or trends that help explain an occurrence, property, structure, building, or site. Key elements of historic context are themes, geographical limits, and chronological periods, which provide perspective to understand and identify features as contributing to the Landscapes. For this plan evaluation, the geography is the approximate Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes boundaries and time period is 1777. Relevant broad themes are ‘18th century landscape’, ‘local community’, and ‘military activity’, with specific themes of: British tactical flank and advance, American military activity, 18th century Brandywine Valley, still readable battlefield landscape, battle impact on local residents, and enduring Quaker community roots.

Understanding historic context is necessary to more definitively identify built features as battle-era contributing resources. Features can be examined for how they support each Landscape’s significance and convey information about battle events and plan themes. Built features that are ‘contributing resources’ have characteristics that embody aspects of Landscape or battlefield significance and plan themes, while features that are also ‘defining’ relay information about battle military events.

Brandywine Valley

More so than many places in the American colonies, Chester County farms enjoyed fertile soil, moderate climate and access to nearby markets. Here the early, primarily Quaker, settlers quickly realized the quality of the rich soils, and that Brandywine Creek, with its many tributaries and considerable slope, could power numerous mills. To the north, settlers found added resources of a limestone valley (Chester County’s Great Valley), iron ore, and more powerful creeks to sustain ironworks and mills. Within 30 years of original

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING FEATURE</th>
<th>KOCOA CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources in Figure 4-2a</td>
<td>Key Terrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Baily House</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimble’s Ford(s) Primary archaeological site</td>
<td>Key Terrain, Obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimble’s Ford(s) Secondary archaeological site</td>
<td>Key Terrain, Obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley aka Great Valley Road (modern Red Lion Rd, Broad Run Rd)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728/1771 Trace of Road to the Great Valley to/from Trimble’s Ford (archaeological battle-era road sites from modern Red Lion Rd to secondary ford, primary ford, and the Creek with areas of visible road beds, e.g. on a Township trail/former Bragg Hill Rd)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705 Spur and Trace to/from Trimble’s Ford (modern Camp Linden Rd and archeological battle-era road site to the primary ford)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746 Spur to/from Marshallton village (modern Northbrook Rd) of 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Col. Ross’ patrol’s probable location and skirmish site on the 1728/1771 Road of the Great Valley (modern Red Lion Rd) near the 1742 Road (modern Corinne Rd)</td>
<td>Observation, Fields of Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742 Road and Trace, and 1706 Road to American Guard Posts at Wistar’s, Jone’s/ Painter’s, and Brinton’s Fords as probable as Ross’ reconnaissance report route. (modern Corinne Rd to Street Rd Bridge, and archaeological battle-era road sites from Corinne Rd to Street Rd with visible road bed on Denton Hollow Rd)</td>
<td>Key Terrain, Observation, Obstacle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: use of ‘Road’ indicates the approximate battle-era roadbed and road alignment still exist. ‘Spur is the approximate road extension of a battle-era road that still exists. ‘Trace’ indicates a former battle-era road that today is largely an archeological site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING FEATURE</th>
<th>KOCOA CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources in Figure 4-2b</td>
<td>Key Terrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferis’ Ford archaeological site (modern Jefferis’ Ford County Bridge #111, Allerton Rd)</td>
<td>Key Terrain, Obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705 Road to Dilworthtown village/Chester city to American Guard Posts at Buffaloington’s Ford and nearby Wistar’s Ford (modern N. Wawaset Rd, Bridge Rd, Creek Rd)</td>
<td>Key Terrain, Observation, Obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725/1764 Road to Turk’s Head village/Philadelphia (modern Strasburg Rd, Lucky Hill Rd, Allerton Rd, W. Miner St)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754 Trace (archaeological battle-era road sites from modern Camp Linden Rd to Lucky Hill Rd)</td>
<td>Avenue of Approach, Observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Note under Table 4-1a
settlement, increased demand and population led to building a second iron forge (c.1717 in Coventry) and additional mills in the County. By the 1790s, the Creek powered over 70 mills and over 130 at the height of use.

The Brandywine Creek’s east and west branches join to form its main stem at the ‘Forks of the Brandywine’ in East Bradford, with the west branch considered the ‘parent’ of the main stem. West Branch Brandywine Creek Multiple Resources and Thematic National Register Area was completed as part of a planning effort, which led to the successful designation of the lower Creek as part of the state Scenic River system, the focus of which is to support water quality and flow and protect pastoral scenic and historic characteristics including historic mill dams. The Thematic Area denotes the Creek’s significance as the ‘heart’ of the Brandywine Valley and focus of regional identity historically and today. For Lenni-Lenape Indians, the Creek was a source of food. For colonial (and 19th century) settlers, the Creek provided fertile soil for agriculture and hydropower for milling. In modern times, the Creek provides drinking water and recreation. The Thematic Area melds historic resources, landscapes, and natural resources, particularly the Creek. It encompasses villages, including Trimbleville and Northbrook, with commonalities of historical and architectural significance in origins, as 18th century milling seats augmented with modest houses and cottage industries.

Flour, wheat, corn, pork, beef, flaxseed, butter, and iron after 1750, were all important products produced in Chester County and surrounding counties, and were exported from Philadelphia to as far away as China. Although farms in the Brandywine Valley produced a wide variety of products, it was still a relatively modest yield overall. Physical clearing of land required rigorous manual labor and took a long while. By the time of the battle the region had been settled for 80 years, yet most farms still had uncleared lands. Fallow lands, woodlots, and meadows took up a relatively large proportion of cleared land. Livestock were few and usually found their own forage, roaming unfenced. Orchards and vegetable and herb gardens, as family food sources, rounded out the typical farmstead land-use pattern. More prosperous farms were located on the many creek tributaries, which would also power mills and serve as centers for trade before villages developed during the mid-18th century.

William Penn’s surveyors charted lands in Chester County in the late 1600s and many land patents were granted by the early 1700s. At the time of the battle, the majority of property owners in the Brandywine Valley were Quaker. A key tenant of Quaker faith was testimonies or descriptions of faithful actions. The Peace Testimony (the majority of Quakers practiced) were actions to promote peace and refrain from participation in war. These actions were documented by individuals as ‘sufferings’ and recorded at their Meetinghouses as testimonies of good conscience. Likewise, non-Quaker property owners filed depredation claims against the Crown and/or plunder claims ‘deductions’ on their state tax assessment, indicating they had experienced losses from battle actions1. Due to their nature, depredations generally include more detailed information than plunders or sufferings. Sufferings and claims2 by landowners were researched for this plan to provide a broad understanding of ‘on the ground goings on’ that occurred, level of support or lack thereof both armies experienced, and the impact of the battle on the civilian community. Sufferings and claims are key information for this plan as, when mapped as to their location of occurrence, they reveal places where troops were present. This information, combined with understanding the battle-era road network, location of properties and owners, and first person accounts and histories, is critical for Chapter 3’s analysis and helping to identify the path of the British flank.

---

1 Plunder claims – Individuals identified as ‘plundered’ in the state tax assessment compiled following the events of September 1777. The local tax assessment took place in late fall and early winter of 1777 and was then returned to the County Assessor’s by January 5, 1778. Individuals who were plundered had their taxes forgiven or abated. (Chester County Tax Records, S-1a). Depredation claims – A register compiled in November 1782 that contains accounts of property of Chester County residents seized or (not as frequently) destroyed, without compensation, by the Crown Forces, aided by ‘adherents’ (Pennsylvania Tories), during their march toward and occupation of Philadelphia, from the fall of 1777 until June 1778. Most of the accounts are for damages that occurred during Crown Force marches through Chester County in mid-September 1777. Township and borough tax assessors, acting upon the orders of the County Commissioners, collected these accounts in their respective municipalities.

2 Research included Sufferings, Plunders, and Depredations known at the time of this plan, which varied per community. It is not known if this variation is because no Sufferings or Claims occurred in a community, or instead if records are privately held by individual families or have been lost.
Trimble’s Ford Landscape

West Bradford Township Historic Context

Bradford Township was organized in 1705 and divided and incorporated into East and West Bradford Townships in 1731. The earliest settlers were English Quakers, many having acquired large land tracts by patent that subsequently were divided into farms. Settlement initially occurred along streams. Quaker Richard Buffington, Sr. has been described as the ‘founding member’ of West Bradford’s earliest family, obtaining land along Brandywine Creek as early as 1696. Among the earliest settlers are Abraham Marshall and his wife Mary, English Quaker immigrants, who established their homestead, Derbydown c. 1707, along the Creek’s west branch. A rock on the boundary of their property marked the northernmost point of William Penn’s 1706 repurchase of Native American lands. They raised nine children and helped to establish Bradford Friends Meeting, which first convened on their land prior to moving to its permanent home in Marshallton village around 1730. Their descendants erected additional homes, built a grist mill and saw mill, and ran prosperous farms (see Pocopson Historic Context). Their son, Humphrey, became an esteemed botanist authoring important botanical books and establishing a botanical garden and arboretum at his 1773 brick home that still stands in Marshallton village. He was elected into the American Philosophical Society.

West Bradford’s early economy, like that of its neighboring communities, was agriculturally based with pockets of rural industry. The majority of residents were Quakers belonging to the Bradford Friends Meeting. Rural industry included lime kilns, blacksmith forges, a spinning wheel factory, tanners, and mills. Commerce in villages included general stores, taverns, a carriage painter, and cigar factory. Having a good central location, West Bradford was known as a place of prosperous farmers and prominent middle-class craftsmen. It had 25 residents in 1715, and 81 residents by 1760. During the Colonial era, original log homes gave way to stone and brick structures. By the first Census in 1790, the Township had 725 residents and in 1820, 1,739 residents.

Trimbleville village grew at the juncture of the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley and its 1746 Spur to Marshallton village. Its colonial history is related to the importance of these major roads, the Creek and its tributary Broad Run, and ford. Its origins are a 3-way partnership for a grist and saw mill on 70 acres. The mill was established in 1740 along the Broad Run tributary and was sold by William and Elizabeth Marshall in 1744 to Robert Mendenhall and brothers William and James Trimble. In addition to its commercial mill use, the property held a ford across the Creek’s west branch. James and Ann Trimble settled along the Creek in 1738, transferred to Bradford Meeting, and bought the other two shares of the mill in 1751. In addition to running the mill, the family farmed and acquired additional land in 1758, their 121 acres becoming the core of the village. Trimbleville Historic District straddles the Creek and a portion crosses into modern Pocopson Township, which was still part of West Bradford at the time of the battle, Trimbleville is significant for its settlement and continued occupation by Quaker Families, multi-generational farming and milling, its key role in the battle, and as an example of pastoral Chester County.

Marshallton and Romansville villages grew along the Strasburg Road, one of the main routes between Philadelphia and Lancaster in the mid-1700s. Being a ‘free market road’, it became West Bradford’s main thoroughfare and bustled with miller’s wagons and drovers. These drovers would herd their sheep, cattle, pigs, and turkeys from Lancaster to Philadelphia for sale, stopping each evening at an inn along the road.

Newlin Township Historic Context

In June 1724, Nathaniel Newlin took possession of 7,100 acres from the Free Society of Traders who had purchased this land and more from William Penn in 1681. In 1740, the Newlin tract of land became a township, and was named for Nathaniel. Early founding families that settled in the eastern portion of the Township were Richard Barnard, Joshua Pusey, and Thomas Buffington. In 1849, 300 acres were taken from the southeast corner of Newlin for the newly formed Pocopson Township.
The history of Newlin revolves around the Brandywine Creek and its tributaries and the Lenni-Lenape Indians who were native inhabitants of the Brandywine Valley. Indian Hannah, the last of the tribe, lived along the Creek’s west branch near her tribe’s ancient burial grounds. She died in 1802 and was buried in the Township on the grounds of the old Poorhouse (the former Embreeville Hospital). In her later years, 33 local Quaker families, including Thomas Buffington, Mordecai Hayes, Caleb Harlan, and Samuel Marshall, provided for her support. This rural Quaker community built the Marlborough Meetinghouse in 1801.

Mills, homes and hamlets were built along the Creek. One of the earliest recorded mills was near the hamlet of Embreeville. A deed from 1756 notes a corn, grist and saw mill in the hamlet. The stone core of the mill still stands with an addition dating from 1883 and is familiar to many as the Embreeville Mill. Nearby, Harvey’s Mill site and house date from 1780. The hamlet of Laurel, on the boundary with East Fallowfield Township, was the location of the Laurel Iron Works, originally founded in 1793. Still one of Chester County’s more rural communities, there are more horses than homes in Newlin Township today.

**Pocopson Township Historic Context**

Pocopson Township was formed through a petition to the Court of Quaker Sessions in late 1848 signed by 28 male inhabitants of Pennsbury, West Bradford, East Marlborough and Newlin Townships pleading “they labor under great inconvenience for want of a new township.” Although three of the townships losing territory with Pocopson’s formation vigorously contested the application, Pocopson was approved by the Court and ordered an election of township officers in 1849. While battle events technically took place on lands that were in West Bradford and Newlin, for ease of understanding this plan discusses historic activity in terms of today’s Pocopson.

Joel Baily acquired land along Brandywine Creek in 1758 and 1764 from his mother’s side, the Caldwells. He was a member of Bradford Meeting where he married Abraham Marshall’s granddaughter, Elizabeth. A clockmaker as well as a surveyor, he worked for Mason and Dixon, participated in the 1769 observation of the eclipse of Venus, and was elected into the American Philosophical Society.

The importance of Trimble’s Ford as a key component of the colonial road infrastructure should not be underestimated and can be seen in the number of roads and Townships it served. From the south, the four primary roads to the Great Valley from Kennett, East Marlborough, Newlin, Pocopson and Pennsbury converged at the floodplains where the ford was located. The 1742 Road that intersected the 1728 Road to the Great Valley, which was utilized by Crown Forces, brought goods and people from East Bradford and Birmingham Townships north via Trimble’s Ford. Locally, the ford was the main crossing of the Creek from Marshallton and points north towards Baltimore. The first covered bridge in the County, c. 1807, was built southwest of the ford in Northbrook village, at the site of an early, small, private bridge owned and used by the Marshall family to connect their land holdings on either side of the Creek. Once safe passage over the Creek was available via the public bridge, the ford fell into disuse until it vanished along with the immediate road system serving it. With the advent of bridges, colonial thoroughfares changed however they can still be traced today (Chapter 3).

One of the most historic areas of Pocopson is the Northbrook area, which lies south of Trimbleville and was settled in the early 18th century by the Marshalls, an early Chester County family with a long tradition of milling. Their son, Humphry, a renowned botanist, inherited the homestead (Derbydown in West Bradford) in 1759. A stone mason by trade, he enlarged it in 1764, and acquired additional lands and built a mill. He was assisted with botany and milling by his nephew, Dr. Moses Marshall, who built a stone house in 1746 on the mill property. Moses inherited the mill property and other lands after Humphry’s death in 1801. The saw mill, rebuilt in 1958, remains in use today, run by two members of the Marshall family who live on the original tract; one in a battle-era house that is a battlefield historic resource. Due to the family’s prominence, Northbrook village originally was known as Marshall’s Mill and the original Marshall tract occupies much of the village.
Northbrook’s historic importance is recognized through its designation as a historic district. Northbrook Historic District straddles the Brandywine Creek and extends into Newlin and West Bradford, however the majority of the district is in Pocopson with buildings representing an assortment of historic uses. The district is significant for its association with the Lenni-Lenape Indians, its settlement and longstanding occupation by an early prominent Chester County family, and the later 19th century railroad system. Its association with the Creek’s west branch is a common element of its significance.

Jefferis’ Ford Landscape

East Bradford Township Historic Context

Bradford Township was established in 1705, being named after the town of Bradford, England. In 1731, Bradford was divided into East and West Bradford. The early Quakers found the area to be an ideal setting due to its abundant natural resources and convergence of the east and west branches of the Brandywine Creek that could support many mills. One of the most successful was Strode’s Mill (today a popular framing studio where artist Andrew Wyeth had much of his work framed), established by John Willis, George Carter, and Samuel Scott. The Strode’s Mill area provides important Township history and will be a focus of the Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Strategic Landscape Plan. The mill was a grain, flour, saw, and cider mill. Several other mills powered by the Creek and its tributaries include Grubb’s, Woodward’s, Shrack’s, Dixon’s, and Bower’s mills. A tilt hammer mill was established in the 1790s near Taylor’s Ford, one of the fords that existed at the time of the battle (Map 3-1).

In 1805, one of Chester County’s earliest and distinguished stone arch bridges, Cope’s Bridge, was built on the Strasburg Road, replacing the ford. Cope’s Bridge lies in historic Copesville and today’s Taylor-Cope Historic District. This district is adjacent to Jefferis’ Ford and Marshallton Landscapes, within the battlefield, and denotes one of the earliest settlements in Chester County. Abiah Taylor settled on 430 acres in 1702, and in 1719 built a mill on Taylor Run. By 1777, Taylor owned a saw mill, grist mill, farm, hatter’s shop, and inn on the Strasburg Road. His residence, barn, and mill house still stand and are contributing resources within the district. In 1840, Copesville resident Gilbert Cope, and James S. Futhey, authored the legendary History of Chester County. In the 19th century, the southernmost portion of East Bradford became part of modern Birmingham Township.

For this plan, the primary historic context focus is Worth/Jefferis Rural Historic District and Jefferis’ Ford. The ford stretched between the land of two Jefferis’ family members, and was located where historical accounts indicate the Creek was broad but shallow. Worth/Jefferis Rural Historic District is mostly located in East Bradford, with a portion extending into West Bradford. The district includes 10 farms and 47 contributing resources on approximately 1,800 acres. George Carter (1716 purchase), Thomas Buffington (1709 purchase), Thomas Worth (c. 1720 purchase), and James Jefferis (who married Elizabeth Carter in 1728) were some of the primary founding property owners on lands in the district. Their farmhouses remain, reflecting English Colonial vernacular building traditions of the time, and integrating Georgian and Federal architectural elements. Their associated tenant houses exhibit the well-used regional Penn Plan of the time. In addition to extant historic buildings, rural historic districts also take into account other characteristics, including landscape features (road networks, vegetation), land use, spatial layout, and presence of cultural traditions. The district reflects a settlement pattern representative of original English Quaker settlement, distinct collection of rural Pennsylvania agricultural buildings (barns, farmhouses, and tenant houses associated with the 10 farms), and landscape elements of roads, fields, rolling terrain, hedgerows, and farmsteads. The 1725 Road ran through today’s district, connecting families to the 1719/1705 Road and the larger region, including the early established (c.1684) Concord Quarterly Quaker Meeting, Chester city, and Philadelphia. Later roads (1744 and 1764) provided more direct access to Philadelphia markets and the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting1.

---

1 Places of worship for Quakers are generally called Monthly Meetings. Monthly Meetings located in close to one another conduct business through Quarterly Meetings, which are Monthly Meetings that also serve this added purpose. All are under the umbrella of a Yearly Meeting which is also determined by geography. In Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting is the oldest and largest. (PHMC website, 2015)
**Historic Structures, Properties, Sites**

This section reviews, refines, and updates information for previously inventoried battle-era historic resources from the 2013 Plan. It seeks to refine identification of battle-era built features that speak or contribute to the overall story of the Landscapes in the battlefield as contributing resources (Figures 4-2a and 4-2b). It also notes those resources that relate to battle events as KOCOA built defining features and includes descriptions of such for each Township. For the purposes of this plan, historic resources include battle-era buildings, structures, sites, and properties. Resources are looked at in terms of Landscape significance, context, and settlement pattern, using analytical methods listed on page 4-1. Historic resources identified through this analysis also represent aspects of plan themes. Contributing resources, whether they are defining features, National Register, or other designation, are equally valuable resources that tell the story of differing but important aspects of the battle and battlefield and are worthy of protection. This section also notes historic resources that are interpretive features for heritage interpretation in Chapter 6 (Figures 4-2a, 4-2b, and 4-2c) and other extant battle-era historic resources inventoried in the 2013 Plan (Figure 4-2c) that still contribute to the battlefield, and, as such, are carried forth into this plan but are generally in need of additional research.

Prominent regional settlement patterns, building types, and architectural design choices characterize both Landscapes and embody the pattern of colonial life. Farmhouses, tenant houses, and outbuildings on farmsteads dotted the landscape near roads for access to farm products and markets. Today many historic buildings are found abutting the edge of roads, as roads have widened and improved over the centuries since the battle. Settlements also included early crossroads with tradesmen (blacksmith or wheelwright shops), mills, homes, and taverns. Some buildings served the unanticipated, impromptu role as field hospitals, officer’s headquarters, and troop concealment for the battle. Most structures were owned/built by original settlement families (primarily Quaker), with a few erected by or for farm staff, millers, and tavern owners. Buildings are mostly conservative and practical in design, befitting the tastes of their builders. Structures were often built in phases and expanded, even in the early colonial era, to reflect multi-generational growth or inclusion of a new use. Common architectural elements include: 2-story, stone construction, side-gable roofs, and representations of English Colonial vernacular building types popular in the region.

In order to accomplish this analysis, research and analytical mapping presenting a depiction¹ of the battle-era development pattern (Map 4-1a and 4-1b²) was undertaken by Chester County Archives using primary source materials. Mapping displays known property lines, owners, and roads as they likely existed in 1777, providing a good representation of the battle-era landscape. This is critical in analyzing the battlefield, as insight on the development pattern (road network and location/size/ownership of properties) is necessary to identify extant features contributing and/or relating to the Landscapes. The mapped 1777 landscape can then be compared to historic accounts and battle and township histories to understand the civilian population (major families, locations of their properties, and their relative’s properties in association/distance to one another), and ascertain today’s locations of historic accounts and battle-era structures/properties. Important particularly to Chapter 3’s battle and geophysical analysis, property location/owner mapping is used to trace the British advance through the battlefield using Quaker sufferings and civilian recordings of depredation and plunder claims.

---

¹ In is important to note when looking at the developed battle-era landscape maps that they are depictions. For example, there were instances during the process of mapping roads that researchers found roads were improperly laid out, not completed, used but not officially recorded, or abandoned but road vacating was never recorded. As well, minor paths, e.g. farm lanes, would not have been recorded, and it was found during the research process that during the 19th century records from the 18th century were destroyed.

² Base Map: Breou’s Official Series of Farm Maps, Chester County, 1883
Trimble’s Ford Landscape Battle Events

West Bradford Township Description

Most of the battle military activity that occurred in West Bradford took place in and near today’s Trimbleville Historic District. Buildings located here provide examples of rural vernacular architecture from the colonial to federal periods, and reflect the simple and conservative lifestyle of their Quaker builders. James Trimble owned the ford and land to the north in 1777 when Crown Forces used his ford to reach the Creek’s north bank. Like the Bailys and Marshalls, the Trimbles lived along the direct path of the Crown Forces flank. Francis Trimble, possible tenant on the Baily property, reported losses of “4 draught horses and gears, 28 barrels of Hower”.

At the time of the battle, it is surmised that a blacksmith shop was located within close proximity of Trimble’s Ford on the James Marshall property and/or John Carpenter property. This is based on archeological evidence of slag found at the ford (Chapter 3). Slag from blacksmith operations would have been applied to fill ‘pot’ holes that formed in the ford, likely due to the constant flooding of the Creek and high level of ‘traffic’ using the ford to cross the Creek. John Highfield, a tenant blacksmith, filed a depredation claim for “1 horse, 1 sadle & 2 bridles, 1 blanket, 1 sheet, 1 pair of new shoes & buckles, 1 smothing iron, 2 shirts, 1 pair of gloves, 1 jacket & gown, 3 axes, 6 barrs of iron, shoeing and other smith tools”. Highfield lost his possessions of trade to Crown Forces and never recovered, such that he and his wife died in the County poorhouse. Robert Ingram settled in Trimbleville and established a tenant blacksmith shop on John Carpenter’s 1764 property, from whom Ingram purchased 50+ acres of farmland in 1795. It is possible that Ingram’s shop was the site of Highfield’s shop earlier, and/or that Highfield’s shop by the time of the battle was on a tenant property on James Marshall’s land that was closer to the Ford. A school was established in the early 1800s on the former James Marshall property where Highfield’s tenant house likely was located at the time of the battle. James Marshall recorded a depredation claim for losses of “4 draught horses, 200 lbs cheese”.

One of the two known eyewitness accounts of the flanking march took place in West Bradford. On September 11, 1777, Justice ‘Squire’ Thomas Cheyney and Col. John Hannum sighted a large number of Crown Forces near Trimble’s Ford at the Brandywine Creek’s west branch. Tradition holds that Cheyney rode to warn Gen’l. Washington of Crown Forces occurrence in the area. The sighting most likely took place at the Joshua Clayton House in West Bradford, which is extant and has an excellent view of the ford. Joshua Clayton was a cousin of Cheyney’s wife and it is very likely the two men knew each other well. Clayton’s House is located on today’s Northbrook Road, the 1746 Spur to/from Marshallton village of the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley.

Altogether in modern West Bradford, known depredation and plunder claims and Sufferings along the flanking route leaving Trimble’s Ford were recorded by: John Highfield (Depredation), James Trimble (Plunder, Suffering), and James Marshall (Plunder, Depredation, Suffering).

Newlin Township Description

The only reported encounter with the British advance in Newlin Township was by Richard Barnard, who recorded the loss of a mare to Crown Forces. Barnard’s property was nearby the flank route and his son happened to be riding in the flank’s path when the mare was procured.

Pocopson Township Description

Around 10am the morning of the battle, Lt. Col. James Ross of Lancaster encountered the British advance on the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley. His 11am letter of warning to Gen’l. Washington (Chapter 2) reported an ambush and skirmish that involved the death of an enemy solider. He also identified Joseph Galloway, the known loyalist who was guiding Gen’l Howe and Maj. Gen’l. Cornwallis on their advance. The first skirmish in the northern battlefield between American Forces and Crown Forces likely took place near the intersection of the
1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley and 1742 Road that led to Jone’s/Painter’s and Brinton’s Fords and Gen’l. Sullivan’s position on the east side of the Creek. (Chapter 3) The skirmish occurred on property owned in 1777 by Richard Baker, Sr., and his house, still stands at the juncture of modern Red Lion and Unionville-Wawaset Roads. Baker reported losses of “5 horses, cheese”. His property is part of Brandywine Red Clay Alliance (BRCA) lands. To the north of Baker’s house the 1728 Road Trace of the Road to the Great Valley that went to Trimble’s Ford also is also part of BRC Alliance lands.

About the same time, an American infantry patrol from Gen’l. Sullivan’s Division scouting on the west side of the Creek came to the farm of Joel Baily, which overlooks Trimble’s Ford about four miles northwest of Brinton’s Ford, where the American Army was facing Gen’n. Knyphausen. Baily was a well-to-do Quaker who owned nearly 250 acres and a grist mill. Mistaking the Maryland Regiment for a British patrol Baily provided the patrol with a meal. Capt. Mountjoy Bayly reminisced 40 years later that his regiment beat a “hasty retreat” when the front of the British line came into view “on the Great Valley Road, a mile or so away to the south.” Though a loyalist, Baily lost “4 horses, 5 fat sheep, 300 lbs cheese, 4 holland shirts, 1 coat, 3 aprons, 1 petty coat, 2 short gowns, 4 fine handkerchiefs, stockings, 1 brass kettle, 6 pewter bassoons & potting ere, 1 pewter quart and sundry smith tools. 1 horse taken by Maj. Brewin” to Crown Forces.

Newly attributed to Trimbleville Historic District as a result of research for this plan is the Joel Baily House, which had incorrectly been attributed to a possible tenant house on the Baily property, but which actually sits at a prominent location on a remaining portion of the original colonial road bed of the 1728 Road to the Great Valley. The Baily House and property are highly significant to the Trimble’s Ford Landscape. The primary Trimble’s Ford abutted (on the northeast) the Baily property, and the secondary Trimble’s Ford and associated floodplain lands for both fords were on the Baily property through which the 1728 Road to the Great Valley also traversed on its approach to the Fords.

The Northbrook area also played a role in the battle. Humphry Marshall had expanded his family’s land holdings including building a mill (in modern Pocopson). His nephew, Dr. Moses Marshall, built his stone residence on the mill property in 1746. Jonathan Buffington, the tenant miller on the property at the time of the battle, reported losses of “2 horses with gears, 1 mare, 1 ax”. Dr. Marshall assisted in caring for the wounded at the battle.

South of Northbrook on the 1728 Road to the Great Valley are the Allen, Cloud, and Eckoff family properties. Mordecai/Abner Cloud property, individually eligible for the National Register, reported a loss of “1 sorrel mare”. David Eckhoff reported losses of “3 mares, a quantity of leather dressed”. As they were located along the direct route of the Crown Force’s marching route, properties along the 1728 Road to the Great Valley generally experienced losses. An exception is James Allen whose property abutted the 1728 Road, but whose primary residence was well west of the flank. Altogether in modern Pocopson, known depredation and plunder claims and sufferings along the flanking route approaching Trimble’s Ford were recorded by: John Battin (Plunder, Suffering), Francis Trimble (Depredation), Joel Baily (First Person Account, Plunder, Depredation, Suffering), Jonathan Buffington (Plunder, Depredation), Richard Baker (Plunder, Depredation), Abner Cloud (Depredation), and David Eckhoff (Depredation).

**Jefferis’ Ford Landscape Battle Events**

**East Bradford Township Description**

Approximately 9,000 Crown Force troops passed on the now abandoned 1754 Road Trace that connected the 1705 Spur from Trimble’s Ford to the 1725 Road, which crossed the Creek’s east branch at Jefferis’ Ford. Of the 10 farms in the district, Barr Farm was owned by George Carter, Jr. at the time of the battle and he recorded losses to Crown Forces who passed his residence and lands located on the north side of the 1754 Trace. Barry Farm, to the south of the 1754 Trace, was owned by Richard and Ann Jones who also reported losses to Crown Forces. The extant house, built in 1790, includes the chimney remains of the earlier Jones house in the cellar.
James Jefferis owned the property immediately to the east of the Jefferis’ Ford creek crossing and his brother Emmor Jefferis owned Blue Rock Farm immediately west of the ford. His son or brother (both were named James) reported a loss of “2 horses” to Crown Forces.

In an 1845 letter, Dr. William Darlington recounted Emmor Jefferis’ ordeal at the hands of Crown Forces who begin fording the Creek on his land. Emmor, a Quaker farmer at the time of the battle, was compelled by Gen’l Howe to guide the Crown Forces across Jefferis’ Ford and towards Birmingham Meeting. As a result, Emmor was with Gen’l. Howe for part of the battle. The letter reads, “...Howe moved on after the army, taking Mr. Jefferis some distance with him. Mr. J often used to relate, that when they approached the contending forces, the bullets from the Americans whistled so sharply by him, that he could not refrain from dodging his head, as they passed;” Emmor’s terror amused his captor. “Sir William observing, called out very encouragingly – “Don’t be afraid Mr. Jefferis, they wont hurt you”. Mr. J. however, took the earliest opportunity to quit the scene, and return home.” Although the American retreat had begun, the battle was not over when Emmor took his leave. Gen’l. Washington in his second dispatch of the day to the president of Congress said, “At half after four o’clock, the enemy attacked General Sullivan at the next ford above us [Brinton’s Ford] and the action has been violent ever since.”

In East Bradford, along the flanking route approaching Jefferis’ Ford, known claims and Sufferings include those recorded by: George Carter (Suffering), Richard Jones (Suffering), and James Jefferis (Depredation).

Unlike Trimble’s Ford, a bridge was later built at Jefferis’ Ford, c. 1833, 56 years after the Crown Forces took the same route, while the current Jefferis’ Ford Bridge, c. 1905, crosses the Creek at the same place today.

**Historic Resources Contributing to the Landscapes**

While the 2013 Plan takes a macro look at battle-era historic resources and evident defining features throughout the battlefield, this plan takes a micro look at historic resources that were present at the time of the battle in or near the Landscapes and contribute to Landscapes significance or plan themes, and may also inform about battle events. Figures 4-2a (Trimble’s Ford) and 4-2b (Jefferis’ Ford) update the 2013 Plan historic resource and defining features inventories for these Landscapes, and are categorized as ‘contributing’ resources to the Landscapes. (These resources are shown on Map 4-2.) Structures and sites listed in the figures stood at the time of the battle, and as such are listed by their battle-era property owner or tenant names unless otherwise indicated. In all figures, ‘Map IDs’ with a ‘N’ indicate newly identified historic resources since the 2013 Plan. Figures also show current historic resource designation status (e.g., resources in and designated as contributing to a Historic District) and indicate suggested future designation based on this plan analysis. Designations include resources that are currently: National Historic Landmarks (NHL), individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NR), contributing to a National Register Historic District (HD), and/or identified as a KOCOA built defining feature (KOCOA), and that are recommended to be considered for National Register eligibility as individual resources or as part of a current historic district (NRE), as locally significant (Local), and/or an interpretive resource (Interp2).

---

1 In the 2013 Plan, Historic Resources are listed in Figure 3.6 and Defining Features in Figure 3.9, and both are shown on Map 3.12.
2 See heritage tour in Chapter 6 and Appendix C.
## Figure 4-2a: Trimble’s Ford Landscape Contributing Historic Resources & Current and Recommended Resource Designation Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>PARCEL NUMBER</th>
<th>PARCEL ADDRESS</th>
<th>OWNER/ASSOCIATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
<th>RECOMM. STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NHL:</td>
<td>NR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HD:</td>
<td>NR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCH:</td>
<td>NR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NRE:</td>
<td>LDC:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERP:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEST BRADFORD TOWNSHIP**

| 50.07  | 50-9-25      | 311 Broad Run Rd | Trimbleville HD: John Carpenter 1764 Farm with Robert Ingram Blacksmith House/Shop and Wheelwright Shop (extant) as possible site of earlier John Highfield Blacksmith Shop (possible site of John Highfield – Depredation) | Y Y Y Y Y Y |
| 50.09  | 50-9-37      | 301 Northbrook Rd | Trimbleville HD: James Trimble 1738 Farm with c.1750 Miller House, Barn, Mill (extant). Later c.1820 Farmhouse(extant) (James Trimble – Plunder, Suffering) | Y Y Y Y Y Y |
| 50.10  | 50-9-31.1 50-9-30 | 1573, 1451 Camp Linden Rd | Trimbleville HD: James Marshall Farm with former school (extant) as possible site of earlier John Highfield Blacksmith Shop. Later 1811 barn (extant) and James Marshall potential residence site (James Marshall - Plunder, Depredation, Suffering) (alternate possible site of John Highfield – Depredation) | Y Y Y Y Y Y |
| 50.24N | 50-9-27      | 339 Broad Run Rd | Associated with, but not listed in Trimbleville HD: John Carpenter Farm and probable stone Residence (extant) | Y Y |

**POCOPSON TOWNSHIP**

| 63.08  | 63-1-9      | 1511 Unionville-Wawaset Rd | John Battin Farm (extant) (John Battin – Plunder, Suffering) | Y Y Y Y |
| 63.19  | 63-1-10     | 45 Bragg Hill Rd | Trimbleville HD: Joel Baily 1758 Farm with possible Francis Trimble Tenant House (extant) and Trimble’s Ford floodplain lands (extant) (Francis Trimble - Depredation) | Y Y Y Y Y Y |
| 63.21N | 63-1-8      | 15 Bragg Hill Rd | Associated with, but not listed in Trimbleville HD: Joel Baily 1758 Farm with c.1770 Residence (extant) (Joel Baily - Plunder, Depredation, Suffering; American Capt. Bayly - Account) | Y Y Y Y |
| 63.22aN | 63-1-12 63-9-38 (50-9-37) | PHMC Site¹ | Associated with, but not listed in Trimbleville HD: Primary Trimble’s Ford (archaeological site) | Y Y Y |
| 63.22bN | 63-1-12.1 (63-1-12) | PHMC Site¹ | Associated with, but not listed in Trimbleville HD: Secondary Trimble’s Ford (archaeological site) | Y Y Y |
| 63.13  | 63-1-5 63-1-42 63-1-42.2 63-1-42.4 | 205 Northbrook Rd 59 Northbrook Rd, 184, 60 Bragg Hill Rd | Northbrook HD: Humphrey Marshall property with c.1746 Dr. Moses Marshall Residence, and Jonathan Buffington Tenant Miller House and Mill Marshall property farm field abutting flanking march (Jonathan Buffington – Plunder, Depredation) | Y Y Y Y Y Y |
| 63.23N | 63-3-7      | 1775 Unionville-Wawaset Rd | Richard Baker Farm and Residence (extant) (Richard Baker - Plunder, Depredation) | Y Y Y Y |
| 63.24N | 63-3-8 63-3-80 63-3-80.1 | PHMC Site¹ | Probable location of Lt. Col. Ross’ patrol and site of reported skirmish with Crown Forces (the 1728 Road to the Great Valley (modern Red Lion Rd) near the 1742 Road (modern Corinne Rd) | Y Y Y Y |
| 63.20  | 63-3-79     | 651 Haines Mill Rd | Abner Cloud property, probable Residence (extant), and archeological mill site. (Abner Cloud – Depredation) | Y Y Y Y Y |
| 63.26N | 63-3-104    | 655 Red Lion Rd | David Eckhoff property (David Eckhoff - Depredation) | Y Y |
| 63.27N | 63-3-99.1   | 630 Red Lion Rd | David Eckhoff property with possible Tannery site | Y Y Y Y |
| 63.28N | 61-3-7      | 770 Marlboro Spring Rd | Joseph Eckhoff property with possible Wheelwright Shop site | Y |

¹ Newly identified archeological sites that will be filed with the Pennsylvanian Historical Museum Commission.
**Figure 4-2b: Jefferis’ Ford Landscape Contributing Historic Resources & Current and Recommended Resource Designation Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>PARCEL NUMBER</th>
<th>PARCEL ADDRESS</th>
<th>OWNER/ASSOCIATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
<th>RECOMM. STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NHL</td>
<td>AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.05</td>
<td>51-7-7</td>
<td>145 Lucky Hill Rd</td>
<td>Worth-Jeffeरis Hist. Dist.: Abraham Taylor Farm and Residence (extant). ('Lucky Hill Farm', residence intact, barn rebuilt in 1980s)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.06</td>
<td>51-6-2.3</td>
<td>320 Lucky Hill Rd</td>
<td>Worth-Jeffeरis HD: George Carter Farm with c.1726 Residence (called Barr Farmhouse in HD) (George Carter – Suffering)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.07</td>
<td>51-7-5</td>
<td>175 Lucky Hill Rd</td>
<td>Worth-Jeffeरis Dist: Emmor Jefferis Farm, with Wheelwright Shop &amp; assoc. Tenant House (extant)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.10</td>
<td>51-7-21.1</td>
<td>1104 Allerton Rd</td>
<td>Emmor Jefferis ‘Blue Rocks’ Farm, Residence, and Barn (extant) with James (Emmor’s son), Local tradition is that a large amount of brandy was taken by Crown Forces. (Post-1777 residence became ‘Sign of the Eel’s Foot’ Tavern) (James Jefferis - Depredation, alternate location*)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.29N</td>
<td>51-7-6</td>
<td>165 Lucky Hill Rd</td>
<td>Emmor Jefferis Hist. Dist: Emmor Jefferis Farm with Blacksmith Shop Site</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.30N</td>
<td>51-7-7.4</td>
<td>155 Lucky Hill Rd</td>
<td>Associated with, but not listed in, Worth-Jeffeरis HD: Emmor Jefferis Farm with associated Blacksmith shop site</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.08</td>
<td>51-6-16</td>
<td>240 Lucky Hill Rd</td>
<td>Worth-Jeffeरis Hist. Dist: Thomas Worth Farm with Tenant House (extant)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.13</td>
<td>51-6-3.4</td>
<td>137 N. Wawaset Rd</td>
<td>Emmor Jefferis HD: Richard and Ann Jones Farm and Residence site (extant c.1790 house still has a chimney support from the earlier house visible in the cellar) (Richard Jones – Suffering)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.31N</td>
<td>51-7-14</td>
<td>975 W. Miner St.</td>
<td>Associated with, but not listed in, Worth-Jeffeरis HD: James Jefferis Farm site (Emmor’s Brother) (James Jefferis – Depredation, alternate location*)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.32N</td>
<td>Bridge site</td>
<td>PHMC Site 1090, 1104 Allerton Rd</td>
<td>Associated with, but not listed in, Worth-Jeffeरis HD: Jefferis’ Ford archaeological site (at modern Jefferis’ Ford County Bridge #111 on Allerton Rd) and surrounding lands that Crown Forces traversed</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.33N</td>
<td>51-7-18</td>
<td>171, 180 S. Bridge Rd, 200 S. Creek Rd</td>
<td>Buffington’s Ford site (at modern Shaw’s Bridge and Park on S. Bridge Rd) Buffington’s Ford site and ‘Forks of the Brandywine’ where the Creek’s main stem splits into the east and west branches</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The depredation claim is for a James Jefferis, who is either the son or brother of Emmor.*

**Additional Historic Resources contributing to the Battlefield**

Figure 4-2b lists and Map 4-2 depict other extant battle-era historic resources inventoried in the 2013 Plan that contribute to the battlefield and have the possibility of being battlefield defining features. Further investigation of these resources is needed, but is outside the scope of work for this plan. Unlike the prior tables, Figure 4-2b does not include columns for ‘KOCOA’ and ‘NRE’ as this information has yet to be determined via further studies.

Approximate location of the 1777 uphill “defile”, a narrow passage, which 9,000 Crown Force troops climbed near the end of their flanking advance towards the high ground of Osborne Hill after crossing Jefferis’ Ford and having marched around 12-miles since early that morning.
Figure 4-2c: Historic Resources Contributing to the Brandywine Battlefield Overall in/near the Landscapes & Current and Recommended Resource Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>PARCEL NUMBER</th>
<th>PARCEL ADDRESS</th>
<th>OWNER/ASSOCIATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
<th>RECOMM. STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>battle-era roads shown on Map 4-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POCOPSON TOWNSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.01</td>
<td>63-1-57</td>
<td>155 Hickory Hill Rd</td>
<td>Isaac Marshall property with c. 1825 Abraham and Mary Marshall Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.02</td>
<td>63-3-112</td>
<td>1780 Lenape-Unionville Rd</td>
<td>Amos House property. William Cloud sold the farm to Amos House in 1769. (See 63.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.03</td>
<td>63-3-30-2</td>
<td>350 S. Wawaset Rd</td>
<td>John Marshall property. More research needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>63-4-167.3B</td>
<td>1239 Pocopson Rd</td>
<td>Benjamin Temple property. Attributed as associated with Darlington Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.05</td>
<td>63-3-21.1</td>
<td>495 Corinne Rd</td>
<td>John Marshall property in Corinne village. Partial log structure. More research needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.06</td>
<td>63-1-53</td>
<td>100 Hickory Hill Rd</td>
<td>Isaac Marshall property with c. 1751 Abraham and Mary Marshall Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.07</td>
<td>63-3-106</td>
<td>680 Haines Mill Rd</td>
<td>Abner Cloud property. More research needed. (see 63.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.11</td>
<td>63-3-26.1</td>
<td>360 Locust Grove Rd</td>
<td>Samuel Sellers property. More research needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.12</td>
<td>63-4-334</td>
<td>580 W. Creek Rd</td>
<td>Benjamin Taylor property. More research needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.14</td>
<td>63-3-82</td>
<td>650 Larkin Baily Rd</td>
<td>Abner Cloud property and Mill Race.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.15</td>
<td>63-4-133</td>
<td>2003 W. Street Rd</td>
<td>Sara Taylor, widow of Benjamin Taylor residence. More research needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.16</td>
<td>63-3-25</td>
<td>430 Locust Grove Rd</td>
<td>Samuel Sellers property. More research needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.17</td>
<td>63-4-167.3A</td>
<td>1241 Pocopson Rd</td>
<td>Benjamin Temple property. Attributed as associated with Darlington Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.25N</td>
<td>63-3-74</td>
<td>330 Red Lion Rd</td>
<td>James Allen Farm: Probable Tenant House (extant on road, being restored)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST BRADFORD TOWNSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.09</td>
<td>51-6-15.2</td>
<td>270 Lucky Hill Rd</td>
<td>Thomas Worth property and tenement. Research indicates 1806 residence. NR nomination indicates it is 18th century. More research needed.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>51-5-68</td>
<td>450 N. Creek Rd 447 Lucky Hill Rd</td>
<td>Worth-Jefferis HD: Thomas Worth property and residence, c. 1739.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.20</td>
<td>51-7-28</td>
<td>275 S. Creek Rd</td>
<td>Joseph Guest property. Associated with Buffington’s Ford.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.21</td>
<td>51-7-27.11</td>
<td>485 S. Creek Rd</td>
<td>Thomas Gibbons property. Associated with Jone’s/Painter’s Ford. Attributed as associated with Robert and Ann Jefferis with right to grind at Jone’s mill.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.26</td>
<td>51-7-16 51-7-16.1</td>
<td>35, 15 South Bridge Rd</td>
<td>Joseph Buffington property with c.1795 Joseph Hance (nephew and heir of Joseph Buffington) House and Barn (extant) located just above Forks of the Brandywine, site of Buffington’s Ford c.1750 built by Joseph Buffington, son/heir to Richard, an original c.1676 Chester County settler.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWLIN TOWNSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>49-2-85</td>
<td>299 or 275 Brandywine Dr</td>
<td>Indian Deep Farm, c.1759. Thomas Buffington residence (extant) (Depredation Claim)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Historic Roads

Examining historic resources for this planning effort revealed the unexpected need to also reconsider the assumed battle-era road network. Key roads thought to have existed at the time of the battle appeared to be later roads. This section reviews and updates the assumed battle-era road network from the 2010 Study. Roads - as built features under KOCOA - are a key feature for battlefield analysis as discussed in Chapter 3. This section also examines roads for the role they played in the battle, whether they are KOCOA built defining features, and their relationship with the contemporary landscape. Understanding where roads were located at the time of the battle, and especially in relation to properties and structures, is necessary to map the battle-era built environment and clarify and compare locations of places and their proximity to one another referenced in historic accounts, deeds, road petitions, and civilian property loss records. For local planning purposes, this information is needed to craft guided planning and interpretation strategies.

In addition to the obvious benefit of clarifying the battle-era road network for a better understanding of existing conditions and settlement patterns at the time of the battle, this review of roads also became necessary to carry out the basic plan goals to identify historic resources, defining features, and locations of battle events in the modern landscape. In particular, this involves identifying the Road to the Great Valley referenced in historic accounts (Chapter 3) and its relationship to these Landscapes (especially Lt. Col. Ross’ patrol, skirmish, and probable reconnaissance report route). This also involves understanding battle-era roads leading to the fords and the fords themselves as ‘waterway roads,’ and the route of the Crown Force flank. Roads identified as built defining features represent aspects of plan themes of settlement patterns, and/or association with military events or battle impact on the local community.

Chester County Archives, together with local volunteers, re-examined the battle-era road network using primary source materials. Their detailed research and analytical mapping provides a visual approximation of the public road network and properties/their owners present at the time of the battle. The mapping ‘recreates’ a depiction of the battle-era development pattern. The approximated battle-era road network is overlaid on both 1847 (Map 4-31) and 1883 (Maps 4-1a and 4-1b) maps of Chester County. Doing so shows how roads relate to longstanding historic places, some of which are referenced in battle-related accounts. This mapping updates the battle-era road network shown in the 2010 Study and 2013 Plan, and should be used in place of those roads.

The battle-era road network compiled and mapped for this plan is considered a depiction, as delineating historical information of varying degrees of specificity and availability is a challenging and imperfect task. For example, Brandywine Creek and municipal borders have altered over time. Modern Pocopson Township, which lies in the heart of the battlefield, did not yet exist as an incorporated municipality in 1777 and its lands were parts of other townships (Map 4-2). However, the mapped depiction of battle-era roads provides the best and possibly first detailed modern delineation of the battle-era road network that employed detailed primary source research. Battle-era roads were mapped using original road petitions, deeds, and justification of information with historic maps. Knowledge of battle-era properties was needed to map battle-era roads and vice versa – road petition descriptions and property line/owner/deed descriptions were compared against one another to confirm historic information and accuracy in mapping. Dates on Map 4-3 (shown in black text) next to roads, indicate road petition dates. There may have been additional public roads in existence in 1777, for which documentation no longer exists or is not available. Given the large size of tracts in the area in 1777 and the need for property owners to have access to public roads to conduct business and life affairs, private farm lanes would have also existed in 1777. However, being private means no road petitions were filed and thus they can only be located

---

1 1777 Fords of the Brandywine Map depiction by Clifford Parker, Chester County Archives. Base map is 1847 Map of Chester County, Pennsylvania: from original surveys / by S.M. Painter & J.S. Bowen; projection & drawing by J.S. Bowen; engraved by Edw’d Yeager, Philadelphia. 1777 roads provide a delineation of best available primary source information from Chester County Archives as researched by Archival staff.

2 1847 and 1883 maps were used as they are considered the most accurate as well as are the closest in age to the battle period of known and readily accessible historic mapping.
Chapter 4 – Built Features
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A Brandywine Battlefield Strategic Landscape
when named in other reference materials. To speak to the latter, both 1847 and 1883 maps show farm lanes, some of which plan researchers conjecture were likely also in place at the time of the battle. This is surmised as development was minimal during the roughly 100 years between the battle and 1883 map in Chester County, which remained rural and relatively unchanged in the 19th century still having battle-era properties and families.

Figure 4-3a: Trimble’s Ford Strategic Landscape Contributing Historic Roads and KOCOA Defining Features & Recommended Historic Resource Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD TYPE</th>
<th>ROAD NAME</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
<th>RECOMM. STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Roads</td>
<td>1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley aka Great Valley Road</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(modern Red Lion Rd, Broad Run Rd)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Roads</td>
<td>1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley (modern Red Lion Rd) near the 1742 Road</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(modern Corinne Rd) as probable location of Ross’ patrol and skirmish site</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Roads &amp; Trace</td>
<td>1742 Road, 1742 Trace, and 1706 Road to American Guard Posts at Wistar’s,</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Jone’s/Painter’s, and Brinton’s Fords as probable as Ross reconnaissance report route</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(modern Corinne Rd to Street Rd Bridge, and archaeological battle-era road sites from Corinne Rd to Street Rd with visible road bed on Denton Hollow Rd)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township trail &amp; Trace</td>
<td>1728/1771 Trace of Road to the Great Valley to/from Trimble’s Ford</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(archaeological battle-era road sites from modern Red Lion Rd to secondary ford, primary ford, and Creek with areas of visible road beds, e.g. on a Township trail/former Bragg Hill Rd)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Road &amp; Trace</td>
<td>1705 Spur and Trace to/from Trimble’s Ford</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(modern Camp Linden Rd and archeological battle-era road site to the primary Ford)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Roads</td>
<td>1746 Spur to/from Marshallton village (modern Northbrook Rd) of 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4-3b: Jefferis’ Ford Strategic Landscape Contributing Historic Roads and KOCOA Defining Features & Recommended Historic Resource Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD TYPE</th>
<th>ROAD NAME</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
<th>RECOMM. STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Roads</td>
<td>1705 Road to Dilworthtown village/ Chester city to American Guard Posts at Buffington’s Ford and nearby Wistar’s Ford</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(modern N. Wawaset Rd, Bridge Rd, Creek Rd)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Roads</td>
<td>1725/1764 Road to Turk’s Head village/Philadelphia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(modern Strasburg Rd, Lucky Hill Rd, Allerton Rd, W. Miner St)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace Road</td>
<td>1754 Trace Road (archaeological battle-era road sites from modern Camp Linden Rd to Lucky Hill Rd)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 18th century road network was generally formed through a system of approved roads (via road petitions) that connected destinations, typically mills, taverns, crossroad villages, and places of worship. Primary roads with similar destinations would share the same road name. For example, there were several ‘Roads to the Great Valley’, all leading to the industrial corridor in the colonial-era Caln Township and the County’s Great (limestone) Valley, through which the official ‘Great Valley Road’ traversed. Road spurs were referred to in the same manner as their related primary road. Roads from the era were not given the level of systematic road naming that exists today. As such, road dates on Map 4-3 are the primary way this plan can provide ‘road names’ to identify a road’s role in the battle. Figure 4-3a (Trimble’s Ford Landscape) and 4-3b (Jefferis’ Ford Landscape) summarize historic roads.

The battle-era landscape depiction provides a basis for understanding the public road network available to Crown Forces and American Forces, as well as civilians impacted by the battle and the local community at large. Delineating the Road to the Great Valley is a critical component of seeing the relationship of northern battlefield
areas. Knowledge about the flanking march is based largely on historic accounts that reference a Road to the Great Valley as their route. By analyzing the location of extant battle-era structures, battle-era properties/owners, and roads, some of which still exist, along with civilian recordings of battle-related losses in the form of depredation and plundering claims, and Quaker sufferings, this project analysis determined that the Road to the Great Valley referenced in historical accounts is most likely the 1728/1771 Road on Map 4-3 (highlighted in pink on Map 3-1). Further information on battle-era roads that are built defining features is discussed in Chapter 3.

**Recommendations**

Using the analysis undertaken in this chapter, the following recommendations were developed. Parties that may carry out a recommendation are noted after the related recommendation.

**Overarching Recommendation:** A KOCOA analysis is a valuable tool for planning and interpretation purposes, as it identifies extant features that still define the battle/battlefield. Protecting those resources is paramount in efforts to preserve and/or interpret the battlefield and history of the battle in the American Revolution and as part of Chester County’s legacy. All future actions should be made with consideration and focus on protection of KOCOA identified defining features, including battle-related historic structures and their associated contextual surrounding lands and historic landscapes.

4-1. Develop a strategy to undertake a Thematic/Multiple Property National Register eligibility nomination for the northern battlefield, which could include historic resources, historic districts, roads, fords and other built features identified in this chapter and Chapter 3. The strategy should outline funding and hiring an architectural historian to assist. (BBTF Historic Resources/Interpretation Subcommittee, West Bradford Historical Commission, East Bradford Historical Commission, Pocopson Historical Committee, PHMC)

4-2. Further research identified historic properties and resources in Figures 4-2a and 4-2b using information in this plan as a starting point. (West Bradford Historical Commission, East Bradford Historical Commission, Pocopson Historical Committee, PHMC)

4-3. Update Township historic resource inventories to reflect Figures 4-2a and 4-2b, including recommended resource designations. (West Bradford Historical Commission, East Bradford Historical Commission, Pocopson Historical Committee, Newlin Historical Committee)

4-4. Research the other extant battlefield historic resources from the 2013 Plan listed in Figure 4-2c and update Township historic resource inventories to reflect these contributing battlefield resources. (West Bradford Historical Commission, East Bradford Historical Commission, Pocopson Historical Committee, Newlin Historical Committee)

4-5. Research 18th century families in both Landscapes. Focus on families named in this plan to understand the dynamics between them and their motivations to support the Revolutionary War effort or live by the Quaker Testimony of Peace. (West Bradford Historical Commission, East Bradford Historical Commission, Pocopson Historical Committee, Newlin Historical Committee)

4-6. Research the ‘rise and demise’ of Trimbleville as an active 19th century hamlet. (West Bradford Historical Commission, Pocopson Historical Committee)

4-7. Determine how to integrate newly attributed and/or associated resources into their respective historic districts. This could entail including them in the Township historic resources inventory as such and designating them as locally significant resources. This could also include updating National Register documentation for Trimbleville, Northbrook, and Worth/Jeffers historic districts, as well as the West...
Branch Brandywine Creek Multiple Resources and Thematic Area, whether or not the updated information is officially submitted to the National Register. (West Bradford Historical Commission, East Bradford Historical Commission, Pocopson Historical Committee Newlin Historical Committee)

4-8. Continue to refine 1777 property and road network mapping. (CC Archives with volunteer researchers)

4-9. Update information and mapping in the 2013 Plan. (CCPC)

4-10. Undertake heritage interpretation recommendations in Chapter 6, with emphasis on interpretation from public corridors and places. (West Bradford Historical Commission, East Bradford Historical Commission, Pocopson Historical Committee, along with Friends of Martin’s Tavern, Brandywine Red Clay Alliance, and Friends of Strode Mill)

4-11. Report the archaeological findings for Trimble’s Ford and trace roads to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission for their records of important archaeological sites. (JMA)
Land conservation allows retention of a still readable battlefield landscape for future generations.

Like the rest of the northern battlefield, Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes as ‘associated battlefield sites’ are relative ‘newcomers’ to both formal recognition as part of the battlefield and for battlefield protection strategies. While both of these areas prior to the 2010 Study were known to contain extant battle-era buildings, be the site of the fords, and crossed by Crown Forces in the flanking march, the areas were not considered ‘the battlefield’ proper and thus not planned for in that regard. The 2010 Study recommends a preservation plan for the entirety of the 35,000-acre battlefield area, and the resulting 2013 Plan provides general open space and historic resource planning recommendations for the battlefield as a whole. This chapter refines those recommendations, using clarified battlefield elements (events and features in Chapters 3 and 4) to focus on historic resource and open space land conservation opportunities. Battlefield planning and protection is simultaneously a historic resource protection, nature features and open space planning, land conservation, and overall land use and development management effort.

Land Conservation Overview

From its founding in 1682, Chester County, and the battlefield area, became a highly successful agricultural community. By 1777, the battlefield was largely a farm community dominated by crop production. High quality soils and moderate climate made the area ideal for agricultural production. The farming tradition continues to this day, preserving many of the colonial-era farmsteads. Within these Landscapes, much of that landscape remains intact. The battlefield and larger Brandywine Valley region are fortunate to have municipal governments that promote open space land preservation, conservation organizations with long-term experience in protecting land, and property owners with an interest in long-term land and resources stewardship and conservation.

Under Pennsylvania law, municipal level regulations have the authority in most land use decisions. A variety of ordinance-based options for conserving land have been used in the battlefield under the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), PA Act 247. Many of the 15 battlefield municipalities have adopted provisions in their zoning and subdivision ordinances limiting development of sensitive sites. Some municipalities have enacted provisions that promote land conservation via the land development process, whereby land is designated to remain undeveloped or to have limited development. Often this takes the form of open space/conservation design development, whereby units are grouped on smaller lots and large ‘common’ land areas (aka ‘restricted’ or ‘protected’ open space) remain as farms, preserves, historic landscapes, parklands, passive recreation, or undeveloped land and are and managed by a homeowner, condo, or like association. When conservation is just for one site or lot, it sometimes is referred to as a ‘conservation tract or lot’. Land is protected via notations on recorded subdivision documents, conservation or agricultural easements, deed restrictions, or restrictive covenants that run with the land and prohibit additional unspecified use or development, and also provide notice and documentation that land has reservations on its use.

1 Newlin Township is included in Chapter 4’s historic resources discussion, however as only a small area of the Township falls in Trimble’s Ford Landscape the Township’s land conservation and historic resources policy is not included in this chapter.

2 See Chapter 2 in the 2013 Plan for more information.
The most effective tool for land conservation has been its outright protection via fee-simple acquisition or conservation easement (open space or agriculture) held by a land trust or government entity. Some municipalities have put forth and accepted land preservation referendums whereby an additional tax is assessed at the municipal level to be used for the permanent protection of land. Use of preserved land usually is based on the reasons for its preservation; as such it could be undeveloped open space to protect important natural resources, a nature preserve to protect sensitive habitats, active farm land, passive recreation, parkland, and/or a historic landscape including key feature interpretation. For the 2013 Plan, public input noted that protecting land through purchase or easement can be costly for municipalities, while protection via ordinance standards is a more affordable but typically not permanent option, dependent on how standards are structured.

Land stewardship is significant in the battlefield dating back to William Penn land grants. The battlefield remains home to descendants of original Quaker colonists, who continue to be stewards of their lands and historic structures as part of their family’s cultural heritage. More broadly, many individual property owners have a committed interest in stewardship and preservation, and the protection of the battlefield as a national treasure. This committed interest, in large part, is what has distinguished planning and protection of the battlefield from other places. Several land trusts, such as Brandywine Conservancy and Natural Lands Trust, have been active in the northern battlefield with land conservation. The northern battlefield is also fortunate to be home to Brandywine Red Clay Alliance (BRCA), which owns over 300 acres of lands used for agriculture, trails, and open space. BRCA seeks to advance water conservation and environmental education. Through their stewardship, BRCA has been active in land conservation of the northern battlefield.

**Land Conservation Policy and Analysis**

**West Bradford Township**

West Bradford Township, where a portion of Trimble’s Ford Landscape is located, firmly supports open space, greenways, and land conservation in Township policy. The Township has planning strategies that guide land conservation, including a Comprehensive Plan; Open Space, Recreation and Environmental Protection Plan; and Greenways, Trails, and Gateways (GTG) Plan; and Official Map, as well as a Recreation Commission that also addresses open space. The Township through its GTG Plan is working to plan for an extensive connected greenway and habitat preserve system. The Township is part of the multi-municipal Brandywine Greenway Plan project, a coordinated approach of planning for a natural and cultural resources conservation corridor via an interconnected system of protected lands and linkages, centering on Brandywine Creek. Troops marched through the Township as part of the flanking movement on the day of the battle (Map 4-2) in an area that remains largely rural today thanks to municipal and landowner commitment to conservation.

Figure 5-1a overviews the variety of land conservation/open space protection measures the Township has in place. The Township has worked to direct most development to appropriate areas, thus allowing rural, natural, and agricultural areas to remain intact. Agricultural and horticultural uses are permitted throughout the Township. In the case of land development of otherwise open areas, the Township has primarily employed open space design development. Zoning also includes an open area overlay district that addresses and encompasses lands preserved during development. Land development open space only allows conservation-oriented uses, e.g. agricultural, horticulture, passive recreation, habitat preserves, spray irrigation, and retention of existing historic and agricultural structures. R-1 district zoning comprises most of the Township including this Landscape, however R-1 provisions do not promote open space land conservation. In the past, the zoning had broader use of open space design development as well as transferable development rights, but these provisions have been repealed.

Land conservation efforts have been successful with approximately one-fifth of the Township as protected open lands (public parklands, preserves, trails, eased lands, land development open spaces, and quasi-public lands such
as school or recreation league grounds). Land development open space includes lands dedicated as open space via open space design development and through transferring development rights to a different tract. The Township contains over 700 acres of land development open space, over 250 acres of Township preserves, and approximately 150 acres of Township parklands. Additionally, more than 1,100 acres have been partially or wholly protected through conservation or agricultural easements. There are also many tracts under PA Acts 515 and 319, which provide property tax benefits to agricultural or forested lands. The Acts allow property taxes to be based on current use as opposed to market value use. While these lands are not protected, the Acts, particularly Act 319, discourage future development, which would invoke repayment of back taxes for the difference between current versus market value use.

Pocopson Township

Pocopson Township, where the bulk of Trimble’s Ford Landscape is located, supports open space, greenways, and land conservation policy through the recent Township Comprehensive Plan update. A Parks, Recreation, and Trails Committee assists in planning and managing recreational spaces, public parks, and a trail network guided by the Township’s 2010 Community Trails Master Plan. The Township is highly supportive of trails and their planned future network is featured in the 2013 Plan as a model for working towards comprehensive and interconnected trails planning throughout the battlefield. As the ‘heart of the battlefield’, the Township’s planned trail network facilitates interconnected battlefield interpretive planning.”

Township landowners have a strong commitment to maintaining and fostering agriculture as displayed through the extent of lands enrolled in Agricultural Security Areas, a portion of which coincides with Trimble’s Ford Landscape. As authorized under PA Act 153, Pocopson levies an additional property tax dedicated to land conservation approved by voter referendum, and development rights have been secured and retired for more than 600 acres, using those funds. The Township is part of the multi-municipal Brandywine Greenway Plan project, and supports...
a greenway system including critical linkages and significant historic or natural resources. The Comprehensive Plan recommends considering opportunities to protect features and landscapes related to the battlefield, particularly as the Township remains largely rural in the area troops crossed during the flanking maneuver on the day of the battle (Map 4-2).

Figure 5-1b summarizes the variety of land conservation/open space protection measures the Township has in place. The vast majority of the Township including the Landscape is zoned RA Residential Agricultural, which has a focus on conservation-oriented development options. Most development has occurred in southern and eastern parts, leaving the remainder of the Township as largely rural, natural, and agricultural areas that are mostly protected. In the case of land development, the Township has primarily implemented cluster (open space) development, which places an emphasis on development designed around key site features and open space connections to adjacent lands. Agricultural and horticultural uses are permitted in much of the Township. Land development open space primarily permits conservation-oriented uses, allowing land to remain open but useable.

Strong land conservation efforts are evidenced by about one-third of the Township being protected open space. Land development open space includes lands dedicated as open space via cluster (open space) development. The Township contains nearly 400 acres of land development open space, and about 120 acres of Township open space and parklands. Additionally, more than 1,200 acres have been partially or wholly protected through conservation or agricultural easements. There are also many tracts under PA Acts 515 and 319. Importantly, the Township contains the Brandywine Red Clay Alliance (BRCA) that holds significant lands in the vicinity of Trimble’s Ford and on the route of the British flank. The battle-era Richard Baker property and Trace of the 1728 Road to the Great Valley leading to Trimble’s Ford also are part of BRCA lands.

**Figure 5-1b: Pocopson Township Land Conservation-related Policies Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT</th>
<th>CURRENT STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Zoning                          | - Open space uses in order of Twp priority: woodland/natural areas preservation, historic site/landscape protection, community garden, recreation, agriculture, greenways/scenic stream or road corridors, wastewater spray irrigation, and stormwater facilities.  
- Open space general standards (open space designed around conservation of site features and connection to adjacent open space; conservation easements required; open space management plan required).  
- RA district development designed around conservation of site features and permits various development options that can help conserve land/features (transferable development rights; agriculture tracts (10ac min); conservation development (20ac min.); village overlay (50% min. open space); cluster development 1 and 2 (60% and 50% min. open space). Density bonus in exchange for preserving natural features, greenways, and reforestation; Density reduction if features degraded. Scenic roads/views/rivers considered.  
- Agricultural/horticultural uses permitted in most zones.  
- Net-out of constrained natural resources and infrastructure areas from open space and development calculations.  
- All development is to provide open space, recreation lands, and/or trails/bikeways/links to the Twp system or proportionate monies (aka ‘fee-in-lieu’ of land) to Twp Open Space, Recreation, or Trails Funds.  
- Natural resource protection provisions (steep slopes, woodlands, riparian buffers, floodplains, heritage trees). |
| Subdivision/Land Development (SLDO) | - Existing resources/site analysis plan and conservation plans identifying natural, historic, and scenic features, greenways, trails. Review by Parks and Recreation Commission. |

**East Bradford Township**

East Bradford Township, where the entirety of Jefferis’ Ford Landscape is located, highly supports open space, greenways, and land conservation in Township policy. The Township has planning strategies that guide land conservation, including a Comprehensive Plan and Open Space, Recreation and Environmental Protection Plan (OSREP), Parks/Preserves Stewardship Plans, Botanical Survey and Official Map, as well as an Open Space Review Board, Environmental Advisory Council, and other groups to address open space/natural areas. The Township Comprehensive Plan is currently being updated with a focus on specific planning concerns and needed improvements, but overall Township policy is expected to remain unchanged. The updated Comprehensive Plan
will address the battlefield. Township landowners have a strong commitment to maintaining and fostering agriculture as displayed via lands enrolled in the Agricultural Security Areas, a portion of which coincides with Jefferis’ Ford Landscape.

East Bradford has in place an open space property-based tax dedicated to land conservation via acquisition and easement. Through its various planning efforts, the Township is working toward an extensive interconnected greenway, open space, park, and nature preserve system as promoted by the OSRER Plan. The Township is also part of the multi-municipal Brandywine Greenway Plan project. Troops crossed the Township in Jefferis’ Ford Landscape as part of the flanking movement on the day of the battle (Map 4-2) in an area that remains largely rural today due to municipal and landowner support for conservation.

Figure 5-1c summarizes the variety of land conservation/open space protection measures the Township has in place. The western portion of the Township, in which most of the Jefferis Ford Landscape lies, is zoned R-1, which has a focus on conservation-oriented development options. Most development has occurred in eastern portions of the Township, abutting West Chester. Zoning reflects this pattern, with zones from east to west becoming more rural, leaving western areas as largely rural, natural, and agricultural areas that are mostly protected. In the case of land development in otherwise open areas, the Township has primarily implemented open space development and permits agricultural uses in most of the Township. Land development open space primarily permits conservation-oriented uses, e.g. agriculture, horticulture, preserves, and parkland, allowing land to remain open but usable.

Land conservation efforts have been successful, with about one-third of the Township in protected open lands (public parklands, preserves, woodlands, trails, eased lands, land development open spaces, and quasi-public lands such as school or recreation league grounds). Land development open space includes lands dedicated as open space via open space developments. The Township contains about 500 acres of land development open space and over 500 acres of Township preserves and parklands. Additionally, more than 1,000 acres have been partially or wholly protected through conservation or agricultural easements. There are also many tracts under PA Acts 515 and 319. Importantly, the Township contains Stroud Preserve, over 500 acres of protected land held by Natural Lands Trust that is in Jefferis’ Ford Landscape and on the route of the British flank. Stroud Preserve entails the entire battle-era Thomas Worth property, plus sections of the George Carter Jr. and Taylor family properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT</th>
<th>CURRENT STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Open space generally can be used for: agriculture, horticulture, woodlands/preserves, parks, individual water supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open space development option (60% required open space in R-1, 50% in R-2, 40% in R-3, and 35% for single-family detached and 50% for two-family and multifamily in R-4. Open space configuration based on environmental impact assessment to minimize negative impacts of development and maximize site feature conservation, views, and useful open spaces. Open space management plan required).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural/horticulture uses (min. 10acs) permitted in most zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net-out of constrained natural resources and infrastructure areas from open space and development calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental impact assessment report identifying and assessing the effects of proposed development on natural, historic, open space, and visual features. Review by Environmental Advisory Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenic road standards including scenic vistas along those roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural resource protection provisions (steep slopes, woodlands, riparian buffers, floodplains, ag soils, Penn trees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision and Land Development (SLDO)</td>
<td>Open space for residential and nonresidential development to be consistent with Township Open Space, Recreation and Environmental Resources Plan and Linking Landscapes (2,000sf/du, 500sf/1,000sf nonres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open space and recreation design standards (interconnectivity to adjacent open space, parkland, trails, landscaping requirements, and minimum individual area to be usable as open space).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fee-in-lieu of park or open space land dedication in new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing features identification (natural, historic, archeological, and Brandywine Scenic River Overlay).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes

Much of the land conservation effort in the battlefield has focused on preservation of viable farmland, natural resources, and/or historic landscapes relating to the core battlefield engagement zones, such as Meetinghouse Road Corridor in Birmingham Township. There has been less focus on the marching corridors and other associated battle areas, such as the northern battlefield. This is somewhat expected as until the 2010 Study, these areas were not given adequate consideration as part of the battlefield, much less as areas where battlefield protection efforts should be focused.

The 2013 Plan takes the next step to assess strategic landscapes for their general existing and potential for land conservation. Map 2.9 from the 2013 Plan is included here to show the broader context of how these Landscapes fit into overall battlefield land protection. It shows there are unprotected lands in close proximity to protected lands and developed open grounds, particularly in the ‘Marshallton Cluster’, which Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes are part of, that have a good potential to protect and link to create a large cluster of conserved lands in the northern battlefield. Northern battlefield lands are well maintained in village, large lot suburban, and rural land patterns, which creates a positive setting for land conservation. The 2013 Plan indicates Marshallton Cluster is one of the best-suited areas in the battlefield for additional land protection, due to its potential to have a large area of protected open lands that could also simultaneously protect historic and natural resources and landscapes, thus making the area even more competitive for conservation funding. Northern battlefield land conservation efforts can benefit from this plan’s further look at this mix of unprotected and protected lands in the Landscapes.

This plan takes a closer look at potential land conservation tracts in relation to existing protected lands, undeveloped land well-suited for protection, battle events, extant historic resources, battle-era properties, natural features, and buffering as well as important plan themes. Within the Landscapes, overall potential for land conservation is high as many lands are farm fields or open lands well-suited for conservation.

---

1 Developed open grounds are mostly institutional uses with significant open lands, e.g. schools, County uses, golf courses, Longwood Gardens, etc.
Updated 2013 Plan mapping on the contemporary landscape (Map 5-1) shows current protected lands and lands for possible future protection. Updated mapping is also laid over battle-era development pattern mapping (Map 5-2) to display the information within the context of the battle-era landscape. Map 5-2 shows that open lands still coincide with portions of battle-era farms. This analysis supplements 2013 Plan mapping and recommendations by identifying additional possible land conservation tracts. Maps 5-1 and 5-2 show tracts recommended as well-suited for possible preservation in the 2013 Plan and additional recommended tracts from this plan’s detailed analysis. Maps also show tracts that are in proximity to the approximately half-mile wide corridor for the flanking movement, which is the width the ABPP indicated was appropriate (during the era and through the local terrain) for a march of 9,000 troops plus their ‘baggage train’ of support people and supplies.

Some of the ‘newly’ identified tracts contain a battle-era historic resource and part of its period associated lands (Chapter 4), honoring founding families and those who played a part in the outcome of American history and founding of our nation. Using established criteria for establishing land conservation potential, identified tracts are generally larger (10 acres+), however key smaller tracts (<10 acres) that contain battle-era historic resources, critical connections, or are part of key battle-era individuals/families original properties, are also identified through this plan’s mapping. Lands within the half-mile flanking column and containing battle-era historic resources should be considered as higher priority for conservation. Tracts outlying Landscapes bounds are deliberately included to serve as a transition area between this portion of the battlefield and possible future development and intrusion. Related recommendations are found at the end of this chapter.

Summary

Open lands coupled with rolling topography characterize West Bradford, Pocopson, and East Bradford battlefield landscapes, a character the townships are working to maintain for future generations. While open lands vary in their level of protection and public access, they nonetheless provide environmental and cultural resource protection benefits to the community. Appreciable additional development cannot occur or is limited on these lands, and they are currently in low intensity uses. Community benefits of protection of the battlefield, the still readable Brandywine Valley colonial era landscape, Quaker roots, American history, and the story of our nation’s founding is supported. Open character, viewsheds, and natural resource protection is also fostered. Open lands have been preserved due to the efforts of property owners and local entities to identify and support land conservation opportunities and to recognize historic resources and districts.

Historic Resource Protection Overview

As with land conservation, Chester County including the battlefield has been fortunate to have stewardship-minded landowners, municipal governments, and active citizen volunteers that support historic resource protection. The battlefield is still dotted with period historic structures (Map 4-2) that highly contribute to completing the ‘picture’ of the still readable battle-era landscape. Farming traditions that continue today also have contributed to the preservation of many colonial-era structures that are part of the original farmsteads. Within the Landscapes, there remain 18th century structures that ‘witnessed’ battle activity and those that contribute to the overall period setting, Quaker history, battle-era families, and other plan themes. West Bradford, Pocopson, and East Bradford Townships are good examples of such historic preservation promotion as evidenced through their policy and ordinance provisions discussed below. These communities are members of Brandywine Battlefield Task Force (BBTF) and have representatives participate in BBTF’s historic resources/interpretation subcommittee. All three Townships also participate in Chester County Historic Preservation Network, a group who advocate for ongoing historic resource preservation, education, and outreach throughout the County.
One of the most effective tools for historic resource protection is a property owner’s stewardship and willingness to maintain and continue the viability of their historic structures for future generations. Like land conservation, preservation of historic resources has been significant in the battlefield. Land conservation and historic resource preservation, particularly on larger parcels in the battlefield, have tended to go ‘hand-in-hand’ in part due to the battlefield remaining home to many descendents of original colonists, who continue to be stewards of their lands and historic structures as part of their cultural heritage. More broadly, many individual property owners have a committed interest in resource preservation, and the protection of the battlefield as a national treasure. This committed interest, in large part, is what continues to distinguish planning and protection efforts in the battlefield from other places.

Like land conservation, historic resource protection is enabled under the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), PA Act 247. The MPC calls for historic resources protection to be integrated into local planning policy and zoning regulations. Many of the 15 battlefield municipalities have adopted provisions in their zoning and subdivision ordinances that encourage historic resources protection and adaptive reuse, and that regulate demolition. In Chester County, this often takes the form of a historic resource zoning overlay, whereby provisions addressing historic resource protection are added to base zoning. This may include permitting modification of area and bulk requirements; providing additional uses as incentives for continued resource use; or reviewing proposed building changes. Historic resource overlay zoning is often employed in situations where there is not a sufficient concentration of resources to form a historic district. This tool is flexible and usually employed municipal-wide.

Likewise, the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SLDO) often includes provisions requiring identification of extant historic resources on proposed plans and Historic Impact Statements, which require an analysis to determine the impact of new development on historic resources within and near the proposed development tract. With the majority of battlefield municipalities having Historical Commissions in place, a key first step has been taken in acknowledging the importance of the area’s historic resources and landscapes. There are multiple National Register listed and eligible sites and districts, and locally designated historic resources throughout the battlefield.

The Historic District Act of 1961, PA Act 167, offers a different approach to resource protection. It enables municipalities to protect historic and architectural character through regulating the erection, reconstruction, alteration, restoration, demolition, or razing of buildings within a certified local historic district. Local historic districts established under this Act must be formally certified through the Pennsylvania and Museum Commission (PHMC). This Act also requires the appointment of a Historic Architectural Review Board (HARB) to advise the local governing body on the appropriateness of building activity in the district. This type of protection has tended to be less well used in Chester County, likely due to the less dense development pattern and scattered rural historic resources. However, there are five local historic districts in battlefield communities.

**Historic Resource Protection Policy and Analysis**

**West Bradford Township**

West Bradford emphasizes the importance of historic resources and their protection in Township Comprehensive Plan policies and mentions the battle in the context of Trimbleville Historic District. Township GTG Plan policy is consistent with that for battlefield planning, as it promotes evoking a sense of place in part through integrated natural, historic, and cultural features planning and protection. West Bradford’s Historical Commission addresses historic resources in the Township.
In addition to the historic district in Marshallton village (Behind the Lines - Marshallton Strategic Landscape Plan), West Bradford contains portions of three National Register historic districts in the northern battlefield: Trimbleville, Northbrook, and Worth/Jefferies. The Township also contains individual National Register properties and has a historic resource survey that identifies locally designated significant resources. West Bradford is very fortunate to have a thoroughly written Township history, ‘Between the Brandywines, A History of West Bradford’, that was consulted as one of the sources for Township and battle history for this plan.

The 2013 Plan examines the 15 battlefield municipalities for their overall historic resource protection standards. Comparatively speaking, West Bradford has historic resource protection measures in place (Figure 5-2a), but in limited areas that do not include half of the battlefield in the Township. The portion of West Bradford where Trimble’s Ford Landscape is located is zoned R-1, and includes a sizable floodplain as delineated by the flood hazard overlay district. While other areas of Township zoning, such as TND-2 and Unified Development, promote strong historic resources protection, historic resource protection provisions in R-1 are minimal.

Specific protection items of note in the Township as compared to other battlefield communities include the identification and assessment of proposed land development impact on archeological resources as part of the SLDO Environmental Impact Assessment, and the comprehensive and user-friendly design guidelines for TND districts. Additionally of note is the provision that Strasburg Road through Marshallton village is to be treated as a scenic road corridor whereby elements should not detract from scenic roadside quality.

Pocopson Township

Pocopson supports historic resources protection policy through its recent Comprehensive Plan update that recommends additional historic resources protection measures. It places historic resource protection as one of three priority focuses, along with implementing the future land use vision to protect natural resources and open space in the northern portion of the Township and advancing a Township and regional greenway. It recommends participation in regional initiatives for historic resources planning through efforts such as BBTF, and considering opportunities to protect features and landscapes related to the battle. Pocopson has a Historical Committee in place to address historic resource related items in the Township. The Township is a member of the Brandywine Valley Scenic Byway, and as such has adopted an Intergovernmental Cooperative Agreement and a Byway Ordinance that promotes the historic and cultural importance of the byway and its resources. The Township also references its roles in the battle and 2013 Plan on its website.
Pocopson shares Trimbleville Historic District with West Bradford, and Northbrook Historic District with West Bradford and Newlin. The Township contains individual National Register properties and is in the process (2015) of conducting a historic resource survey and inventory to identify locally significant resources.

Based on the 2013 Plan’s examination of battlefield municipalities historic resource protection measures, Pocopson has limited but fairly effective historic resource protection measures in place in the battlefield area of the Township. The Residential-Agricultural district permits a variety of development options each with slightly different historic resources protection measures. Of note for maintaining battlefield landscape character are buffering of historic resources from new structures both on-site and on adjacent lands and architectural design standards for new development and community sewage facilities in open space that are to resemble historic vernacular spring houses or agricultural structures. There is a density bonus incentive for historic preservation where additional acreage is provided to historic structures lots to preserve context, or façade easements are placed on principal facades. However, no bonus density is given if an owner or developer of the subject property has within three years of the development application period demolished any historic site or structure. Likewise, permitted density is reduced where historic resources are to be demolished or principal façades substantially altered or lose historic integrity through proposed development. An incentive for historic preservation is that development exceeding 100 units and/or 100 acres can use preserved historic sites (on-site) to partly meet required active recreation. Additionally, SLDO provisions include identifying historic districts, resources, and archaeological resources on site, or on abutting tracts. Pocopson also considers scenic roads, views, and rivers during land development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT</th>
<th>CURRENT STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Historic site/landscape protection highest priority open space use, after woodland/natural areas, and highest priority for TDR sending area, after agricultural lands/uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential/Agricultural district development designed around conservation of site features and permits various development options that can help preserve historic resources/landscapes (transferable development rights (TDR), conservation development, village overlay, cluster development). Density bonus in exchange for preserving historic sites/landscapes, historic rehabilitation, using traditional building materials, and ‘green’ building design. Density reduction where historic sites are degraded. Provide a buffer around historic structures on-site and on adjacent sites. Scenic roads/views/rivers considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster development design to protect historic sites including preserved/adapted to any permitted uses. Architectural design requirement (see village overlay). Road network to be designed for minimal impact/alteration of site features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village overlay architectural design to be compatible with traditional village or rural architectural character/ proportions or be a contemporary expression of traditional styles/forms, respecting scale, proportion, character, stylistic features, and exterior materials of historic structures in/near the Township. To promote appropriate village design, design experts may be used to help design of new structures and historic rehabilitations. Twp. village design review committee may be formed to review/recommend on architectural matters for village development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional use of bed-and-breakfast permitted only in historic structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision/Land Development (SLDO)</td>
<td>Existing resources/site analysis plan and conservation plans identifying natural, historic, and scenic features, greenways, trails. Includes historic districts, resources, and archaeological resources on the tract or abutting tracts. Review by Historic Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**East Bradford Township**

East Bradford highly supports historic resources protection policy through its township policy. The Township Comprehensive Plan is currently being updated with a focus on specific planning concerns and needed improvements. Township policy is expected to remain unchanged, though it will address the battlefield. East Bradford Historical Commission addresses township-wide historic resources related items. There is also a HARB that addresses historic resources protection in the Township’s two locally regulated historic districts. The Township is a member of the Brandywine Valley Scenic Byway, and as such has adopted an Intergovernmental Cooperative Agreement and a Byway Ordinance that promotes the historic and cultural importance of the byway and its resources.
East Bradford shares Worth/Jefferies Historic District with West Bradford, though the vast majority of the district lies in East Bradford. To the immediate north of Jeffereis’ Ford Landscape is the Taylor Cope Historic District and to the southeast is the Strode’s Mill Historic District (Preparation for Battle - Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Strategic Landscape Plan). The Township contains individual National Register properties and is in the process (2015) of conducting a historic resource survey that identifies locally designated significant resources.

Based on the 2013 Plan’s comparative examination of battlefield municipalities’ historic resource protection measures, East Bradford has strong measures in place in the battlefield portion of the Township. The western portion of the Township, in which most of Jeffereis’ Ford Landscape is located, is zoned R-1, which has a focus on resource protection-oriented development options. Provisions entail Township-wide historic overlay zoning that encourages reuse and discourages demolition of historic resources. Provisions also provide adaptive reuse in residential districts and a Historic Resource Impact Study to assess the effect of development on historic resources. Open space development is to be designed to preserve historic and other resources. Brandywine Scenic River district conserves sensitive features including historic resources and visual attributes. SLDO standards require identification of historic resources and areas, including below-ground features, on-site and off-site within specified distances of a development tract boundary. While not in the Landscape, zoning also includes Strode’s Mill and Taylor Cope Act 167 local historic districts. There are also zoning provisions related to historic resource protection through neighborhood commercial zoning that encourages continued use of historic structures. Other historic districts in the Township (Paradise Valley and Worth-Jeffereis) are not regulated through Act 167.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT</th>
<th>CURRENT STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Open space development designed to preserve features identified in environmental impact assessment including historic resources and scenic preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Township-wide historic resource protection standards (special use opportunities/standards to encourage adaptive reuse, historic rehabilitation standards, modification of area/bulk, demolition standards (demolition by neglect, delay of demolition, denial of demolition), required buffering of historic structures from new development on-site and from new commercial development up to 100ft off-site, adaptive reuse promoted in residential districts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Resource Impact Study (evaluates development impact on historic resources on-site and up to 300 ft off-site; to be prepared by a historic preservation/architectural professional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional use of bed-and-breakfast permitted only in historic structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act 167 local historic districts standards (Strode’s Mill and Taylor Cope Historic Districts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brandywine Scenic River district (conserves sensitive features including historic resources and visual attributes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic resource/character preservation promoted in C-3 Historic Neighborhood Commercial District (buffering historic resources from new development, compatible new building or historic rehabilitation in proportion/scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental impact assessment report identifying and assessing the effects of proposed development on natural, historic, open space, and visual features. Review by Environmental Advisory Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subdivision/Land Development (SLDO) | Existing features identification (natural, historic, archeological, and Brandywine Scenic River District) on-site and within 50 ft for below-ground and 300 ft for above-ground historic features from a development tract boundary. |
Specific Land Conservation Recommendations

This plan recommends expanding on the successful land conservation that has occurred to date. This can occur by linking existing protected lands to form an interconnected network. West Bradford, Pocopson, and East Bradford all promote land conservation in their Township policy. The specific recommendations in this plan differ in nature from those in plans for Marshallton and Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill. This can be attributed to the rural character of Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Ford Landscapes and lack of public access points. Therefore, there is a greater focus on landscape conservation intertwined with historic resources protection. In comparison, the village settings of Marshallton and Strode’s Mill Landscapes lend themselves to resource-by-resource recommendations and points of public access. Parties that may carry out a recommendation are listed after the related recommendation. Land conservation recommendations include:

**Overarching Recommendation:** Conserve lands that contain battle-era historic resources and/or are within the half-mile flanking buffer as a first priority for Landscapes’ preservation. Future actions should be made with a particular focus on protection of KOCOA identified defining features, including battle-related lands and historic landscapes, and their interrelated historic structures.

5-1. Expand existing clusters of protected lands in the northern battlefield’s ‘Marshallton Cluster’ as a land conservation priority for battlefield preservation. ‘Marshallton Cluster’ has a good potential to protect and link lands to create a large cluster of conserved lands in the northern battlefield. It is the largest clustering of protected and unprotected lands in the entire battlefield, and also the largest clustering of active cropland, much of which is adjacent to existing eased lands. This cluster is one of the best-suited areas in the battlefield for additional land protection, due to its potential to create a large area of protected open lands that could simultaneously protect historic and natural resources and landscapes, which is an ideal combination when seeking competitive conservation funding.

To advance this priority the northern battlefield municipalities should consider undertaking a special project. To protect this area special funding could be sought, such as a fund raising campaign or referendum for a land conservation tax to be levied. Who and how this fund would be managed and whether it is an individual Township, multi-municipal, County, or other effort are initial considerations.

Protecting Marshallton Cluster can also be further incorporated into municipal comprehensive planning and open space planning policy. Township land conservation planning efforts could be prioritized to protect open tracts that are adjacent to existing protected land and are within or adjacent to the Landscapes. An approach that creates a larger total conserved land cluster provides beneficial environmental impacts, protects battlefield landscape and township rural character, and provides more competitive applications for funding opportunities. (Landowners, Land Trusts, West Bradford, Pocopson, East Bradford Townships, Chester County Open Space Dept.)

5-2. Protect smaller parcels to link larger conservation tracts. In the coming years, many larger open lands in these Landscapes may either be protected or developed, leaving smaller lots available for conservation. Such lots are already beginning to become more of a conservation priority in villages and other more established settings. While the available acreage may be relatively minimal, the value of conservation may be significant due to historic resources or the ability to link existing protected lands. (Landowners, Land Trusts, West Bradford, Pocopson, East Bradford Townships)
5-3. Work to protect battlefield lands within the Landscapes, and particularly lands within the half-mile flanking column buffer and those containing battle-era historic resources. Tracts outlying Landscapes bounds provide a transition area between the Landscapes and possible future development and intrusion. Tracts identified on Maps 5-1 and 5-2 should be considered for conservation, or at least limited development. (Landowners, Land Trusts, West Bradford, Pocopson, East Bradford Townships)

5-4. Ensure Township recreation entities also address land conservation or establish a separate advisory committee. This committee could identify and prioritize opportunities to protect land, beginning with lands identified in this plan. Such a locally-based committee can coordinate directly with landowners within the Townships, and serve as a liaison between landowners and land trusts who have staff and resources needed to protect lands. Municipal open space committees can also coordinate on projects that cross municipal lines, such as the Marshallton Cluster project. (West Bradford, Pocopson Townships)

5-5. Revisit open space design development in R-1 and transferable development rights in R-1/targeted growth areas as possible land and resource conservation options via a battlefield zoning overlay. Through this overlay, encourage battlefield lands, historic resources, and viewsheds be protected if proposed for development. (West Bradford Township)

5-6. Consider possible land and resource conservation options for battlefield lands via a battlefield zoning overlay in East Bradford and Pocopson Township. East Bradford Township currently has a Brandywine Scenic River Overlay that can be looked at as an example of specific resource-based overlay zoning. (Pocopson Township, East Bradford Township)

5-7. Consider expanding fee-in lieu provisions to include open space. See recommendation under ‘Additional Recommendations for further information. (West Bradford Township)

5-8. Revisit the Official Map/Ordinance in West Bradford and develop/adopt one in Pocopson to address land conservation in the battlefield. Denote key battlefield lands worthy of preservation on the Official Map, using information in this plan. Map 5-1 in particular should be consulted as it ties the modern landscape, protected lands, possible lands for protection, historic resources, and the battlefield landscape into one analysis. East Bradford has a good model of an Official Map, denoting proposed future lands for conservation among other information. (West Bradford, Pocopson Townships)

5-9. Continue to participate in and implement greenway master planning in the Townships and for the multi-municipal Brandywine Creek Greenway (BCG) Plan. West Bradford, Pocopson, and East Bradford are all working to plan for an extensive interconnected greenway, open space, trail, and preserve system, and are part of the BCG Plan which can serve the dual purpose of protecting battlefield lands. All the municipalities participating in the BCG Plan have a ‘to do’ plan implementation list. To supplement greenway planning, Pocopson and East Bradford could consider undertaking a similar plan as West Bradford’s GTG Plan. West Bradford should consider updating their plan to also address coordinated gateways to complement greenways and trail. (West Bradford, Pocopson, East Bradford Townships)
Specific Historic Resource Protection Recommendations

This plan recommends expanding on the successful historic resource protection that has occurred to date. All three Townships promote historic resources protection policy, and these recommendations build upon this. Parties that may carry out a recommendation are listed after the related recommendation. Historic resource protection recommendations include:

**Overarching Recommendation:** Protect battle-era historic resources, particularly those within the half-mile flanking buffer as a first priority. Future actions should be made with a definite focus on protection of KOCOA identified defining features, including battle-related historic structures and their associated contextual surrounding lands and historic landscapes.

5-10. Complete PA Historic Resource Survey Forms for historic resources identified in this plan. The analysis and information in this plan represents another step towards battle-era resources documentation. The next step is to consistently document resources in an accepted manner by using the PA Historic Resource Survey Form. This level of information provides municipalities and BBTF with a solid base for resource protection. Documentation on the PA Survey Form should include information from this plan and be completed in a manner consistent with the standards of PHMC’s Bureau of Historic Preservation (BHP). (West Bradford Historical Commission, East Bradford Historical Commission, Pocopson Historic Committee)

5-11. Consider creating minimum standards and adopting a historic battlefield protection overlay district. This overlay could supplement existing historic resources provisions and would address protection of resources in the Landscapes. The 2013 Plan includes an outline of key items to include in a historic overlay. Within the battlefield, Thornbury and Pennsbury Townships, Chester County include a special battlefield zoning overlay, which should be consulted as a starting point. Such an overlay would cover only those parts of the Townships that are within the battlefield and would focus on battle-related historic resources, sites, landscapes, objects, and their interrelation to each other, as well as other defining features, strategic landscapes, and proposed development or building activity. (West Bradford, Pocopson, East Bradford Townships)

5-12. Undertake a comprehensive review of current Township historic resource regulations. The goal is to ensure regulations adequately protect historic resources Township-wide and specifically address those related to the Landscape and battlefield. Regulations should be examined as to whether they provide clear and consistent protection of historic resources with consideration also of the importance of sense of place and quality of life factors that protected resources inherently provide. Based on comprehensive plan priority recommendations, the townships should consider expanding historic resources protection through a historic resource zoning overlay and fostering incentives that encourage care and maintenance of historic properties. The following items should be considered in revising resource protection regulations: (West Bradford, Pocopson, East Bradford Townships Planning and Historical Commission/Committee)

- Ensure regulations guide new, infill, and re-development so that the built environment is compatible with, and designed to complement historic resources.
- Ensure historic definitions are consistent across the regulatory framework.
- Ensure regulations require that historic resources be identified on properties undergoing or within a designated proximity of those undergoing land development or that require a permit.
- Ensure the Historical Commission has input into the permitting and review process.
Ensure regulatory language encourages adaptive reuse and incentives, and discourages demolition (through strong demolition and demolition by neglect provisions).

Ensure there is a clear process for review and early coordination between applicants and the Township for proposals that may impact historic resources.

Encourage voluntary review of rehabilitation and alteration plans related to historic resources.

Encourage property owners proposing rehabilitations to seek design and technical assistance from professionals with expertise in historic preservation and the Township historical commission.

Obtain or develop materials to assist with evaluation of historic resource-related proposals, such as design guides.

5-13. Continue to encourage incentives for historic preservation and adaptive reuse for the purpose of resource protection and the continued viable future use of historic structures. Zoning should be revised to more broadly promote adaptive reuse of historic structures. This would include both additional uses permitted only for historic resources and permitting this township-wide. Adaptive reuse can preserve buildings that are inherently part of battlefield character but that can no longer accommodate their original use. Broader utilization of adaptive reuse is supported in other battlefield municipal zoning ordinances. Adaptive reuse is featured as a tool on Chester County’s Landcapes2 website, where more information is available. (West Bradford, Pocopson Townships)

5-14. Revise the Environmental Impact Assessment in West Bradford and East Bradford to also identify and assess development impact on the battlefield. Such a requirement would make developers more aware of historic resources, and able to design their projects to accommodate preservation. Pocopson could consider including this requirement in zoning or SLDO to assess and ideally mitigate the impact of development on the battlefield. Likewise, update or require existing features identification and specifically the battlefield on development plan proposals via the SLDO (West Bradford, Pocopson, East Bradford Townships)

5-15. Revise open space design development standards in East Bradford to include historic resources as permitted uses in open space. This is an approach to foster historic resource protection as well as context preservation. Both West Bradford and Pocopson zoning can be used as examples of how this type of regulation could be put forth. (East Bradford Township)

5-16. Involve Township historical committees/commissions in the subdivision and land development review process when historic resource or sites, including the battlefield, are involved. All three Townships promote historic resources protection, and as advisory entities to municipalities, historical entities have expertise regarding historic resources that they can provide during development proposal review. Pocopson Historical Committee reviews/advises on environmental assessment, and along with West Bradford and East Bradford’s Historical Commissions could be considered to be added into the development review process in their respective communities. (West Bradford, Pocopson, East Bradford Townships)

5-17. Consider the following recommendations for West Bradford Township:

- Include specific battlefield and Landscape references and protection policy during the next update to the Township Comprehensive Plan. Due to the relatively new emphasis of West Bradford as part of the battlefield, the current Comprehensive Plan mentions the battle only in terms of Trimbleville Historic District and plan updates should address the overall battlefield in the Township. Several battlefield communities, including Birmingham, East Bradford, Kennett, Pennsbury, Pocopson, Thornbury, and Westtown Townships specifically address the battlefield as a key historic resource in their communities and include supportive policies and recommendations. (West Bradford Township)

- Add historic resource conservation standards to R-1. Unified development standards preserve historic ruins, sites, roads, or other transport traces, paths and trails, and other historic landscape features to the greatest degree possible via inclusion in development plans/design. It also allows additional dwelling
units/lots in reused and preserved historic structures as bonus units that must be conserved via restrictions/easements. Certain TND standards could also apply in R-1, such as allowing provisions to be modified to achieve historic resource, context, and landscape protection and expanding adaptive reuse opportunities to extend the lifespan and utility of historic resources. (West Bradford Township)

- Modify zoning provisions to fully address demolition of historic resources. Currently, demolition regulations for historic resources are limited to the TND-2 district. These provisions should be expanded to take into account limiting demolition of equally important historic resources located outside of TND-2. Adding demolition-by-neglect provisions should also be considered, which can minimize deterioration of historic resources from long-term lack of maintenance. (West Bradford Township)

- Modify zoning provisions to provide a density bonus to development provided that existing structures are reused sensitively. This incentive permits historic resources to be preserved through land development without impacting the yield or maximum number of units or lots permitted in zoning. This allows historic resources to effectively be ‘bonus’ units in a development. The current unified development area allows additional dwelling units/lots in reused and preserved historic structures as bonus units, with the caveat that they must be conserved permanently via restrictions/easements. This type of requirement provides a good incentive for historic resource reuse and protection, while requiring that sensitive preservation and reuse of historic resources will occur in exchange for this bonus. This tool can be coupled with permitting additional special uses for these resources to further encourage their viability and reuse. (West Bradford Township)

- Consider applying Strasburg Road’s scenic provisions to other scenic battlefield road corridors. Strasburg Road through Marshallton village is to be treated as a scenic road corridor whereby elements should not detract from scenic roadside quality. This same provision could be expanded to other critical roadways. (West Bradford Township)

- Include West Bradford Historical Commission in the land development, and building, zoning, and demolition permitting review processes when historic resources are involved. Many battlefield communities involve their Historical Commission in the review process from the early stages of a plan or permit proposal. In this way, the applicant can receive specific, expert input from the beginning stages. (West Bradford Township)

**General Land Conservation and Historic Resource Protection Recommendations**

**Land Conservation**

5-18. Work with other battlefield communities to protect lands as part of a larger open space network that extends throughout the battlefield. Significant historic landscapes, such as Trimble’s Ford, may be protected due to their obvious historic merit. There are protected and unprotected lands throughout the battlefield without such a specific battle-related story, and these lands serve to form a larger network to link key areas of the battlefield and display a representation of the battle-era landscape feel/setting. Northern battlefield communities with significant success and experience in land conservation would benefit this larger effort. (Battlefield Municipalities, Chester County Open Space Dept, Land Trusts)
5-19. Encourage adoption of consistent or at least compatible definitions for protected open space in ordinances throughout the battlefield. This can be promoted through continuing to participate in BBTF and its subcommittees, and would require regulatory amendments by battlefield municipalities. (Battlefield Municipalities)

5-20. Consider adoption of open space fee-in-lieu provisions throughout the battlefield. Through this approach, a developer would be required to provide a specific amount of open lands for certain types of development (usually large scale residential), or pay a fee which can be used by municipalities to fund future acquisition of open space. Accepting a ‘fee-in-lieu of open space’ can be effective in cases where it would not contribute to expansion of/access to overall network, or would not provide significant recreational benefit to residents of the development. The amount of the fee-in-lieu should be reviewed and adjusted at least every five years to account for changes in land costs. Ordinances should indicate what types of lands can be acquired with fee-in-lieu funds. (Battlefield Municipalities)

5-21. Protect and promote agriculture as an industry and historic land use in the battlefield. Municipalities might consider agricultural or rural conservation zoning as another tool option to maintain farmlands, rural character, and battlefield lands. Agricultural land easement is another method and funding source to help protect battlefield lands, and simultaneously preserve farming traditions. (Battlefield Municipalities)

5-22. Coordinate natural resource protection and battlefield land conservation. Zoning and SLDO provisions include protection of natural resources. In the battlefield, natural feature areas are also locations where battle action often occurred. Thus, protecting natural features inherently serves to protect key battlefield lands. Focus the protection of open space along stream corridors and their associated floodplains and wetlands. Much of the undeveloped land that is well suited for protection as open space is located along the banks of the Brandywine Creek, its tributaries, and associated floodplains. Stream corridors are by themselves a valuable natural resource worthy of protection, as is being implemented through Brandywine Creek Greenway planning. Protecting stream corridors will not only protect natural habitat but also landscapes that influenced strategies employed by both armies during the battle. (Battlefield Municipalities)

5-23. Coordinate with BRCA and other like organizations to investigate options for establishing programs that protect natural features as key battlefield elements. Programs can be explored that enhance, restore, and maintain the battlefield’s natural features and take into account the importance of these features in battle strategy and its outcome. For example, Brandywine Creek is a critical natural feature as an obstacle for battle troop maneuvering as well as key terrain as part of the British flank and Washington’s defense. (BBTF, Battlefield Municipalities)

5-24. Continue to encourage land trusts, working in coordination with municipalities and landowners, to be the primary agents for land conservation in the battlefield. During the financial boom of the 1990s and early 2000s, land trusts were able to garner funding to protect known significant properties in the battlefield. Since that time, more information has been gathered about the extent of the actual battlefield land coverage and land trusts have gained further experience with landowners, available funding sources, and public programs for land preservation. The economic downturn of the late 2000s reduced available funding, but land trusts remain the primary organizations with the experience and staff to pursue funding and coordinate with landowners.

Municipalities can serve in an educational liaison role by providing information about available conservation options on their websites, newsletters, and mailings. Additionally, municipal officials and land trusts could meet with interested landowners to make them aware of specific benefits and opportunities to protect their lands. (Land Trusts, Landowners, Battlefield Municipalities)
5-25. Manage conserved lands in a manner consistent with long-term battlefield planning. Language should be included in conservation easements about the importance of being part of the battlefield and retaining battle-era historic resources. This could take the form of requiring historic resources to be maintained or allowing an additional primary use on the conserved lot in the easement, thereby giving opportunity for historic resources to be re-used and remain viable. Due to the era in which they were developed, many older conservation easements that exist in the battlefield allow for only one primary use on the property. This has created a situation where historic resources have been at jeopardy for being mothballed at best and demolished at worst to make way for a new building, usually a large residence, on the property. Land conservation and historic resources protection need to be better intermeshed going forward, particularly as smaller lots targeted for conservation often include historic resources and historic resource protection is a ‘positive’ in ranking lots for public land conservation funding.

The very landscape of the battlefield is a feature that could also be used to promote historic interpretation. Lands could be managed in way that continue to display practices of the colonial era, for example including compatible fencing, signage, hedgerows, or shrubbery.

Conserved land also results from land development open space. It is typically managed by a homeowners association (HOA) made up of volunteers, who may not have expertise in land management. This land should be managed in a manner consistent with battlefield planning. For example, HOAs wanting to create a community building can use fencing, material, and building scale and proportion that blend with colonial landscape features. (Battlefield Municipalities, Land Trusts)

5-26. Encourage landowners who own unprotected open lands to manage the sensitive natural resources on their property. Many protected properties in the battlefield are adjacent to private land that may never be protected. These unprotected lands, of varying sizes, can still be managed in a way that promotes quality environments. For example, a residential property next to protected woodlands could be planted with native trees along the common border, and thus extend the forest canopy, even if there is recreational residential lawn space underneath. Likewise, stream banks on smaller private lots can be vegetated with trees or kept as seasonally mowed tall grass in a 5 to 15 foot-setback ‘low mow zone.’ More information can be found in CCPC’s ‘Taking Control of Your Land: A Land Stewardship Guide for Landowners’.

(Battlefield Municipalities)

5-27. Publicize and celebrate land conservation efforts at heritage sites associated with the battlefield to publicly display the inherent relation between battlefield protection and land conservation. In the past, public education efforts for the battlefield have focused on battle history or colonial-era topics. However, the history of land preservation over the last 40 years could also be presented to the public in this forum. Such publicity would celebrate the efforts of local landowners and entities, while providing information to the public about the multi-faceted benefits of land conservation. (Land Trusts, Battlefield Municipalities)

5-28. Include the battlefield as a key feature that is to be addressed in land development design. During the sketch plan process, the township should encourage the use of site sensitive and open space development design, particularly on larger historic properties. When open space development design is used, the Township should consider requiring that significant historical and archeological resources be retained and viewsheds protected on conserved open lands or on a separate lot. If other development design is proposed on a key battle Landscape tract, the townships should require the historic resources to be preserved, or adaptively reused, as part of the development of the land. (Battlefield Municipalities)
Historic Resource Protection

5-29. Consider working with the Task Force and other battlefield municipalities to investigate developing battlefield design guidelines. Given the current design guidelines and experience in applying such guidelines, Township assistance and guidance with this task would help other battlefield communities. Such an effort could help provide guidance for redevelopment, rehabilitation, reuse, infill, or new construction that preserves the character and scenic values of the Landscapes and battlefield overall. West Bradford Township’s TND-2 has an excellent set of design guidelines that could be used as a starting point for this broader effort. Such guidelines should be presented in a guidebook and take into account preservation standards developed by the Secretary of the Interior. Chester County Community Planning Handbook (Tool #45) provides additional information. (West Bradford Township, Battlefield Municipalities)

5-30. Consider applying for designation as Certified Local Government (CLG). The CLG program provides technical assistance, greater access to the national preservation network, direct participation in the National Register nomination process, and small grants to local governments seeking to preserve historic resources. In Pennsylvania, the program is administered by PHMC and a match is required for projects undertaken with CLG funding. Only a few of the battlefield municipalities are designated as being a CLG and the rest should consider becoming designated. Municipalities apply directly to PHMC as detailed in their Guidelines for Implementation of the Certified Local Governments Program in Pennsylvania and Certification Worksheet for the Pennsylvania Certified Local Governments Program. (Battlefield Municipalities)

5-31. Require professional architectural assessment when a land development is determined to have an impact on identified historic resources in the Environmental Impact Assessment. While volunteer historic commissions/committees provide a great deal of knowledge on local resources and history, expertise by a professional in architectural historic and historic preservation planning can be extremely useful when it has been determined that there will be impacts to historic resources. This is standard procedure for municipalities with respect to seeking professional input when there are impacts to natural resources in transportation infrastructure- historic resources should be provided the same level of consideration. (Battlefield Municipalities)

5-32. Encourage adoption of consistent or at least compatible definitions for historic resources in ordinances throughout the battlefield. This can be promoted through the townships continuing to participate in the Battlefield Task Force and its subcommittee, and would require regulatory amendments by battlefield municipalities. (Battlefield Municipalities)
Due to the size and complexity of the battlefield, the 2013 Plan proposes a series of Gateways, Heritage Centers, Interpretive Sites, and Viewing Corridors (2013 Plan Map 5.1) as a means to organize public interpretation and education. It places strategic landscapes into one or more of these categories for their future interpretation and study. Phase one strategic landscapes planning further clarifies the battlefield via grouping related landscapes. Marshallton, Trimble’s Ford, and Jefferis’ Ford Landscapes form the ‘American reconnaissance and successful tactical northern British flanking march’ part of the battle, and together with Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Landscape form the northern battlefield. To facilitate interpretation, this Chapter refers to Trimble’s Ford and Jefferis’ Ford Landscapes as the ‘Breaching the Fords/British Advance’ area.

The 2013 Plan indicates the Breaching the Fords/British Advance area has high potential for interpretation due to its numerous extant and well-preserved historic resources, readable 18th century battlefield landscape, access to many of the historic roads where the flanking march occurred, and open space land conservation that is a hallmark of the area. The 2013 Plan indicates opportunities should be examined for establishing tours of critical corridors where the flanking march occurred with information on tours available in Marshallton village. This Chapter provides an outline of opportunities for heritage interpretation and, along with its related conceptual Heritage Tour (Appendix C) and corresponding Interpretative Signage (Appendix D) is intended to be a guide in its use and implementation by local entities. As such, this Chapter calls out and recaps key concepts that are detailed in the rest of the plan so prose may be somewhat repetitive herein, however when interpreting this area other plan parts should still be consulted for detailed and clarifying information.

The authenticity of historic sites and places discussed in this Chapter is what makes them so critical and attractive for battlefield interpretation. While interpretation provides important heritage recreation and education benefits to the community via a better understanding of what is literally ‘is their back yards’ and possible economic assistance, the strategies in this Chapter respect that the battlefield spans existing local communities where people live and work today just as they did in 1777.

Setting the Stage for Interpretation

Map 5.1 displays the interpretation network concept for the entire battlefield from the 2013 Plan that is the starting point for this Chapter, which provides an outline to begin to implement elements of the network. Relevant to this plan from the network concept are Heritage Centers, Viewing Corridors, and Interpretive Sites. Due to the large size of the battlefield, the 2013 Plan recommends four Heritage Centers, one of is which suggested for Marshallton village. Heritage Centers are villages or areas with a cluster of historic resources in a strategic landscape, where people could stop for 15-30 minutes to learn about particular elements of the battle. They then direct people to nearby Viewing Corridors and Interpretive Sites that further tell the story at the site of those particular battle elements through Heritage Tours and related interpretive signage. Heritage Centers could include outdoor areas, kiosks, or signage that could be readily viewed (e.g. Martin’s Tavern in Marshallton village) and/or indoor facilities with limited hours and staff.

---

1 This plan for Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Strategic Landscapes, along with plans for Marshallton and Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill, represent phase one battlefield strategic landscapes planning.
Breaching the Fords/British Advance area, along with Marshallton Landscape, relate to the proposed Behind the Lines Heritage Center in Marshallton village. This Heritage Center would tell the story of the northern battlefield and American reconnaissance and successful tactical northern British flanking march; where a good portion of the 9-hour, approximately 14-mile British tactical flanking march took place that began in the early morning near Kennett Square and halted near Strode’s Mill to prepare for the impending battle. It would explore historic themes related to American military activity, significance of the British flanking strategy, 18th century landscape, local Brandywine Valley community, and the impact of the battle. The concept of a heritage center in Marshallton village is in line with West Bradford Township policy in their Greenways, Trails, and Gateways Plan, which identifies the village to be a Township “gateway”. A ‘gateway’ as defined in the Township plan shares similar qualities with this plan’s heritage center concept, including evoking a sense of place and connection to the community fabric, enhancing and integrating historic, natural, and cultural features, and be visually accessible to the public. Strategies outlined in this Chapter are intended to be undertaken and further refined at the Behind the Lines Heritage Center, including Heritage Tours that are intended to begin at the Heritage Center.

Breaching the Fords/British Advance Area: Overview for Interpretation Purposes

Breaching the Fords/British Advance area begins near modern Red Lion and Marlboro Roads in modern Pocopson Township, at the mid flank marching route of the British Line, and ends near modern West Miner Street and Birmingham Road in modern (and battle-era) East Bradford Township, where the British Line completed their second crossing of the Creek and their flanking advance.

See Behind the Lines – Marshallton Strategic Landscapes Plan.
The area can be highlighted for heritage interpretation for several overarching historic reasons, which coincide with and translate into themes that follow. 1) Successful Flanking Tactic: It is where Gen’l. Howe was able to successfully flank the American Army by navigating 9,000 troops on a 9-hour circuitous march through difficult terrain that included two unguarded Creek fordings. 2) Conflicting Reports: It is the location of conflicting American reconnaissance accounts about British activity, leading Gen’l. Washington to be uncertain about his military strategy and ultimately failing to understand, until it was too late, that he was being outflanked to the west and north by half the Crown Forces. It was in this area that the skirmish between Lt. Col. Ross’ patrol and Crown Forces took place. Lt. Col. Ross’ patrol, who were ordered to patrol roads in the area for British activity, skirmished with the rear of the British column, most likely near modern Red Lion Road at Corinne Road (the 1742 Road). The 1742 Road led to Jone’s/Painter’s Ford along the Brandywine Creek, where Gen’l. Washington posted American troops. The skirmish resulted in a report by Ross to Gen’l. Washington, warning him of the flank, its general location, and possible route. 3) Unguarded Fords: The area contains Trimble’s Ford and Jefferis’ Ford, the unguarded fords closest to the northernmost American guarded Buffington’s Ford. The ability to successfully cross the Creek is highly relevant to the area and battle overall. The area is also the location of the narrow passage (‘defile’) leading east from Jefferis’ Ford, which to the great surprise of Gen’l. Howe was not, and could have easily been, defended by a relatively small number of American troops, likely leading to the failure of Howe’s flanking tactic. 4) Readable 18th century Landscape: The area continues to display an 18th century Brandywine Valley landscape (including structures and lands American and Crown Forces would have viewed firsthand) and retains colonial-era cultural roots and identity (including local Quaker community and continuously used 18th century meetinghouses, residences, and properties). (Chapters 1, 3, and 4 and Appendix A should be referenced for detailed information.)

This area can also be highlighted for the local community’s committed and ongoing open space land conservation and historic resource protection efforts. Though located only a short distance from West Chester Borough, the area still contains expanses of open lands that convey a still visible battlefield landscape. This enduring 18th century character is largely enabled due to intact rural and farmland surroundings. The importance of the remarkable way the rural nature of area has been preserved for almost 250 years cannot be underestimated. The setting is sparsely developed, primarily with residential and agricultural uses, including original associated historic buildings and structures that are still used today. Property owners in the area generally value historic resources and open lands and actively work to keep both preserved and viable. The municipalities promote the area’s stewardship mindset via active local land conservation, historical, environmental, and recreation commissions/committees, which promote continued preservation balanced with vitality in the area. Important to the area is the presence of Brandywine Red Clay Alliance, which has significant conserved land holdings in Pocopson Township near the location of Trimble’s Ford and on the route of the British flank. The area has remained so well preserved due to the efforts of property owners and local entities to identify and support open space land conservation opportunities and to recognize historic resources and districts. (Chapters 4 and 5 provide further information)

The area contains numerous individual historic resources and National Register historic districts of Northbrook Historic District, Trimbleville Historic District and Worth/Jefferis Rural Agricultural Historic District as well as West Branch Brandywine Creek Multiple Resources and Thematic National Register Area. Together, they encompass over 2,00 acres of historic structures, open lands, woodlots, and farmlands and contain both Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords as well as modern roads and archaeological sites of trace (former) roads used during the Crown Forces flanking advance. (Chapter 4, Appendices B and C should be referenced for detailed information.)
Interpretive Themes

Chapter 5 of the 2013 Plan recommends establishing unifying interpretive themes for the battlefield. This plan takes that step and identifies themes based on the area’s significance, which speaks to several overarching themes broadly categorized as ‘military events’, ‘18th century landscape’, and ‘local community’. Aspects of these themes are interlaced. Under (one or more) broad categories fall specific themes for this area that directly reflect reasons for the area’s significance:

Military events theme:
- British advance and tactical military flanking strategy

Military events and Local community themes:
- American military action and reconnaissance, and battle skirmishes
- Battle impact on local civilians

18th century landscape theme:
- Still readable battlefield landscape

Local community and 18th century landscape themes:
- Brandywine Valley in the colonial era through 1800
- Quaker roots and Peace Testimony

Chester County history related themes: Area history also mirrors major themes in the overall history of Chester County, including multi-generational rural agricultural tradition, Brandywine Valley Quaker settlement, prosperous commerce/industry foundation, and the American Revolution.

Museum of the American Revolution (MAR) related themes: These Landscapes interpretive themes can also be categorized under the broad MAR themes. Landscapes’ themes of: American military action, reconnaissance, and battle skirmishes generally fall under MAR theme of ‘Citizens turned Revolutionaries’; British advance and strategic outflanking of Washington’s position near Chads’ Ford, and the battle’s impact on local citizens generally fall under MAR theme of ‘Radical Nature of the Revolution’; and a still readable Brandywine Valley colonial landscape and Quaker roots/Peace Testimony generally fall under MAR theme of ‘Lasting Meanings’. The overarching theme for the entire Brandywine Battlefield as a pivotal moment in the American Revolution, discussed in the 2013 Plan speaks to all MAR’s themes.

Thematic Narrations

Specific themes for the area can be organized into thematic narrations or stories for public consumption, which can be conveyed through Behind the Lines Heritage Center and related Heritage Tours, Viewing Corridors, and Interpretive Sites for the area:

Role of the northern battlefield in the overall battle Thematic Narration:
This would tell the story of the battle in the northern battlefield and as such would incorporate information from strategic landscapes plans for Marshallton, Trimble’s Ford, Jefferis’ Ford, and Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill, as well as from the 2013 Plan as needed. While the Breaching the Fords/British Advance area coincides with the mid stage of the British flank, this narrative would also feature the last stage of the flank from the crossing at Jefferis’ Ford to the British halt and preparation for battle at Strode’s Mill and nearby Osborne Hill. Possibility this narrative could be expanded and coordinated with the Heritage Center proposed near Kennett Square to also discuss the first stage of the flanking march that started in the Kennett Square area.

1 ‘Chads’ is the 18th century family name, which differs from present-day spelling of the locale ‘Chadds Ford’.
Successful British Flanking Tactic and Conflicting American reconnaissance Thematic Narration:
Battle staging\(^1\) on both sides occurred during the morning and into the afternoon of September 11, 1777 in the northern battlefield. This entails the successful British military strategy under Gen’l. Howe to avoid, via a tactical flanking maneuver, the bulk of the American Army arrayed near Chadds Ford. This also entails the American’s inability to gather reliable field intelligence, even with active field patrols, on the occurrence and location of the British flank.

Important to this story is the battlefield’s National Historic Landmark information that states: “Washington’s defeat at the Battle of Brandywine was a consequence of his failure to appreciate the geography of the region. The stream itself had little defensive value for, although it necessitated fording, the fords were so numerous that it was almost impossible to defend all of them. The British realized this, and after a forced march crossed upstream of Washington’s army at a ford Washington did not even realize existed.”

Terrain, Physical Geography, and Natural Resources in the northern battlefield Thematic Narration:
This narration would largely rely on information in Chapter 3 that discusses the area’s terrain and what soldiers (British and American alike) would have experienced in 1777 traversing the rough terrain. Before the time of bridges, travel regularly included crossing watercourses and their adjacent floodplains and wetlands via fords that served as ‘waterway roads’ of the period.

Roads, fords, taverns, meetings, and hamlets in colonial Chester County Thematic Narration:
This narration would largely rely on information in Chapter 4 that discusses the area’s settlement patterns including existing roads, properties, key structures (meetinghouse, mills, residences, blacksmith shops, taverns, and the like), along with local property owners, tenants, and their family histories and the effect on colonial settlement and the landscape of today.

Techniques to locate Trimbles Ford Thematic Narration:
This narration would heavily rely on information in Chapter 3 that discusses the reasons and techniques (documentation and in the field) to locate Trimble’s Ford and roads traces leading to and from the ford.

Interaction between two invading armies and the local community Thematic Narration:
Primary accounts giving a sense of conflict and cooperation between both armies and the local community could be featured. Reported property losses (in the form of Plunder claims, Depredation claims, and Quaker Suffering), diary entries, letters, field reports and other others could provide the basis for this narration, which would need to be supplemented by additional interpretation to fill-in gaps. This could be expanded to also discuss primary source research (document and field) in general, including the information and sources used to map battle-era roads and properties, as well as to discuss types of documented accounts that still exist from the colonial-era.

Local support or lack thereof for the war effort Thematic Narration:
One of the unique aspects of the battlefield that sets it apart is the pacifist Quaker community that largely made up the Brandywine Valley community at the time of the battle. Effectively, the battle brought an invasion of two armies into the community. Quakerism is an intriguing story that has just become more of a recent focus, particularly in light of the increased interest in the Underground Railroad in the region with the recent creation of the First State National Monument and its related sites. This narrative could include information about Quaker settlement in the Brandywine Valley, their philosophy including Testimony of Peace and Quaker ‘Sufferings’, and the enduring Quaker presence in the region.

---

\(^1\) Tactical battle staging in the northern battlefield includes American reconnaissance (Marshallton and Trimble’s Ford Landscapes), northern British tactical flanking advance (Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes), and last leg of the flanking advance/ preparation for battle (Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Landscape). Osborne Hill Landscape is related to Strode’s Mill as an area of battle staging/preparation; however, it will be discussed in earnest as part of the core battle in a future battlefield strategic landscapes plan.
Celebration of committed and ongoing incredible local efforts in open space land conservation and historic resource protection Thematic Narration:
This narrative would stress that the persevering stewardship of property owners and local entities in the area is what has enabled the battlefield landscape, including historic building and open lands, to endure to this day. This has occurred through ongoing and committed open space land conservation and historic resource protection efforts. Examples of historic resource preservation, sensitive reuse, open space land conservation efforts, and recognition of parties involved would be included. Important to this narrative is the battlefield’s NHL information that states: “The significance of the Battlefield...is increased as a consequence of the degree to which the area has remained unchanged.”

Water Tour on the Brandywine Creek Thematic Narration:
While Appendix C provides a proposed driving (or cycling) tour concept, in addition a ‘Water Tour’ concept should be explored and an interpretive heritage tour developed. It would entail a kayak or canoe tour on the Brandywine Creek passing by fording and other sites. As the Creek comprises ‘waters of the Commonwealth’, its length, as passable depending on water depth, is publically accessible. Limited interpretive signage could be posted at fording and other sites along the Creek edge, particularly on municipal or other public-oriented lands. This provides a way by which the fords can be viewed from a different vantage point.

Thematic Narration Treatment Example for this Area
A thematic treatment is needed for each of the interpretive themes and related thematic narrations identified in this plan. This thematic treatment supplements Heritage Tours, Viewing Corridors, Interpretive Sites, and the Heritage Center concepts by developing the specific means and strategies by which to inform viewers about themes. These means and strategies would form the basis for future educational material, outreach, signage, etc. As these treatment would need to be vetted and developed once thematic narrations are decided upon, this section provides an example of how this could work using one of the thematic nations addressed above.

Successful British Flanking Tactic and Conflicting American reconnaissance Thematic Narration detail:
The prior wording about this theme, while not repeated again here, provides a good summary that should be included as a compelling preface to this more detailed description that follows.

In the early morning on September 11, 1777, the day of battle, the British army began maneuvering near today’s Kennett Square Borough. Gen’l. Sir William Howe divided his army into two columns. One headed east toward Chads’ Ford (today spelled Chadds) as a distraction for the Americans in thinking they were facing the whole of the British army, while the other headed north under Gen’l. Howe. The flanking tactic, directed by Gen’l. Lord Cornwallis and accompanied by Howe consisted of the finest troops in Howe’s army. Guiding them north were local Loyalists, who Hessian Capt. Ewald noted had good topographic knowledge of the area.

Simultaneously American patrols on horse and foot were scouring the roads on the west side of the Brandywine Creek looking for British troop movements. That morning, Gen’l. Washington deployed troops to guard fords the British might use to approach American Forces from the west. Troops were posted at seven fords along the Creek’s main stem, though Trimble’s Ford and Jefferis’ Ford further north were unguarded. It is through using both unguarded fords that the British were able to make their flanking advance. After Gen’l’ Howe crossed and emerged on the east side of the second (Jefferis) ford, he was surprised he was not met by Gen’l. Washington’s troops since his men had encountered and skirmished with American Forces earlier that day. It would have taken a relatively small number of American troops, to defend the narrow passage (‘defile’) leading east from the ford, likely resulting in the failure of Howe’s flanking tactic. Their ability to successfully cross the Creek in this area makes it highly significant to the battle and its outcome.
In the meantime, conflicting American reconnaissance accounts about British activity led Gen’l. Washington to be uncertain about his military strategy and ultimately fail to understand, until it was too late, that he was being outflanked to the west and north by half the British Army. In the fog of war, Gen’l. Howe was able to successfully outflank the American Army and navigate 9,000 troops plus a ‘baggage train’ of supplies on a 9-hour, approximately 14-mile circuitous march through difficult terrain that included two unguarded Creek fordings with few skirmishes. It is not known why General Washington did not investigate fording possibilities north of Buffington’s Ford or have on hand local guides well versed in the local terrain and road possibilities. In perspective, however, General Washington was going up against the most powerful army in the world at the time, who well understood the value of capable guides, to navigate British troops through the local countryside.

Concepts/Topics to be provided as part of interpretation:
- Role the roads and terrain played in the successful British flank. Challenges of 18th century fording in general prior to the development of bridges.
- What a fording by 9,000 troops plus a baggage train of supplies and people would have looked like, and how long and wide it would have extended.
- Conditions that British troops endured on the flanking march (e.g. 9-hour, approximately 14-mile march, humid late summer weather, traversing difficult terrain) and how their likely exhaustion may have impacted the battle.
- Eyewitness, firsthand, and other accounts of the flanking march.
- The march’s impact to property, business, and the longer lasting effects on agriculture and industry (e.g. tenant blacksmith Highfield’s significant property losses to British troops led him to bankruptcy).
- Lessons of the military flanking tactic as may be relevant today. How KOCOA is still used on battlefield lands by present-day soldiers in learning about terrain and military tactics.
- What can be learned about items lost or discarded by troops and re-found by locals over the years.
- Description of known information Gen’l. Washington would likely have been aware of related to the flank, location of fords and roads, loyalists, and related topics.

Locations:
- Behind the Lines Heritage Center: As an anchor and starting point for further information, and which includes amenities of shops, restaurants, and rest stops.
- Trimbleville: Crossroads that evolved at the convergence of several colonial-era roads and near the well-traveled only ford for miles (Trimble’s Ford); grew into the early 19th century and then dissolved into a hamlet when bridges were built and drover’s roads flourished.
- BRCA: Non-profit managing over 300 acres with public access in the heart of the battlefield, including the site of Lt. Col. Ross’ patrol’s skirmish with British troops and segments of the trace of the 1728 Road to the Great Valley that could be demarked as a trail with interpretation.
- Proposed Trimble’s Ford Interpretive Site and municipal park: Location of the historic ford now found that was long lost to history, and including a proposed parking pull-off, walking trail to the ford, and conservation of these lands for this purpose.
- Proposed Jefferis’ Ford Interpretive Site: Location of the second successful fording of the Creek, highlighting how the ford and the narrow passage leading east from the ford were unguarded and the high probability of a successful ambush and failure of the flanking march if it were guarded.

Outreach and communication:
- Audience: Local and Regional Visitors; Heritage Tourists, Residents, School Children.
- Brochure on the ‘Ford to Ford’ Heritage Tour and/or the thematic narration to direct people to relevant sites and associate sites and themes.
- Webpage on the same with the additional audience of Virtual Visitors.
Visiting the five designated locations (above) physically or virtually via developing a smart phone app along with or incorporating information from the brochure and/or webpage can provide visitors with the experience of the site.

Heritage Tours including a proposed driving tour outlined in Appendix C and a proposed ‘Water Trail’ tour (to be developed) showcasing fording sites and other relevant sites viewable from Brandywine Creek.

Interpretive signs can be placed at appropriate locations that are further detailed in Appendix D.

**Interpretive Places**

Themes are explored through displays featured at Behind the Line Heritage Center and related Interpretive Sites in Marshallton village, and through Viewing Corridors and Interpretive Sites in the surrounding area viewed on Heritage Tours. The viewer’s experience is intended to begin at the Heritage Center where they would be provided historic and logistical viewing information and guided to Interpretive Sites in the village and on Heritage Tours. Viewing Corridors are roadway segments with low to moderate traffic volumes that provide views of landscapes, buildings, and natural features relevant to the battle and reflective of the battle-era landscape. Interpretive Sites are battle-era structures, roads, properties, and natural and land areas that still exist in the contemporary landscape. They are chosen based on their relevance to tell the story of one or more interpretive themes and their potential for public viewing. Sites include both those that are publically accessible and private properties that are viewed solely from the public right of way. Heritage Tours link Interpretive Sites and Viewing Corridors for confined public interpretation. Each strategic landscape plan is intended to include a proposed Heritage Tour concept as a starting point for local interpretation, however additional Heritage Tours ideas, such as developing a Brandywine Creek ‘Water Tour’ via canoe or kayak, are anticipated. Behind the Lines Heritage Center would provide the beginning or ending point for each of the three tours proposed in northern battlefield strategic landscapes plans. Below provides a summary of the proposed “Ford to Ford’ Heritage Tour, which is the featured tour for Breaching the Fords/British Advance area, and Appendix C provides the detailed tour and map.

**Behind the Lines Heritage Center at Marshallton village**

Marshallton village features Bradford Meeting, Martin’s Tavern, Humphry Marshall House, and the Blacksmith Shop interpretive sites, the latter of which is also proposed as the physical location of the Heritage Center. Information about these sites is found in the Behind the Lines Plan for Marshallton Landscape.

**‘Ford to Ford’ Heritage Tour: Viewing Corridors/Sites, and Interpretive Sites**

**Trimbleville Interpretive Site**

The former Trimbleville is located in the broad valley formed by the Brandywine and Broad Run Creeks just west of Trimble’s Ford. A marker is proposed in this area where visitors can take a moment to consider the colonial landscape and how it remains visible in today’s landscape. The convergence of several battle-era roads coupled with Trimble’s Mill and close proximity of the ford made Trimbleville a busy crossroads from the late 1700’s until the mid-1800's.
The 1705 Spur Road Viewing Corridor
Camp Linden Road, a spur road of the early 1705 Road to Chester, follows the route of British troops on their flanking advance. It was previously felt that the documented skirmish between British and American Forces during the flanking advance took place near this location. However, new evidence indicates that skirmish likely occurred roughly three miles south of this location.

The 1705 Road to Chester Viewing Corridor
Led by three loyalists, British troops were led to a now former road (the 1754 Road) that went around a notch in the hill and led east to Lucky Hill Road and Jefferis’ Ford. Two battle-era families lived on the 1754 Road, the George Carters and Richard and Ann Jones, both of whom recorded property losses.

Trimble’s Ford Interpretive Site and Trail
A parking pull-off area is proposed on Unionville-Wawaset Road west of Bridge Road bridge, where a viewer can go for a walk on a proposed trail to near the location of newly found Trimble’s Ford. Trimble’s Ford was the first crossing of the Creek. The importance of Trimble’s Ford as a key component of the colonial road infrastructure can be seen in the number of roads and places it served. From the south, the four primary roads to the Great Valley from Kennett, East Marlborough, Newlin, Pocopson and Pennsbury converged at the floodplains that formed the ford. The 1742 Road that intersected with the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley brought goods and people to/from East Bradford and Birmingham Townships.

The ford fell into disuse after Brandywine Creek was bridged nearby at what evolved into Northbrook village in the early 1800’s. By the early 1900’s, the section of the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley that led to the ford and that had been marched upon by the British was closed, though today segments still remain visible, such as a small section of unpaved road that is a designated Pocopson Township trail. One of the most important aspects of this plan is pinpointing Trimble’s Ford. Through geomorphic and geophysical study (Chapter 3), the location of the ford is now known, as is the fact that the ford was actually comprised of a secondary southern ford crossing a tributary and a primary ford crossing of Brandywine Creek’s west branch. Also found is the trace of the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley near the fords that the British used on their approach and exit of their crossing at Trimble’s Ford. Chapter 5 recommends preservation of the land around the fords and development of a local Pocopson Township park and interpretive trail to the site.

Buffington’s Ford Interpretive Site
Buffington’s Ford site is just north of the ‘Forks of the Brandywine’, where the Creek’s main stem split into its west and east branches. The former ford site can be viewed from a Shaw’s Bridge Township Park where a visitor can park and walk to the Creek’s edge to view the fording site as well as the ‘forks’. Directly across the road is the Joseph Guest farm which is associated with the colonial ford. This also represents the northernmost point that American troops guarded along the Creek. It is not known why Gen’l. Washington did not investigate other fording possibilities further to the north or retain capable local guides with this knowledge.

Worth/Jefferis Rural Agricultural Historic District Viewing Corridor
Worth/Jefferis Historic District is a rural agricultural historic district of around 1,800 acres. Historic and modern Lucky Hill Road near modern Allerton Road was Emmor Jefferis’ ‘Blue Rocks Farm’ property at the time of the battle, and his 1714 four-bay two-story stone farmhouse (pictured) with a 1760 addition and his stone and frame barn still stand. In his barn, Emmor apparently was storing liquor for his friend in Wilmington who thought it would be safer from being ransacked during the war in the countryside. Local lore attributes a large amount of brandy stolen by British troops from his property. Sometime after the war, his farmhouse became a tavern known as ‘Sign of the Eel’s Foot’. In addition to buildings, the rural historic district also takes into account landscape features (roads, fields, rolling terrain, hedgerows), spatial layout (roads, properties), and cultural traditions (farmsteads). The 1725 Road (modern Lucky Hill Road) ran through the area connecting families to the 1719/1705 Road (historic and modern Birmingham Road) and larger region, including the early established Concord Quarterly Quaker Meeting c.1684, Chester city, and Philadelphia. Today, the historic district still depicts Chester County’s 18th century agricultural landscape, a still readable battle-era setting, and Quaker community foundations; it is considered one of the County’s most significant rural historic districts.

**Jefferis’ Ford Interpretive Site**

The site of Jefferis’ Ford is located at today’s Jefferis’ Ford Bridge, where the British flank advanced across Brandywine Creek for the second time. Emmor Jefferis, a Quaker farmer who owned the land abutting the Ford west of the Creek, was “compelled” to guide the British Army across the Ford and towards Birmingham Meeting. As Gen’l. Howe emerged on the other (east) side of the ford, he was surprised he was not met by Washington’s troops since his men had encountered and skirmished with American Forces earlier that day. Howe’s tactical flanking maneuver had worked. How this occurred given that American patrols had spotted and reported on the British column’s whereabouts, remains an enigma that confounds historians today. A covered bridge was built in 1833 at the site of the ford, and later replaced by the current bridge.

**The 1725 Road towards Turk’s Head and Philadelphia Viewing Corridor**

Lucky Hill Road (the 1725 Road) provides a viewing corridor in Worth/Jefferis rural agricultural Historic District and there remain battle-era historic structures still in use today. For example, Abraham Taylor built his farmhouse after he inherited 114 acres of land from his father in 1759. Taylor was a Quaker who attended Bradford Meeting in Marshallton village as did his neighbors. The 20th century stone barn on today’s property blends well with the battle-era farmhouse.

**Recommendations**

These recommendations build on interpretation that had been accomplished to provide further direction. Brandywine Battlefield Task Force, which has been key in efforts to date, and its newer Historic Resources, Education, and Interpretation Subcommittee includes representatives from historical commissions and sites throughout the battlefield. The key to successful implementation of interpretation for this area of the battlefield is for the Task Force to identify a Behind the Lines Interpretation Subcommittee consisting of the West Bradford and East Bradford Historical Commissions, Pocopson and Newlin Historical Committees, Friends of Martin’s Tavern, Marshallton Conservation Trust, area residents, merchants, the Methodist Church, and Bradford Meetinghouse. The following are recommendations for such a subcommittee in developing a cohesive interpretation program for the Heritage Center in Marshallton village. All of the following would be implemented by the subcommittee:
6-1. Develop the Blacksmith shop into the physical location of the Behind the Lines Heritage Center where the Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Ford Landscapes will be interpreted. Create a display area in the Blacksmith Shop to house interpretive materials for the Heritage Center. These should include the Marshallton Walking Tour, three proposed northern battlefield Heritage Tours, 2010 Study’s animated battle map, relevant information from this plan and other northern battlefield landscape plans, and displays that discuss Gen’l. Howe’s flanking tactic.

6-2. At the Heritage Center, host an annual speaker program that highlights military strategy of the battle and how it is still visible and can be seen and understood in today’s battlefield landscape. Hold annual special events to highlight the British flank and American reconnaissance attempts to warn Washington and thwart the British flanking strategy.

6-3. Work with BRCA to develop an Interpretive Site. The site could include educational information or programs about the battle, particularly as it relates to the Brandywine Creek and the general role water plays in military strategy. Explore how KOCOA analysis of terrain and natural features can be used for educational experiences in explaining the battle and natural features. It could also include Interpretation at Corrine and Red Lion Roads, where Lt. Col. Ross’ patrol skirmished with British troops. Develop an interpretive trail that roughly follows on the trace of the 1728 Road to the Great Valley (north of modern Red Lion Road’s northern terminus) and describes the flanking march and its impact on the battle outcome, local citizens, and troops.

6-4. Work with Chester County Department of Open Space, Brandywine Conservancy, Civil War Trust, Pocopson Township and public and private partners to acquire or ease the location of the primary and secondary Trimble’s Fords for a township park, which would preserve the ford, trace road, and surrounding land and provide a public interpretive site with access, a walking trail, parking pull-off, and informational signage about the ford and battle.

6-5. Begin discussion with Pocopson Township and BRCA about a potential trail easement to connect BRCA’s trail network including the proposed trail along the British flanking march on the trace of the 1728 Road to the Great Valley (which is on BRCA property) with the Township’s Bragg Hill Road trail.

6-6. Work with Stroud Preserve to interpret the battle as it pertains to the flanking march that passed by along modern Lucky Hill Road. Stroud Preserve encompasses the battle-era Thomas Worth property, plus sections of the George Carter Jr. and Taylor family properties.

6-7. Work with East Bradford Township to create a Jefferis’ Ford and Buffington’s Ford Interpretive Site, including a small area for public access and informational signage. It is proposed that the latter be a part of the current Shaw’s Bridge Township Park from which both the approximate fording site and forks of the Brandywine can be viewed from the Creek’s edge or via canoe or kayak on the Creek.

6-8. Implement the Heritage Tour in Appendix C and develop a smart phone app for the three proposed northern battlefield Heritage Tours.

6-9. Create thematic brochures and information for a Heritage Center webpage. Brochures would be available at the Heritage Center and Interpretive Sites, as possible, and webpage information could be linked to the smart phone app (as recommended) to provide viewers with additional educational information they can view on-site or off-site.

6-10. Build Heritage Center themes into other public events or festivals in Marshallton and Breaching the Fords/British Advance area townships (West Bradford, East Bradford, Pocopson, Newlin). For example the
Marshallton Triathlon, which begins and ends in the village, could focus on the physical difficulty of the 9-hour march, challenging willing participants with 60-pound packs that British troops carried on their difficult but successful march.

6-11. Build Behind the Lines Heritage Center themes into the menus of Four Dogs Tavern and Marshallton Inn. Entrees or special drinks could reference colonial and military wording or offerings. Coordinate with other local businesses, as appropriate, in promoting understanding and interpretation of the northern battlefield.

6-12. Develop a ‘Water Trail’ tour and work with Behind the Lines Heritage Center, Brandywine Battlefield Park in Chadds Ford, and other entities to market and Northbrook Canoe Company to offer canoe and kayak summer tours to residents and visitors to the battlefield.

6-13. Publicize and celebrate open space land conservation efforts at the Heritage Center and Interpretive Sites, as appropriate, to publicly recognize the inherent relation between battlefield protection and land conservation. In the past, public education efforts for the battlefield have focused solely on battle history or colonial-era topics. However, the history of land preservation over the last 40 years could also be presented to the public in this forum. Such publicity would celebrate the efforts of local landowners and entities, while providing information to the public about the multi-faceted benefits of land conservation. Likewise, this idea could be coupled with celebrating historic resource protection efforts, particularly in relation to land conservation, as well as adaptive reuse and restoration efforts.

6-14. Encourage municipal historical commissions/committees to provide articles for their respective township websites and newsletters and host events as possible that highlight the northern battlefield’s significance.
This appendix provides a historical overview of the battle and time sequence for the northern Brandywine Battlefield where tactical battle staging occurred the morning and into the afternoon of September 11, 1777. The northern battlefield consists of the strategic landscapes of Marshallton, Trimble’s Ford, Jefferis’ Ford, and Sconneltown/Strode’s Mill. While not part of the northern battlefield, Osborne Hill Strategic Landscape is considered to be a ‘related’ landscape due to its relationship and relevance to the Strode’s Mill area in regard to the finish of the British Advance and the ‘lull’ in action on the northern front while the Crown Forces halted to ‘rest and regroup’ after a long trek over rolling terrain and through water bodies on a humid late summer day. (This relationship is addressed in the ‘Preparing for Battle’ Plan for Sconneltown/Strode’s Mill Strategic Landscape). The historic overview this appendix provides has been adapted from the 2013 Plan information by the project consultant JMA.

Further, this appendix takes a step back from Strategic Landscapes analysis to look at the broader picture of the entire Brandywine Battlefield and the battle itself. The reason for this broader look is to set the stage for how Strategic Landscapes fit into the larger battlefield landscape. This appendix summarizes the significance of the battle as a defining moment in local, state, and national history and provides an overview of recent battlefield planning efforts. It also reinforces the battlefield’s national importance, as recognized in Landscapes2 (Chester County’s Comprehensive Policy Plan), and validates its significant contribution to the County’s quality of place, which is a key element of VISTA 2025 (Chester County’s economic development strategy).

**Historical Overview of the Battle**

The late summer of 1777 in the upper Delmarva Peninsula witnessed the start of the military campaign that resulted in the capture of Philadelphia by Crown Forces (25 September 1777). Two years of warfare had preceded the Philadelphia Campaign, with much of the principal military action on land occurring in New England, New York and New Jersey. Crown Forces setbacks occurred in December 1776 (First Battle of Trenton) and in early January 1777 (Battle of Princeton). These reversals resulted in the Crown Forces wintering in New York City and in the vicinity of New Brunswick and Perth Amboy, New Jersey, and American Forces taking up winter quarters around Morristown, New Jersey.

During May and June 1777, the inability of Gen’l. Sir William Howe to force a decisive battle or outmaneuver Gen’l. George Washington in New Jersey led to the movement by sea of the balance of Crown Forces from Staten Island to Elk Neck in Maryland. Numbering approximately 15,000 men, the Crown Forces were transported by the British fleet up the Chesapeake Bay and landed at the Head of Elk on 25 August. Their intent was to advance overland to capture Philadelphia, the fledgling capital of the United States (Black 1998:124).

In a series of hard-fought engagements, American and Crown forces battled each other across the landscape and on the waters of Northeastern Maryland and the Lower Delaware Valley. In a series of engagements – Cooch’s Bridge (3 September), Brandywine (11 September), Battle of the Clouds (16 September), and Paoli (20-21 September) – Crown Forces maneuvered and fought their way to the colonial capital of Philadelphia, which was taken on 25 September (McGuire 2006). By far the largest of these engagements – both in terms of land area covered and numbers of troops actively involved – was the Battle of Brandywine.

The terrain between Head of Elk in Maryland and the Schuylkill and Delaware River valleys over which the two armies maneuvered in the late summer and early fall of 1777 was markedly different from the ground in central
New Jersey where fighting had occurred in the early summer campaigning. There, as Howe’s army attempted to maneuver towards the rebel nation’s capital of Philadelphia, Washington’s army had significant high ground – the Watchung Mountains – to his rear, into which he could retire if forced to, and out of which he could launch forays upon the rear and right flank of Crown Forces. In southeastern Pennsylvania and the adjacent counties of New Castle and Cecil, the rolling hills of the Piedmont were cut by generally west-to-east-flowing streams such as the Christina River, the White and Red Clay Creeks, and the Brandywine. Washington was able to use these drainages to his advantage, establishing a principal defensive line along the Red Clay Creek, and a secondary line closer to Wilmington along the lower reaches of the Brandywine. Howe avoided these defensive positions by continuously maneuvering to his left, or west, thus outflanking the American positions (he did this along the Red Clay Creek on 8 September, at the Brandywine on 11 September, and in the forcing of the Schuylkill River fords on 22 September). Unlike the American positions in New Jersey, Washington had no natural anchor for his right, or west flank, thus making it difficult to defend against Howe’s maneuver (Taaffe 2003:63-64).

Washington’s position along the Brandywine clearly blocked the direct route of advance towards Philadelphia (today’s US Route 1 corridor) and because of the broad valley and steep hills along the north side of the Creek was a strong post for his army. The river presented a major geographic obstacle for Howe’s army and the American position included temporary earthworks and prepared positions. The Brandywine position presented a great opportunity for Washington to offer battle, but the principal drawback about Washington’s defensive line was that the Brandywine had multiple crossing points over which the Crown Forces could advance, too many crossing points to adequately defend.

On September 11, 1777, Sir William Howe’s army launched a two-pronged attack on the American position along Brandywine Creek. One column commanded by Hessian Gen’l Kynphausen departed Kennett Square along the Great Notthingham Road (current US Route 1), and attacked Gen’l George Washington’s troops stationed at Chad’s Ford. A second column, commanded by Howe and Lord Charles Cornwallis, followed a more circuitous route, travelling north from Kennett Square, crossing the Brandywine Creek first at Trimble’s Ford (the approximate site is accessible today by walking in open fields and on farm paths through private property), and then turning east and fording the Brandywine again near what is now a bridge at old Jefferis’ Ford. The column arrived at an area near Birmingham Road in Birmingham Township and from there they attacked Washington’s northern flank from right rear. American formations responded to this maneuver by forming a series of defensive lines, but were out-maneuvered. The final action of the day occurred along the Old Wilmington Road south of Dilworthtown when Maj. Gen’l Nathanael Greene positioned his brigade and the remnants of other Continental formations in a semi-circular line that was able to blunt the Crown Forces advance. As evening approached and daylight waned, Washington’s Army retreated east along modern US Route 1. His forces reformed near the City of Chester in what is now Delaware County, Pennsylvania.

**Time Sequence of Battle Events as related to the Northern Battlefield**

Several assumptions about military-related battle events discussed in the 2013 Plan were further examined for this project. For Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Strategic Landscapes, they are shown in *italics* below. Likewise, they are shown in *italics* for Marshallton Landscape and in *italics* for Sconneltown/Strode’s Mill Landscape. Some of the assumptions apply to and thus are exploded for more than one Landscape, however only the primary Landscape to which they are ‘attached’ is highlighted below.

**Before 5AM in Marshallton village:** American patrol under Lt. Col. Ross (that spotted the British northern flank) arrives in Marshallton near the Tavern and begins to patrol the vicinity for British activity. Another patrol under Maj. Spear of the Chester County Militia (8th Battalion) was at the Tavern in the early morning or evening before
the battle. Chester County Militia (1st Battalion) under Col. John Hannum established their headquarters at Martin’s Tavern in the village of Marshallton, and were joined by Maj. Spear and by some pro-Independence civilians including Thomas “Squire” Cheyney the evening before the battle.

**British form two columns of troops – a northern flanking column (northern battlefield) and an eastern column (southern battlefield, to be studied in future strategic landscape plans)**

**Before 5AM to 6:45AM:** British Gen’l Cornwallis’s Division lines up and forms into a northern flanking column, then moves from Kennett Square along Unionville Road, then east along Marlboro Road, then north along to Red Lion Road to near Haines Mill Road. As ordered by Gen. Washington, before sunrise Maj. Spear leaves Martin’s Tavern to scout for British formations. Before sunrise, Spear rides south to Welch’s Tavern near present-day US 1 and Longwood Road at Longwood Gardens. Spear sees no British Troops.

**7AM to 7:45AM:** Cornwallis’s Division continues to move north along Red Lion Road to Unionville-Wawaset Road. From there, they turn west onto Bragg Hill Road, which is the road that leads to Trimble’s Ford. The rear of Cornwallis’s Division is still on Unionville Road near Street Road.

**British northern flanking column crosses the Brandywine Creek’s west and east branches**

**8AM:** Cornwallis’ Division, specifically the Hessian Field Jaegers Corps and the British Light Infantry Battalions, begin crossing the Creek’s western branch at Trimble’s Ford. South of Martin’s Tavern near Northbrook Road and Strasburg Road, American Col. Hannum and Squire Cheyney ride into the countryside from Martin’s Tavern and witness at an undefined location a cloud of dust rising from Cornwallis’s Division approaching Trimble’s Ford from the south to cross the Brandywine Creek. Cheyney rides to warn Gen’l Washington who is at the Ring Road House in Chadds Ford.

**9:30AM:** Ross’ detachment of American light infantry (70 men) arrives in Marshallton near Martin’s Tavern and begins scouting the area for British troops. Cornwallis’s Division continue to cross Creek at Trimble’s Ford and begin to move east on Lucky Hill Road and then Allerton Road to Jefferis’ Ford.

**10:45AM:** Ross’s Detachment moves south to Northbrook and North Wawaset Roads.

**11:00AM:** British’s 4th Brigade is the last military formation of Cornwallis’s Division to cross the Creek at Trimble’s Ford. Ross’s Detachment exchanges gunfire with British’s 4th Brigade at Trimble’s Ford and a brief skirmish ensues.

**11:15AM:** Ross sends a note to Gen’l Washington to report the British have crossed the Creek and are flanking to the north.

**11:45AM:** Cornwallis’s Division begins crossing the Creek’s eastern branch at Jefferis’ Ford. Sir William Howe forces Emmor Jefferis, a Quaker farmer, to guide the British in fording the Creek. Cornwallis’ Hessian Corps cross the creek and then turn south onto Birmingham Road, while Cornwallis’ Division wait to cross at the ford. Squire Cheyney arrives at Chadds Ford and tells Gen’l Washington of Cornwallis’s troops marching to the north, but is not believed.

**Noon:** Cornwallis’s Division continues crossing the Creek at Jefferis’ Ford. Gen’l. Washington receives Ross’s note stating that the British are to the north. Incorrectly believing his troops in the southern battlefield are confronting the majority of the British Army, Gen’l. Washington forms an attack on British troops lined up on the west side of the Creek.

British northern flanking column arrive at Strode’s Mill and halt to stage their attack

1:00PM: Joseph Townsend, a member of the Birmingham Meeting, witnesses the advance of Cornwallis’s Division through Sconnelltown at Birmingham Road and Sconnelltown Road. Cornwallis’s Division halts their advance and begin to organize near Strode’s Mill at present-day Birmingham Road and PA 52. The British Light Infantry and the Hessian Corps line up on the south side of PA 52 just south of Strode’s Mill.

1:15PM: Hessian Corps move south along Birmingham Road to near present-day County Club Road. Gen’l Washington orders troops to go north on Birmingham Road to near Meetinghouse Road where they see Cornwallis’ troops.

1:30PM to 2:15PM: Most of Cornwallis’s Division reach and stop to rest on Osborne Hill north of PA 52 and west of Birmingham Road to prepare for battle.

Battle Action Summary

The Battle of Brandywine was a complicated, multi-phase event involving nearly 30,000 troops and lasting from sunup to sundown on September 11, 1777. Map 1.11 from the 2013 Plan (below) provides a snapshot of what was a complex battle. At 5 a.m. the morning of the battle, British Gen’l Howe’s army launched a two-prong attack on the American position along Brandywine Creek. One column departed Kennett Square along the Great Nottingham Road and attacked American troops at Chadds Ford, as Gen’l Washington had expected (Map 1.11-A, B). A second Crown Force column followed a more circuitous route, travelling north from Kennett Square and then east, crossing the Creek further north than the Americans expected, first at Trimble’s Ford and then again at Jefferis’ Ford, arriving at Strodes Mill/Osborne Hill (Map 1.11-A, B, C, D, E) where they regrouped. From there the Crown Forces attacked to the south, confronting Gen’l Washington’s late planned northern troop defense line and out-maneuvering American Forces from the side (Map 1.11-E, F). American Forces were pushed further south where they regrouped near the village of Dilworthtown to organize a last defensive stand (Map 1.11-G, H), using non-traditional ‘guerrilla warfare’, the first of many times Gen’l Washington would employ the tactic during the war. While the sun was fading in the evening, Maj. Gen’l Greene positioned his brigade and the remnants of other American formations in a semi-circular line that was able to hold off and blunt the Crown Forces’ advance. This allowed American Forces to retreat east, reforming near the City of Chester. (Appendix A provides a more detailed battle history.)

Battlefield Significance

Brandywine was a defining battle of the American Revolution and specifically the British Campaign in 1777 to overtake and occupy Philadelphia, the colonial capital. The battle was significant as it involved the highest ranked officers of both the American Army and British Army, Gen’l Washington and Gen’l Howe. Although the Americans were unsuccessful in preventing British occupation of Philadelphia, the battle demonstrated the American Army had the ability to slow and withstand a direct engagement with the most organized and powerful army in the world at the time, and still rally to fight again. The battle did not result in Gen’l. Washington’s capture by the British nor the destruction of his army. Together, the Brandywine and Saratoga battles signify the
turning point of the war in favor of the Americans, sparking the interest in allegiance from France for the American cause.

Brandywine represents one of the earliest and largest battles of the American Revolution in terms of the number of troops engaged in active combat and total battlefield land area involved (including troop movement, camp, skirmish, and combat sites). It extends through 15 municipalities in two counties, covering approximately 35,000 acres of land. As a testament to its importance, the battlefield is a National Historic Landmark¹, the highest level of historic resource designation in the nation. The battlefield’s importance as a local, state, and national resource is additionally recognized as: a ‘Protection Area of National Significance’ in Chester County’s Landscapes²; the first designated ‘Pennsylvania Commonwealth Treasure’; and a National Park Service ‘Class A, Preservation Priority 1’ Revolutionary War battlefield. Due to its significance and relative integrity, the battlefield is still used today for training soldiers in KOCOA military analysis (see below) and reading a battlefield landscape.

¹ The National Historic Landmark designated in 1961 recognized the existence and importance of the battle to the course of the American Revolution. The boundary was later delineated to include the battlefield known at the time and includes areas where the fiercest battle action occurred. Numerous subsequent studies, each with additional found historical information, led to an increasingly better understanding of battle events and their locations, which extend well afield from the original boundary. The 2010 Study and the following 2013 Plan provide a compilation of ‘best known’ information to date and show the breadth of the battlefield as accepted by the ABPP. That information is supplemented with the undertaking of Battlefield Strategic Landscapes Plans, such as this plan, as also accepted by the ABPP.
The 2013 Plan develops a ‘Statement of Significance’ for the battlefield that provides a summary explanation of reasons the battle is important, centering around three primary themes: 1) military events; 2) local (mostly Quaker) community and the battle’s impact; and 3) the battle’s role in the American Revolution, including the British capture of Philadelphia and diplomatic negotiations with the French. The ‘Statement’ guides historic resource identification and interpretation opportunities. Built features are examined as to whether they represent and contribute to the battlefield based on the extent to which they are associated with the reasons or themes.

**Statement of Significance for the Brandywine Battlefield**
(from Brandywine Battlefield Preservation Plan, 2013)

The Brandywine Battlefield highlights one of the United States’ most significant historical events when on September 11, 1777, General Howe and his well-armed professional army engaged the citizen soldiers led by General Washington for a day long battle along the banks of the Brandywine Creek. Although it was a loss for the Americans, it proved that they had the talent and resiliency to fight a long and difficult war. It demonstrated to the Americans that they would never win by fighting a conventional “European” war, forcing them to adopt an alternative defensive strategy that Washington dubbed the "War of Posts." Lastly, it convinced the French that Washington’s newly formed rebel troops were reliable enough that they deserved assistance from the French Navy, and all the troops and munitions it could deliver.

When the two large armies, which together totaled 30,000 soldiers, marched into the Brandywine Valley, they instantly changed the character of what had been a quiet homogeneous farming community of some 350 residents, most of whom were Quakers. Since the Quaker faith forbade participation in war, even in a just war, the Brandywine Valley Quakers refused to take sides. Therefore, what essentially took place that day was an invasion of “Quaker country” by two outside armies, one British and one non-Quaker Americans. Local Quaker property was damaged or seized by both armies. And although the Quaker community did not cooperate with either side during the active combat, they spontaneously organized to provide medical care to the wounded immediately after the Battle, even turning their meetinghouses into hospitals.

**A ‘Living Cultural Landscape’**

Brandywine Battlefield is a one-of-a-kind cultural landscape that possesses a special authenticity among remaining battlefields on American soil. This uniqueness provides a foundation and catalyst for successful planning, interpretation, and protection of resources, landscapes, and open spaces, and is vital to preserving Chester County heritage, quality of life, and sense of place, as well as promoting education, outreach, and heritage tourism, as appropriate. The battlefield is distinctive in retaining a visible 1777 landscape, including cultural aspects, historic structures, views, natural features, and open rural lands that document and commemorate the history of the nation, state, region, and local communities.

Cultural aspects of the 1777 landscape endure, most notably the local Quaker community who bring a cultural continuity to the landscape. Quakers lived in the ‘battlefield’ well before and during the battle, and still live there today. Descendants of the Quaker families who experienced the battle are present-day residents, some of whom still reside in their family battle-era homes. The same Quaker meetinghouses used for worship before the battle, and as make-shift field hospitals for the injured of both armies during and after the battle, continue to be used for worship today.

Buildings, structures, and lands of the era also endure. Nearly half of the battlefield’s approximately 35,000 acres remain open and undeveloped, and some tracts still have similar property lines as in the 18th century. Intact colonial-era structures, natural features and landforms, rural tracts and farms, roadways, and other physical elements endure and reflect the critical role that Chester and Delaware counties played in the founding of the nation. Colonial-era enclaves, such as Marshallton and Dilworthtown villages, remain as thriving small communities with associated rural lands that remain in agricultural, equestrian, and other open land uses.

Historic natural features and landforms still characterize this cultural landscape, including challenging, sloped-terrain. Obstacles, such as Brandywine Creek and its associated floodplains and wetlands, are referenced in accounts by British and American troops who had to cross or avoid them.
The battlefield is distinct in that it is a ‘living cultural landscape’ where people live and work today in continuously-used, well-preserved battle-era structures and lands. Many have been sensitively updated or repurposed to meet modern needs, while still displaying battle-era character. Local, county, state, and federal agencies, nonprofit organizations, elected officials, residents, and businesses, along with or as members of Brandywine Battlefield Task Force (BBTF)\(^1\), work to provide outreach, education, interpretation, preservation, and planning for the protection of this highly important national resource. The battlefield is not a museum collection of resources, and planning efforts recognize its continuation as a vital, working landscape that encompasses structures, features, and open spaces that speak to the 1777 landscape. Efforts to preserve and interpret the battlefield should not attempt to duplicate an outdoor undeveloped ‘museum’, such as Valley Forge National Military Park or Gettysburg National Historic Park. Rather, the battlefield is a living cultural landscape where the local community has an active role as its caretaker and steward as the battlefield is quite literally their own back yards.

### Recent Planning Efforts

Battlefield planning, preservation efforts, and studies have occurred in the battlefield for decades, at least since the 1961 NHL designation. Recent ABPP-funded projects of the 2010 Study and 2013 Plan extended the previously assumed battlefield boundaries to incorporate northern areas, including Marshallton Landscape and part of Jefferis’ Ford Landscape, and provide the most current and holistic battlefield planning documents. The 2010 Study mapped the newly understood full battlefield for the first time, and in doing so, it found that the battlefield was much larger than previously mapped, including lands as far north as West Bradford Township. The 2013 Plan was a follow-up to/recommendation of the 2010 Study.

### 2010 Battlefield Study and Animated Map

Undertaken by Chester County staff, the 2010 Study inventories historic resources, examines battle logistics, defines battlefield boundaries, maps and animates troop movements and battle action, and provides an educational DVD about the battle.

**Inventorying historic resources and lands** - Chester County staff worked with municipal historic commission volunteers to complete a preliminary inventory of historic resources (battle-era and non-battle era). The results are individual municipal Historic Resource Atlases (of all identified historic resources) and a Battle of Brandywine Historic Resource Atlas (of only battle-era identified historic resources). It is the first time historic resources were identified on such a widespread scale in the battlefield.

**Examining battle logistics using KOCOA analysis** - ABPP guidelines require battlefields be examined using KOCOA\(^2\), a U.S. Armed Forces battlefield analytical technique. KOCOA is used to understand and map the physical extent of a battlefield, locations of battle elements (events and features), and how unique physical geography, cultural topography/ settlement patterns, and communication routes affect military strategy. KOCOA examines land, natural, and built features to identify defining features, which are those features referenced in battle accounts, historic maps, or other sources that help locate battle events in the modern landscape. Figure 2-1 shows defining feature examples and their KOCOA battlefield element category. KOCOA looks at whether features present military obstacles or advantages in a battlefield landscape.

---

\(^1\) Formed in 1993, Brandywine Battlefield Task Force is a volunteer group of concerned organizations (including municipal, state, and federal representatives, as well as non-profit institutions) interested in working collaboratively to preserve and protect the Battlefield, its history, and its resources through raising awareness about the importance of the battle to American history, coordinating public-private partnerships, and promoting battle interpretation.

\(^2\) KOCOA stands for Key Terrain; Observation/Fields of Fire; Cover/Concealment; Obstacles; and Avenues of Approach and Retreat. KOCOA has been used since World War II by the Army War College and was first used as a cultural landscape tool at Gettysburg National Military Park in 1996. ABPP uses KOCOA for evaluations of historic battlefields to establish a consistent baseline for battlefield analysis.
Completing KOCOA allows understanding of engagement areas where combat occurred, approach routes taken by troops, and activities behind the lines where battle support actions occurred (e.g. army supply, baggage trains, camp sites, non-combatant camp-followers, taverns used for meeting places, farms that provisions were taken from, and meetinghouses, residences, and barns used as field hospitals). The KOCOA analysis led to project mapping of battle events and defining features. The portion of the 2010 Study’s KOCOA analysis that pertains to the northern battlefield is shown in the map below.

**Mapping the battlefield extent** - The 2010 Study maps the full extent of the battlefield for the first time. Using ABPP’s 2007 Report on Revolutionary War battlefield sites as a starting point in addition to KOCOA analysis and then recent research by the Study’s historian of record, Tom McGuire, it was found through mapping that the battlefield encompasses a much larger area than previously understood, including parts of 15 municipalities in
Chester and Delaware counties. Per ABPP standards ‘combat areas’ and ‘associated battle sites’, that together make up a battlefield, were considered in determining the extent of the battlefield. Marshallton Landscape is an associated battle site as it involved behind the combat line events, namely American reconnaissance, that played a key role in battle outcomes. Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes are considered associated battle sites as they involved key military events necessary for the successful British tactical flanking maneuver, leading to the battle outcomes. Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Landscape is considered as an associated battle site with Sconnelltown as the final stage of the flanking march and Strode’s Mill (and related nearby Osborne Hill Landscape) as preparation for battle areas. The Landscape played a role in key military events necessary for completing the successful British tactical flanking maneuver, leading to the battle outcomes.

Animated battle event mapping and educational DVD – The 2010 Study provides digital animated mapping of troop movements and battle action displayed over modern and 1777 landscape features. Using technology to interactively convey battle events, the 2010 Study innovatively provides an improved understanding of the battle and extent of its land area. The animated map has been widely used locally as an educational, interpretive, and planning tool for a broad audience including municipal officials, residents, business owners, and children. Animating battle events ‘brings to life’ the battle, its larger context, and its impact on the local community. An educational DVD offers a video presentation of the animated map and battle, including its context in the American Revolution.

Key project outcomes – The 2010 Study and animated map have spurred increased local citizen and municipal support and excitement about the battle. The animated map has become a national model in battlefield outreach, education, and planning. The 2010 Study recommends a battlefield preservation plan as a follow-up project.

2013 Battlefield Preservation Plan

Building off the 2010 Study, the 2013 Plan further analyzes and identifies battle-era cultural and historic resources, features, and landscapes throughout the battlefield and offers recommendations on a multi-municipal level. It provides the first holistic plan for the full battlefield area (combat areas and associated sites as delineated by the 2010 Study and accepted by the ABPP), as well as a compilation and summary of prior studies, plans, and information in one document. It provides guidance for continued collaborative work for education, outreach, interpretation, and preservation of battlefield resources and landscapes and meets the mission of the Brandywine Battlefield Task Force. The 2013 Plan was undertaken by Chester County Planning Commission with Brandywine Battlefield Task Force input. Since much of the battlefield falls on privately owned lands, a balance between recognition and planning for this national resource and protection of landowner privacy was a deliberate consideration. To this end, public meetings and outreach events (e.g. Task Force meetings and Chadds Ford Days) were part of the planning process and public comments were incorporated into the 2013 Plan. The 2013 Plan addresses land conservation and historic resources identification, evaluation, and protection strategies; access to public historic sites; potential for pedestrian connectivity, heritage interpretation and educational outreach; and the potential role of heritage tourism. Its subtitle, ‘Revolution in the Peaceful Valley’, brings to the forefront the additional complication, conflict, and intrigue associated with the battle occurring in a

---

1 Kennett Square Borough, New Garden Township, East Marlborough Township, Newlin Township, Pocopson Township, West Bradford Township, East Bradford Township, Westtown Township, Thornbury Township, Birmingham Township, and Pennsbury Township in Chester County, and Chadds Ford Township, Thornbury Township, and Concord Township in Delaware County.

2 Combat areas are places where core battle military action occurred. Associated sites are actions, places, people, and structures that were impacted and/or needed for the battle to occur. These include troop movements and camp sites (actions and places), farmhouses used as military headquarters and barns and meetinghouses used as field hospitals (structures), and camp followers to support soldiers and citizens who were eyewitnesses to battle events (persons).
largely Quaker pacifist community. It speaks to the two invading armies – one American and one British - that descended upon the Quaker agrarian countryside.

As noted in Chapter 1, a key finding of the 2013 Plan is the identification of Strategic Landscapes, which still reflect the 1777 landscape, represent significant elements of the battlefield, and are critical to battlefield understanding for purposes of interpretation, planning, and preservation. The 2013 Plan recommends further examination and planning for the Landscapes to provide directed guidance to municipalities for local planning and implementation. Landscapes’ battle elements and battlefield defining features, from the 2013 Plan, are intended to be clarified through plans such as this plan. The 2010 Study’s KOCOA analysis identified, and the 2013 Plan reiterated, Marshallton Landscape, Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes, and Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Landscape as associated battle areas in need of additional analysis.

The enduring resources and landscapes found within the battlefield highly contribute to the character and quality of life in southern Chester and Delaware counties, and the 2013 Plan is a critical tool for raising awareness about their value and importance, and helping plan for their continuation into the future.

1847 Map of Chester County showing the general area of the northern battlefield. This is the earliest county map and closest to the time of the battle known to have this level of detail.
This Appendix provides detailed property information for historic resources discussed in Chapter 4. This research was completed via extensive deed research undertaken by Chester County Archives. Numbers listed before the historic resource property owner’s names refer to ‘MapIDs’ in the tables and maps found in Chapter 4. The present-day Township as well as 1777 Township in which the resource is located is noted in parentheses after the resource property owner’s name.

**Trimble’s Ford Landscape**

**50.07, 50.24N:  John Carpenter Farm (West Bradford; 1777 West Bradford)**

311 Broad Run Rd (Parcel #50-9-25), 339 Broad Run Rd (Parcel #50-9-27)

John Carpenter purchased this 150 acre tract at a sheriff’s sale in 1764 (Deed Book N -1 pg 399). The sheriff's advertisement indicates that the property contained “a good Stone Messuage¹, and a large Quantity of good Meadow Ground.” John was a Quaker farmer who moved with his wife Mary and several children from New Garden Township to West Bradford and joined the Bradford Meeting in 1764. There is no indication that his property was plundered. However, John Highfield, the possible blacksmith tenant on Carpenter’s property, filed a depreciation claim (also see 50.10). In 1783 John is taxed for one house and one barn.

**50.09:  James Trimble Farm (West Bradford; 1777 West Bradford)**

311 Northbrook Rd (Parcel #50-9-37)

James Trimble purchased this tract of 70 acres from William Woodward and his wife Elizabeth Marshall in 1744 and purchased an additional tract of 28 acres in 1758. This information is taken from a secondary source that does not provide references to the original sources. No deeds are recorded concerning this property before the 19th Century. Tax records indicate that a James Tremble was taxed as a freeman in Bradford in 1730 but does not reappear in the taxes until 1747 when he is a landholder. It is likely that he purchased the property from William Marshall who originally owned the property in this area. James was a Quaker miller and a member of the Bradford Meeting. In 1783 James Trimble is taxed for one house, one barn, one merchant mill and one saw mill. His property was noted as being plundered in the tax records immediately following the battle. He also submitted a request for relief to his Quaker meeting.

**50.10:  James Marshall Farm (West Bradford; 1777 West Bradford)**

1573 Camp Linden Rd (Parcels #50-9-31.1, 50-9-30)

Abraham Marshall and his wife Mary sold a part of this tract to James Marshall in 1746, containing 144 acres (Deed Book O-1 pg 483). In 1758 James Marshall bought an additional tract adjoining the above from the executors of Betty Caldwell’s estate (Deed Book O-1 pg 486) containing 38 acres. James Marshall was a Quaker farmer and a member of the Bradford Meeting. In 1783 he was taxed for two houses and one barn. His property was noted as being plundered in the tax records immediately following the battle. He also submitted a request for relief to his Quaker meeting and in 1783 submitted a British depredation claim. John Highfield, the possible blacksmith tenant on Marshall’s property, filed a depreciation claim (also see 50.07).

¹ A dwelling house with outbuildings and land assigned to its use.
63.19, 63.21N: Joel Baily Jr. Farm (Pocopson; 1777 West Bradford)
45 Bragg Hill Rd (Parcel # 63-1-10), 27 Bragg Hill Rd (Parcel # 63-1-8)

Joel Baily Jr., a yeoman, acquired this tract of land in two purchases, one consisting of 38 acres from Thomas Gilpin in 1758 (Deed Book R-1 pg 379) and a 125 acre tract from his father Joel Baily Sr. in 1760 (Deed Book R-1 pg 381). Joel Baily was a Quaker and a member of the Bradford Meeting. He married Elizabeth Marshall, daughter of Abraham Marshall in 1759 and died possessed of the property in 1797. In his 1783 tax assessment he has three houses and one barn. A first person account from his farm was recorded the day of the battle by Capt. Mountjoy Bayly from Gen’l. Sullivan’s Division which was scouting on the west side of the Creek. Bayly noted they “came to the farm of Joel Baily, which overlooks Trimble’s Ford about four miles northwest of Brinton’s Ford where the American Army was facing Gen’l. Knyphausen.” Baily was a well to do Quaker. Mistaking the Maryland Regiment for a British patrol Baily provided the patrol with a meal. Capt. Mountjoy Bayly reminisced 40 years later that his regiment beat a “hasty retreat” when the front of the British line came into view “on the Great Valley Road, a mile or so away to the south.” There are several documents which clearly show that Joel Baily’s farm was plundered. His tax assessment immediately following the battle indicates that his property was plundered. He also submitted both a request for assistance to his Quaker meeting and a British depredation claim.

63.08: John Battin Sr. & Jr. (Pocopson; 1777 West Bradford)
1511 Unionville-Wawaset Rd (Parcel #63-1-9)

John Battin, a carpenter, acquired this land through his marriage to Mary Marshall, the daughter of William Marshall. William Marshall died intestate in the 1730s leaving several minor children, including Mary. The property was divided through the Orphans’ Court (OC Decedent – William Marshall, 1734) and Mary received a 100 acre tract. In 1744 he also acquired the shares of Martha and Sarah Marshall, Mary’s sisters. By 1777 John Battin Sr. had already subdivided but not legally deeded the southern portion of his property to his son John Battin Jr. John Battin was a Quaker and a member of the Bradford Meeting. In 1783 John Battin Sr. and John Battin Jr. both had one house and one barn. There are several documents which clearly show that John Battin Sr.’s farm was plundered. His tax assessment immediately following the battle indicates that his property was plundered. He also submitted a request for assistance to his Quaker Meeting.

63.13, 63.18: Humphry Marshall’s Mill Property (Pocopson; 1777 West Bradford)
205 Northbrook Rd (Parcel #63-1-5), 180 Bragg Hill Rd (Parcel #63-1-41)

Humphry Marshall likely acquired this property directly from his father Abraham Marshall who owned 450 acres in this location at an early date, although the date of this transaction cannot be ascertained. The property was leased to Jonathan Buffington who operated a grist and saw mill from 1773 until at least 1799 when Humphry Marshall wrote his will. At the time of the will, a log house and barn were on the property. In 1783 Buffington was taxed for one house and one barn. There are several documents which clearly show that Humphry Marshall’s mill property was plundered. Jonathan Buffington’s tax assessment immediately following the battle indicates that his property was plundered and he submitted a British Depredation Claim in 1783.

63.23N: Richard Baker Farm (Pocopson; 1777 West Bradford)
1775 Unionville Wawaset Rd (Parcels #63-3-7, 63-3-8, 63-1-44)

Richard Baker bought this tract of 214 acres from the estate of John Matthews in 1760 and continued to reside on the property until he sold it to his son Richard Baker Jr. in 1794 (Deed Book L-2 pg 317). Richard Baker of Christiana Hundred, Delaware was a Quaker and married Rachel Marshall at the Bradford Meeting in 1754. In 1783 he was taxed for two houses and one barn. There are several documents which clearly show that Richard Baker’s farm was plundered. His tax assessment immediately following the battle indicates that his property was plundered and he submitted a British Depredation claim in 1783.
63.25N: James Allen Farm (Pocopson & Newlin; 1777 East Marlborough & Newlin)
330 Red Lion Rd (Parcel #63-3-74)
Isaac Allen and his wife Lydia sold two tracts of land to James Allen in 1765, one containing 326 acres in Newlin Township and an adjoining 38 acre tract in East Marlborough (today Pocopson.) James Allen was a Quaker farmer who was originally from West Nottingham where he married his wife Jane Brown. He removed with his family to East Marlborough and joined the Kennett Meeting in 1761. His main residence was located on the 38 acre tract in East Marlborough which lies along the road to the Great Valley. In 1783 no buildings are taxed on his land in Newlin, and in East Marlborough he is taxed for one frame dwelling house. There is no indication that his farm was plundered during the battle.

63.20: Abner Cloud Property (Pocopson; 1777 East Marlborough)
651 Haines Mill Rd Parcel (#63-3-79)
Abner Cloud acquired this tract of land through the will of his father Mordecai Cloud in 1745 and remained on the property until he sold it to Jonathan Coates in 1783 (Deed Book X-1 pg 425). Abner was a birthright Quaker who appears to have been disowned by the Kennett Monthly Meeting for marrying contrary to discipline in 1761. He operated a grist and saw mill throughout the 1770s though he was not consistently taxed for the operation. In 1783 Abner Cloud, then of West Marlborough, submitted a British Depredation claim.

63.26N, 63.27N, 63.28N: David and Joseph Eckhoff Properties (Pocopson & East Marlborough; 1777 Newlin & East Marlborough)
655 Red Lion Rd (Parcel #63-3-104), 630 Red Lion Rd (Parcel #63-3-99.1), 770 Marlboro Spring Rd (Parcel #61-3-7)
David Eckhoff Jr., son of David Eckhoff Sr., acquired this property through his father’s will executed in 1773. Eckhoff was a tanner as was his father before him. In 1775 he sold a 5½ acre tract to his brother Joseph Eckhoff, a wheelwright, at the intersection of the 1723 road leading to Wilmington and the 1728 road leading to the Great Valley. David Eckhoff Sr. requested to come under the care of Friends at the Bradford Meeting with his sons William and Joseph in 1753. It is not clear whether David Eckhoff Jr. became a member as his name is not mentioned in the later minutes of the meeting. In 1783 David was taxed for one tan yard, one dwelling house and two out buildings. In 1783 David Eckhoff submitted a British Depredation claim.

Jefferis’ Ford Landscape

51.04, 51.08, 51.09: Thomas Worth, Jr. Farm (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)
Son of Thomas (1649-1731) and Isabelle Davidson Worth, Thomas Worth Jr. was a Quaker and member of Darby and later Bradford Monthly Meeting. He married Mary Fawcett and the couple had the following known children: Samuel, Susanna, Lydia, Rebecca, Hannah, Ebenezer, Joseph, and Mary. He obtained (transaction unrecorded) 350 acres (northern portion) of what was once part of his father’s 500 acre tract in East Bradford. He occupied this tract from 1739, when he moved from Darby to East Bradford, until his death in 1778. The 350 acre tract is the source of the following three current day parcels.

51.08: 240 Lucky Hill Rd (Parcel #51-6-16)
This building is on what was Thomas Worth Jr.’s 350 acre tract and appears to have been a tenement (see maps 1912, 1873, 1860) to the larger property (eventually Georgia Farm) north of Lucky Hill road.
51.04: 450 N. Creek Rd (Parcel #51-5-69-E)
This was most likely the farm’s main house. Further study is necessary to estimate the date of construction, but the chronology would suggest that the house was built around 1739 when Thomas Jr., the first Worth in the township, moved in.

51.09: 270 Lucky Hill Rd (Parcel #51-6-15.2)
This building is on what was Thomas Worth Jr.’s 350 acre tract. Documentation suggests that there was a dwelling as early as 1806 (A3.78). If the building was built prior to 1777, it was likely a Worth tenement and/or starter house.

51.05: Abraham Taylor Farm (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)
145 Lucky Hill Rd (Parcel #51-7-7)
Son of Samuel Sr. and Deborah Darlington Taylor, Abraham Taylor was born c.1744 and married Hannah Woodward in 1773 at Bradford Meeting. Abraham inherited 114 acres of land from his father in 1759. He did not inherit his father's dwelling however, which his brother Samuel Jr. inherited after their mother’s death.

51.06: George Carter Farm (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)
320 Lucky Hill Rd (Parcel #51-6-2.3)
Son of George and Elizabeth Tull Carter, George Carter Jr. was a Quaker and member of Concord and East Bradford monthly meetings. He married Lydia Worth, daughter of neighbor Thomas Worth, in 1744. George Jr. inherited 260 acres from his father’s 1727 estate (see will #247). Evidence suggests that a house was built between 1716 when George Sr. purchased the land (see deed F.466) and 1753 when George Jr.’s siblings released all rights to the property (see deed F.468). More than likely, it was not built until George Jr. was an adult (~1740) because it does not appear to have been George Sr.’s abode when he wrote his will in 1726 (He bequeathed his plantation to his wife for her natural life and, upon her decease, to three of his daughters.). George Jr. died possessed of this property and it went to his son George (III) in 1783. He also submitted a request for relief to his Quaker meeting.

51.13: Richard and Ann Jones property (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)
137 N. Wawaset Rd (Parcel #51-6-3.4)
Son of Evan and Sarah Woodward Jones, Richard Jones was born ca. 1735 and was a member of Bradford Monthly Meeting. He married Ann Bailey and the couple appears not to have had any children, or at least none that survived childhood. Richard inherited ~230 acres from his father in 1773, of which current day parcel 51-6-3.4 is part. He also submitted a request for relief to his Quaker meeting.

51.07, 51.29N, 51.30N: Emmor Jefferis Farm (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)
Son of James and Elizabeth Tull Carter Jefferis, Emmor Jefferis was a Quaker and member of Concord Monthly Meeting. Contrary to Quaker practice, Emmor and Elizabeth Taylor were married by a priest in 1757. The couple had at least three children: James, Emmor Jr., and Sarah. Emmor owned the corn and grist mill property, which is today referred to as Strode’s mill, from 1772 to 1784 and tax records suggest that his son, Emmor Jr. worked the mill. (See 1781 state tax s-6a). Though relevant to Jefferis’ Ford Landscape also, the mill is located in Sconnellstown/Strode’s Mill Landscape.

Emmor Sr. also inherited a tract of 266 acres (on the western side of the Creek opposite to his father’s dwelling tract) from his father James in 1745. This area encompasses the following parcels:
Emmor Jefferis left portions of his land, including the 40 acres encompassing parcel #51-7-5, to his son James who in turn sold it to Gideon Williamson, a blacksmith, in 1807. An examination of the lands during Gideon Williamson’s ownership indicates that there were buildings on this parcel at least as early as 1830. By the time Gideon died in 1830 he had sold off all but 3-5 acres, of which parcel #51-7-5 and #51-7-6 is a part, including 2 messuages, a blacksmith shop, and a wheelwright shop. He left his son William a little over 1 acre at the western end of his lot with a message and wheelwright shop. The message and approximately 1 acre were sold to John White (owner on 1873 map) and comprises the majority of the current day parcel #51-7-5. The wheelwright shop and 1/8 acre of land was then sold to John Jones and subsequently to Isaac Darlington. By the time Isaac Darlington sells the 1/8 acre to Frank Shellady in 1874, the deed refers to an “old building formerly used as a wheelwright shop” (L8,225). Documentation suggests that the wheelwright shop was associated with Gideon Williamson’s western dwelling (John White on the 1873 atlas and possibly the house on current day parcel #51-7-5) and, contrary to previous research assumptions, the blacksmith shop was associated with the eastern house (Mary Fitch on the 1873 atlas). Neither parcel is delineated on the 1883 atlas, but there is evidence of buildings on the 1860, 1873, 1912, and 1933 atlases. More research is needed to determine which, if any, of the four buildings are still standing.

This house is traditionally thought of as the James Jefferis property, but was actually part of the lands that Emmor Jefferis owned in 1777. In 1783 a James Jefferis recorded a British depredation claim petitioning for reimbursement for two horses that he supplied to the British army. The document (in an East Bradford resident’s personal collection) supplying this information is a handwritten copy and does not contain any original signatures that can be used in determining which James Jefferis (the son or the brother of Emmor, Sr.) submitted the claim. Hence, it is not clear whether Crown Forces stole horses from the house on this parcel, where Emmor’s son James may have lived, or whether they stole from Emmor’s brother James who lived east of Jefferis Ford likely on current day parcel #51-7-14, see below) on the same road in 1777.

James Jefferis, Jr. Farm Site (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)

Son of James and Elizabeth Tull Carter Jefferis, James Jefferis Jr. was a Quaker and member of Concord Monthly Meeting. He married Ann Cheyney and had 6 known children: Mary (Hickman), Emmor, Jacob, Elizabeth, Jane, and Cheyney. He inherited his father’s dwelling and tract of ~220 acres in 1745. Current day parcel #51-7-14 sits on this 220 acre tract. A James Jefferis reported a British Depredation claim for 2 horses possibly at this location. (Also see 51.10)

Joseph Buffington Property (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)

Both parcels (51-7-16 and 51-7-16.1) were part of Joseph Buffington’s tract of land, which he purchased from Isaac Norris in 1749. Joseph was the son of Richard Buffington and was probably born in the 1720s as estimated from tax lists, although many researchers cite his date of birth ca. 1690. He was a joiner, someone who builds wooden “parts” (doors, stairs, railings etc) used in carpentry. He appears to have been unmarried. He died November 1785 without legal issue and his estate was divided (not equally) amongst his sister Abigail Fling and his sisters’ (Abigail Fling and Alice Hance) children.
Additional Historic Resources in/near the Landscapes that contribute to the Battlefield

51.04, 51.09: Thomas Worth, Jr. Farm (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)
See Jefferis Ford Landscape

51.20: Joseph Guest Property (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)
275 S. Creek Rd (Parcel #51-7-28)
Joseph Guest, son of Daniel, owned a 190 acre tract with 1 dwelling and 2 out buildings in 1783 on this parcel. Additional research is recommended for this property for the Ford to Ford Heritage Tour. The historic house is directly across from Shaw’s Bridge Park at the site of the historic Buffington’s Ford. The house is credited with being built by Benjamin Mendenhall prior to 1740, this should be confirmed.

51.21: Thomas Gibbons Property (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)
485 S. Creek Rd (Parcel #51-7-27.11)
Thomas Gibbon owned a 250 acre tract, which this parcel is subdivided from, with 3 dwellings and 3 out buildings documented in 1783. Gibbon is not reported to be a practicing Quaker.

51.25: John Taylor Property (East Bradford; 1777 East Bradford)
975 Hillsdale Rd (Parcel #51-5-83)
Son of Samuel Sr. and Deborah Darlington Taylor, John Taylor was born ca. 1748 and married Ann Sellers in 1770 at Bradford Monthly Meeting. John inherited 90 acres of land from his father in 1759 and purchased an adjacent 111 acre tract from Benjamin Townsend in 1774. In 1783 John was taxed for the entire approximately 200 acres, 1 dwelling, and 2 out buildings. Lore holds that a log structure on this site was rebuilt in 1777 after the original structure was burned during the Crown Forces flanking march.

63.01, 63.06, 63.09: Isaac Marshall Property (Pocopson, 1777 West Bradford)
63.01, 63.06: 155 Hickory Hill Rd (Parcel #63-1-57); 100 Hickory Hill Rd (Parcel #63-1-53)
Originally a part of William Marshall’s 496 acre tract, Isaac Marshall likely acquired this property in the 1740s and remained on it until his death in 1787. Isaac was a Quaker farmer and a member of the Bradford Meeting. In 1783 he was taxed for one house and one barn. There is no indication that his farm was plundered.

63.09: 65 N. Wawaset Rd (Parcel # 63-1-19)
This house is attributed to his father William Marshall c. 1709. It has been greatly modified by the current owners. Additional research is required for verification.

63.02: Amos House Property (Pocopson, 1777 Pennsbury)
1780 Lenape-Unionville Rd (Parcel #63-3-112)
James House willed to his son Amos House, a minor, 100 acres (the southern portion of this tract) of land in 1756 (W&A #1619). In 1769 Amos purchased the adjoining tract of land to the north from William Cloud (Deed Book T pg 196). While not a birth right Quaker or a member during the Revolutionary War, Amos was accepted into membership in 1787 and belonged to the Kennett Meeting. There is no indication that his farm was plundered.
63.03, 63.05: John Marshall Property (Pocopson, 1777 West Bradford)
350 S. Wawaset Rd (Parcel #63-3-30.2), 495 Corinne Rd (Parcel #63-3-21.1)
John Marshall, son of John Marshall Sr. deceased, acquired this 212 acre tract from his mother, Hannah Marshall in 1771 (Deed Book E-2 pg 471). John Marshall was a Quaker farmer and a member of the Bradford Meeting. In 1783 he was taxed for two houses and one barn. There is no indication that his farm was plundered.

63.04, 63.17: Benjamin Temple Property
1239 Pocopson Rd (Parcel #63-4-167.3B); 1241 Pocopson Rd (Parcel #63-4-167.3A)
Benjamin Temple purchased these four tracts of lands containing 243 acres from his father William Temple in 1771 (Deed Book S-2 pg 395). Benjamin was a birth right Quaker but was disowned from the Kennett Monthly Meeting in 1766. There are no indications that his farm was plundered.

63.07, 63.14: Abner Cloud Property (Pocopson, 1777 East Marlborough)
65 Larkin Bailey Rd (Parcel #63-3-82); 680 Haines Mill Rd (Parcel #63-3-106) Also see 63.20.
Abner Cloud acquired this tract of land (63.07) through the will of his father Mordecai Cloud in 1745 and remained on the property until he sold it to Jonathan Coates in 1783 (Deed Book X-1 pg 425). Abner was a birthright Quaker who appears to have been disowned by the Kennett Monthly Meeting for marrying contrary to discipline in 1761. Cloud operated a grist and saw mill throughout the 1770s though he was not consistently taxed for the operation. In 1783 Abner Cloud, then of West Marlborough, submitted a British depredation claim.

63.11, 63.16: Samuel Sellers Property (Pocopson, 1777 West Bradford)
360 Locust Grove Rd (Parcel #63-3-26.1), 430 Locust Grove Rd (Parcel #63-3-25)
The exact date of Samuel Sellers purchase of this 200 acre property is not known as no deeds are recorded regarding its sale or purchase to or from Sellers. The property was originally a part of William Marshall’s 496 acre tract, 200 of which was divided off for his son William Marshall Jr. in 1734. Samuel Sellers likely acquired the property in the mid to late 1740s when he first appears as a landholder in the township. He was a Quaker and a member of the Bradford Meeting. In 1783 Samuel was taxed for one dwelling house and one barn. There is no indication that his farm was plundered.

63.12: Benjamin Taylor Property (Pocopson, 1777 Pennsbury)
580 W. Creek Rd (Parcel #63-4-334)
Benjamin Taylor Jr. acquired this tract of 158 acres of land from his father Benjamin Taylor Sr. (W&A #3390) and willed it to his son William in 1781. Benjamin Jr. was a resident of East Caln when he made his will out in 1781. Neither William nor Benjamin appears to be taxed on the property in 1778. There is no indication that this farm was plundered.

63.15: Sarah Taylor (widow) Property (Pocopson, 1777 Pennsbury)
2003 W. Street Rd (Parcel #63-4-133)
Benjamin Taylor Sr. acquired this 100 acre tract from his father Joseph Taylor who had purchased it from Isaac Taylor and Ezekiel Harlan (W&A #2939). In his will written in 1775 he left the property, which contained his main dwelling house and corn mill, to his wife Sarah during her widowhood. Samuel Morton, who married their daughter Hannah Taylor, appears to be taxed for the property in 1777. Benjamin and Sarah were both Quakers. There is no indication that the tract was plundered.
49.02: Thomas Buffington Property (Newlin; 1777 Newlin)
275 or 299 Brandywine Dr (Parcel #49-2-85)
Indian Deep Farm: Thomas Buffington purchased this 201 acre tract from Humphrey Marshall in 1759 (Deed Book Y-1 pg 240). Thomas Buffington may have been a birth right Quaker but the records aren’t clear. He may be the Thomas Buffington disowned by the Bradford Monthly Meeting for being married by a priest in 1771, the year he reputedly married his wife Lydia Brinton. In 1783 Thomas is taxed for one dwelling house and one out building. There are no indications that his farm was plundered. The farm complex includes the stone and brick main house, tenant house, and other structures. Most of the buildings date to the mid 1800’s. Buffington and 32 local families including Mordecai Hayes, Caleb Harlan and Samuel Marshall contributed to the support of Indian Hannah, the last surviving member of the Lenni Lenape band that originally lived in the area.
Appendix C

Themed Heritage Tour

This appendix provides detailed information about the interpretive heritage tour highlighted in Chapter 6, where heritage tours are described as one element of heritage interpretation for the northern battlefield. This appendix describes tour #2 of three. Tours #1 and #3 are in plans for Marshallton Landscape and Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Landscape. Together the three tours feature battle-era landscape features of farm pastures, farmhouses, barns, mill buildings, road beds and other features that remain intact today and display a still visible colonial era Brandywine Valley landscape. The tours also discuss families living in the area at the time of the battle, and the impact the battle had on them as evidenced by their registered claims against the British Crown for goods stolen by British troops as they marched through the area. As expected, tours discuss military events conducted by both armies. Colonial settlement patterns and features, the battle’s impact on the local community, and military events of both armies are common major themes among all three plans.

These heritage tours are intended as driving tours for personal vehicles or mini-buses at a maximum. Some people may find these tours could instead be trekked by bicycle. In designing these tours, great regard is taken for private property remaining as such, and guiding people to public-access sites, with Marshallton village serving as a recommended center for public interpretation of the northern battlefield in these Landscapes and adjacent landscapes. Tours do not necessarily use the historically technical language found in other parts of this plan; for example this tour generally uses the term British troops rather than Crown Forces.

Though not outlined in this project, as seen in the description for Site #5 below, another idea is to create a ‘water tour’ of this portion of the battlefield via which the fording sites could be viewed and the battlefield seen from a different vantage point. This perspective could also provide a sense of what battle-era local residents and British troops alike experienced in having to use fords effectively as ‘water roadways’ across the stretching and meandering Brandywine Creek.

Looking from the Joel Baily Farm on Bragg Hill Road toward Trimble’s Ford and Trimbleville Historic District reveals the intact battle-era landscape and terrain of General Howe’s flanking march. Trimble’s Mill, House, and Barn (left) is across the Brandywine Creek near the primary Trimble’s Ford, where British troops first crossed the Creek. Marshallton village is located directly north over the ridgeline. The British flanking march continued east (right) toward Jefferis’ Ford.

Tour #2: ‘Ford to Ford’

Heritage Tour Overview

The Early Morning Hours

About 2am on September 11, 1777, the day of the battle, the British army began maneuvering near today’s Kennett Square Borough. General Sir William Howe divided his army into two columns. The column heading east straight for Chads’ Ford (today spelled Chadd’s) along the Great Nottingham Road (today’s Route 1) was commanded by General Baron Wilhelm von Knyphausen. The column heading north using a flanking maneuver...
was directed by Lord Charles Cornwallis accompanied by General Howe, and consisted of the finest troops in Howe’s army. Guiding them north were local Loyalists including John Jackson, a clockmaker from East Marlborough, and Curtis Lewis, a blacksmith in West Bradford. These men were under the direction of Joseph Galloway, a Pennsylvania Loyalist leader. Captain Johan Ewald, a Hessian officer at the lead of the northern flanking column, commented on the topographic knowledge of the guides.

The British Advance North

Simultaneously American patrols on horse and foot were scouring the roads on the west side of the Brandywine Creek looking for British troop movements. In the early morning, the advance guard of Cornwallis’ flanking column reached and began to march north on today’s Red Lion Road in Pocopson Township, in 1777 the Road to the Great Valley in East Marlborough and Newlin Townships, past the tannery and wheelwright shop of Joseph and David Eckoff. Within half an hour of starting the pre-dawn march near Kennett Square, Captain Ewald reports encountering American Forces that skirmished with his advanced guard until midday.

Two hours later around 8am, British troops began crossing the Brandywine Creek’s west branch at Trimble’s Ford. Located in a floodplain and with the Creek notoriously having many tributaries, a smaller ford across a tributary had to first be crossed before reaching the primary ford crossing of the west branch at James Trimble’s mill and farm. The Road to the Great Valley continued northwest while a local road continued eastward towards Jefferis’ Ford. American Major General John Sullivan was posted about six miles to the southeast at Brinton’s Ford with men posted at Jones’/Painter’s, Wistar’s, and Buffington’s Fords, relying on intelligence that General Washington was receiving that there were no fords further to the north “within twelve miles, the Roads leading to & from which, are almost inaccessible.” At 11am a message came to General Washington’s headquarters from the American patrol let by Lieutenant Colonel James Ross reporting his patrol’s encounter with the British flanking column. Ross’s report was sent from a location most probably near the current intersection of Corinne and Red Lion Roads and the failure to “not look for an Enemy in force” on his right (north and west) might cost Washington the battle.

Eyewitness Accounts

There were two eyewitness accounts that day from both sides of Trimble’s Ford from houses that still stand – the Joshua Clayton House were Colonel John Hannum and ‘Squire’ Thomas Cheyney Esq. stopped in their tracks at the sight of the British flanking column and the Joel Dally House where Captain Mountjoy Bayly and his 7th Maryland Regiment made a “hasty retreat” having sighted the front of the British line on the Road to the Great Valley, “a mile or so away to the south.” approaching Trimble’s Ford. What had been a steady uphill march from Kennett Square to the Richard Baker property in Pocopson Township became an exhausting march up today’s Bragg Hill Road, down through the wetland crossing at Trimble’s Ford and then resuming the march uphill to the high ground on Lucky Hill Road in East Bradford Township, descending into the Creek valley once again at Jefferis’ Ford, only to face a final steep climb to a point where the flank column could halt to prepare for battle. Captain Ewald ominously reported that a steep defile (narrow passage on the road) led uphill from Jefferis’ Ford toward the American rear, and that if even a relatively small number of American Forces had blocked that passage, the flanking maneuver would have likely been a failure. No such American party was there to defend the “terrible defile,” a still extant element of the road leading from Jefferis’ Ford. The day was hot and the roads ungraded dirt. The impact of the march on the troops’ ability to fight at top effectiveness has often been brought into question. General Howe had successfully outflanked General Washington but at what cost?

Noted Revolutionary War 1777 Philadelphia Campaign author Thomas McGuire in his book on such describes what Hannum and Cheyney saw: “There across the Brandywine on the hill above Trimble’s Ford, was an amber
cloud of dust, kicked up by thousands or moving feet. Under the cloud were Cornwallis’s troops, a steady stream of British red and Hessian blue uniforms, touched with sparkles of silver and gold glinting from musket barrels and brass plates an buckles, pouring like a slow, smoking lava flow down the hill into the creek. Closer, in the flat fields of James Trimble on the west side of the ford, were the green and red coats of Ewald’s Jagers and British light troops fanning out, followed by battalion after battalion of infantry, officers on horseback, squadrons of light dragoons, ammunition wags, and gleaming brass fieldpieces pulled by scrawny horses dripping with sweat and creek water.” (McGuire, 2006 P. 187-8)

A still readable battlefield landscape

In the modern landscape, the rural setting of the Creek valley, farmfields, farmhouses, mill structures, and battle-era roadbeds remain. In the historical documentary record, names of residents and their reported property losses of stolen goods as the British Army passed by also remain. As you proceed through the quiet countryside, consider what you would have heard that day - voices of soldiers to one another on their grueling 9-hour march, clouds of dust, blur of red and blue uniforms, the expanse of 9,000 troops marching, and the cacophony caused by trampling feet and jingling buckles of the great steady stream of soldiers on their way toward battle. Map C-1 shows the tour’s route, while Map C-2 provides an approximated depiction of public roads in 1777 with northern battlefield strategic landscape study areas shown overlapped to provide perspective for the modern day viewer.
Appendix C – Heritage Tour ‘The British Left Hook - Breaching the Fords and the British Advance’
Trimble’s & Jeffers’ Fords Strategic Landscapes Plan

#1: Behind the Lines Heritage Center at Marshallton Village
The tour begins in Marshallton Village which features Bradford Meeting, Martin’s Tavern, Humphry Marshall House, and the Blacksmith Shop interpretive sites. Information about these sites is found in the Behind the Lines Plan for Marshallton Landscape and so is not repeated here. Travel south from the village on Northbrook Road to Broad Run Road. Dating to 1746, this segment of today’s Northbrook Road connected Marshallton village and Trimbleville and was a spur of the major road, the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley. You will pass the battle-era farm of Joshua Clayton on your right. This is the probable site of one of two American eyewitness accounts of the British flanking column given by ‘Squire’ Thomas Cheyney and Colonel John Hannum.

#2: Trimbleville Historic District and Interpretive Site
Turn right onto Broad Run Road into the former Trimbleville located in the broad valley formed by the Brandywine and Broad Run Creeks just west of Trimble’s Ford. A marker is proposed in this area where visitors can take a moment to consider the colonial landscape and how it remains visible in today’s landscape. Here, visitors find themselves on the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley, a major thoroughfare connecting the Brandywine Valley to Chester County’s Great Valley industrial and transportation corridor and further north to where forges and furnaces produced iron. It was through the Great Valley that the Lancaster Pike, a major transportation corridor, connected the colonial cities of Philadelphia and Lancaster.
The convergence of several battle-era roads coupled with Trimble’s Mill and close proximity of Trimble’s Ford made Trimbleville a busy crossroads from the late 1700’s until the mid-1800’s. A few buildings remain from the period. John Carpenter’s farmhouse still stands on the hill to your left. A blacksmith house and shop and a wheelwright shop building are residences today on Broad Run Road.

As you head back to Northbrook Road, pause at the intersection. In 1777, The Road to the Great Valley went straight to the east to Trimble’s Ford where 9,000 British troops crossed the Brandywine Creek. A mill has been in place on the Broad Run tributary since 1740 at this location. In 1744, William and Elizabeth Marshall sold the grist and saw mill to Robert Mendenhall and brothers William and James Trimble. James and his wife Ann had settled along the Creek in 1738 and transferred to Bradford Meeting. In 1751, they bought the other two shares of the mill. The period miller’s house, stone barn, and stone and frame mill are still standing. The mansion house on the property was built many years after the battle in 1825. The brick mill, built by George Brinton in 1864, was the site of a very early 1703 mill. James Trimble reported property losses to the British Army. Another member of the Trimble family, who was possibly a tenant on a nearby farm, reported losses of “4 draught horses and gears, 28 barrels of Hower”.

3: The 1705 Spur Road Viewing Corridor
Make a jog left then right onto Camp Linden Road, a spur road of the early 1705 Road to Chester. Traveling on Camp Linden Road, you are literally following the footsteps of British troops on their flanking advance. It was previously felt that the documented skirmish between British and American Forces during the flanking advance took place near this location. However, new evidence indicates that skirmish likely occurred roughly three miles south of this location.

The banked stone core of the house you pass on your left suggests a mid-18th century structure. Property records indicate the Greenwood School was opened at this site in the early 19th century. At the time of the battle, James Marshall owned this property and his residence or tenant house was likely located here. James Marshall claimed a loss of “4 draught horses, 200 lbs cheese” to British troops who marched directly in front of his farm. This is a comparatively modest loss with that of his possible tenant blacksmith, John Highfield, who lost such a great amount of property (blacksmith tools, a horse, “6 barrs of iron”, and clothing) to British troops that he never recovered and he and his wife passed in the County’s poorhouse.

4: The 1705 Road to Chester Viewing Corridor
At the end of Camp Linden Road, turn right onto N. Wawaset Road (the 1705 Road). Led by three loyalists, British troops jogged right and then left here onto a former road (the 1754 Road) that went around a notch in the hill and led east to Lucky Hill Road and Jefferis’ Ford. Two families lived on the 1754 Road, the George Carters and Richard and Ann Jones, both of whom recorded property losses.

Continue south on N. Wawaset Road to Bridge Road. In 1777, neither a bridge nor a ford existed here and a traveler would have only had the option to continue southeast on one of the county’s oldest roads, the 1705 Road to Chester. It was along the 1705 Road that General Washington stationed troops at Buffington’s and Wistar’s Fords. General Howe’s flanking strategy was largely successful as General Washington had received faulty information about the location and proximity of fords along the Creek, whereby Washington was informed that no fords existed within a reasonable travel distance north of Buffington’s Ford. It is unknown why Washington wasn’t informed about Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords.
#5: Trimble’s Ford Interpretive Site and Trail

Turn right onto Bridge Road to cross over the Creek’s west branch and bear right onto Unionville-Wawaset Road. To the right is a proposed parking pull-off area, where, if you choose, you can get out of your car to go for a trail walk to near the location of newly found Trimble’s Ford. Trimble’s Ford was the first crossing of the Creek by British troops on General Howe’s tactical flanking maneuver to avoid General Washington and the bulk of the American Army positioned east of the main stem of the Creek. One of the most important aspects of a 2015 study of this portion of the battlefield was to pinpoint Trimble’s Ford. During study, it was found for the first time that the ford was actually comprised of a secondary southern ford crossing a tributary and the primary ford crossing of the Creek’s west branch. Preservation of the land around the fords and development of a local park and interpretive trail to the site is recommended.

The importance of Trimble’s Ford as a key component of the colonial road infrastructure can be seen in the number of roads and places it served. From the south, the four primary roads to the Great Valley from Kennett, East Marlborough, Newlin, Pocopson and Pennsbury converged at the floodplains that formed the ford. The 1742 Road that intersected with the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley brought goods and people to/from East Bradford and Birmingham Townships. At the time of the battle, it is surmised that at least one blacksmith shop was located within close proximity of the ford as slag was regularly needed and used to fill ‘potholes’ that formed in the ford, likely due to the constant flooding of the Brandywine Creek.

#6: Buffington’s Ford Interpretive Site

To resume your driving tour, make a left out of the parking pull-off area and another left to cross back over the Creek. After bridging the Creek, turn right onto Bridge Road. As you bear right to continue onto S. Bridge Road, look at the house on your left, which has been expanded since its battle-era days when it was home to the Buffington family, who built the battle-era ford of the same name that you will be viewing next.

Continue on S. Bridge Road crossing Brandywine Creek again at what was Buffington’s Ford just north of the ‘Forks of the Brandywine’, where the Creek’s main stem split into its west and east branches. Turn right onto S. Creek Road for a quick visit to the former Buffington’s Ford, which can be viewed from Shaw’s Bridge Township Park. You can park and walk down to the Creek’s edge to view the fording site as well as the ‘forks’. Standing at water’s edge, you are at the northernmost point that American troops guarded along the Creek. On beautiful days, many local residents take canoe and kayaking trips on the Creek, via which the fords can be viewed from a different vantage point.

The morning of the battle, General Washington deployed troops to guard fords the British might use to approach American Forces from the west. Troops were posted at seven fords generally along the Creek’s main stem from Pyle’s Ford, south of the Great Nottingham Road (modern US 1), to Buffington’s Ford, near the northern point of the Creek’s main stem. General Sullivan’s Maryland Division were stationed at Brinton’s Ford. He deployed two units from his division to guard the next three fords to the north (Jone’s/Painter’s Ford, Wister’s Ford, and Buffington’s Ford) that were roughly one mile apart from each other along the Creek. The failure to be aware of Jefferis’ Ford and Trimble’s Ford, the next fords to the north and northwest on the Creek’s east and west branches, was a key contributor to General Washington’s military defeat at the Battle of Brandywine. In fact, “proper reconnaissance was strangely uncoordinated or….lacking” throughout the battle. Colonel Timothy Pickering wrote a few days after the battle lessons that he felt had been hard learned, “1. To reconnoitre
thoroughly the post you take….. Before the battle of Brandywine, we had time to have viewed all the ground several miles on our right, but did not do it… 2. To have correct maps of the country…. 3. You should have guides perfectly acquainted with every road. These men should be timely procured beforehand, and not sought for just at the critical moment when you want them.” (McGuire, 2006 P. 171) It is not known why General Washington did not investigate other fording possibilities further north than Buffington’s Ford or capable guides.

#7: Worth/Jefferis’ Rural Agricultural Historic District Viewing Corridor

Turn around and go back in the same direction from which you came; however this time bear right onto Allerton Road. This will take you through the Worth/Jefferis Historic District, a rural agricultural historic district of around 1,800 acres. The horses at the c. early 1800s Allerton Farm will greet you as you approach Lucky Hill Road on your left. At the time of the battle, this was Emmor Jefferis’ ‘Blue Rocks Farm’ property. His 1714 four-bay two-story stone farmhouse (pictured) with a 1760 addition and his stone and frame barn still stand. In his barn, Emmor apparently was storing liquor for his friend in Wilmington who thought it would be safer from being ransacked during the war in the countryside. Local lore attributes a large amount of brandy stolen by British troops from his property. Sometime after the war, his farmhouse became a tavern known as ‘Sign of the Eel’s Foot’.

His brother James owned adjacent land on the other side of the ford. His son or brother (both were named James) reported a loss of two horses to British troops. Like all of Chester County, lands forming the historic district were charted by William Penn’s surveyors in 1686 and many land patents were granted by the early 1700s. Much of the land in the area was cleared for farming by the predominantly Quaker settlers who formed the early community. George Carter (1716 purchase), Thomas Buffington (1709 purchase), Thomas Worth (c. 1720 purchase), and James Jefferis (who married Elizabeth Carter in 1728) were some of the primary founding property owners in this area. Their farmhouses remain, reflecting the English Colonial vernacular building traditions of the time, merging Georgian and Federal architecture. Their associated tenant houses exhibit the well-used regional Penn Plan of the time.

In addition to buildings, the rural historic district also takes into account landscape features (roads, fields, rolling terrain, hedgerows), spatial layout (roads, properties), and cultural traditions (farmsteads). The 1725 Road (modern Lucky Hill Road) ran through the area connecting families to the 1719/1705 Road (historic and modern Birmingham Road) and larger region including the early established Concord Quarterly Quaker Meeting c.1684, Chester city, and Philadelphia. ‘Later’ roads in 1744 and 1764 provided more direct access to Philadelphia markets and Philadelphia Yearly Quaker Meeting. Today, the historic district still depicts Chester County’s 18th century agricultural landscape, a still readable battle-era setting, and Quaker community foundations; it is considered one of the County’s most significant rural historic districts.

#8: Jefferis’ Ford Interpretive Site

As you continue on Allerton Road, you approach Jefferis’ Ford Bridge, the site of Jefferis’ Ford where the British flank advanced across Brandywine Creek for the second time.

Emmor Jefferis, a Quaker farmer who owned the land abutting the Ford west of the Creek at the time of the British flank, was “compelled” to guide the British Army across the Ford and towards Birmingham Meeting. As a result, he was with General Howe for part of the battle. “…Howe moved on after the army, taking Mr. Jefferis some distance with him. Mr. J often used to relate, that when they approached the contending forces, the bullets from the Americans whistled so sharply by him, that he could not refrain from dodging his head, as they passed;”
Emmor’s terror amused his captor, “Sir William observing, called out very encouragingly – “Don’t be afraid Mr. Jefferis, they wont hurt you”. Mr. J. however, took the earliest opportunity to quit the scene, and return home.” Although the American retreat had begun, the battle was not over when Emmor took his leave. Gen’l. Washington in his second dispatch of the day to the president of Congress said, “At half after four o’clock, the enemy attacked General Sullivan at the next ford above us [Brinton’s Ford] and the action has been violent ever since.” (McGuire, 2006 P. 240)

Look down Allerton Road toward Jefferis’ Ford Bridge. The original bridge was covered, built in 1833 at the site of the ford. As General Howe emerged on the other (east) side of the ford, he was astonished he was not met by General Washington’s troops since his men had encountered and skirmished with American Forces earlier that day during the flanking march. In the fog of war, General Howe’s tactical flanking maneuver had worked. He managed to march his 9,000-troop column past American scouting parties with little hassle. Though American patrols had spotted and reported on British column’s occurrence and whereabouts, conflicting American reconnaissance accounts about British activity led Gen’l. Washington to be uncertain about his military strategy and ultimately fail to understand, until it was too late, that he was being outflanked to the west and north by half the British Army.

Try imaging British troops marching on this same road where you are standing. They had begun marching north from near Kennett Square by 5am that day wearing wool uniforms and carrying packs weighing 60 pounds. It was now around 1pm on a humid late summer day and by this time they had marched approximately 12-miles through rugged rolling terrain. When they finally reached the Strode’s Mill area, they paused for no more than about two hours’ time to rest before and to prepare for battle. As you stand near Jefferis’ Ford Bridge, consider they had marched around 14 continuous grueling miles before they finally had a chance to rest near Strode’s Mill. The battle began around 4pm that same afternoon. Both fords had been successfully breached and General Washington’s Army flanked, but at what cost to the British Army’s ability to fight effectively?

#9: The 1725 Road towards Turk’s Head and Philadelphia Viewing Corridor

Turn left onto Lucky Hill Road (the 1725 Road) heading back toward Marshallton village. You are still in the large rural agricultural Worth/Jefferis Historic District, where you will pass a number of historic structures that stood at the time of the battle and are still in use today. Abraham Taylor built his farmhouse after he inherited 114 acres of land from his father in 1759. The 20th century stone barn on today’s property blends well with the battle-era farmhouse. Taylor was a Quaker who attended Bradford Meeting in Marshallton village as did his neighbors.

The three properties adjacent to the Taylor Farm were in 1777 part of Emmor Jefferis’ property. Deed records indicate a wheelwright shop, two houses, and a blacksmith shop stood in this location in 1830. It is not clear whether any were standing at the time of the battle, although it is reasonable to assume a wheelwright and blacksmith shop would have been useful and profitable being located in such close proximity to the well-traveled Jefferis’ Ford. Further research may answer this question.

The house on the left hand side of the road was a tenement house at the time of battle on Thomas Worth’s property. Worth’s 1739 residence still stands and is located to the north on N. Creek Road.

The George Carter residence is located just up the hill from the Worth property. Carter was a Quaker who attended both Concord and Bradford Meetings and married Lydia Worth, the daughter of his neighbor Thomas. Located at the juncture of the former 1754 Road with the 1725 Road, the Carter property suffered property damages from passing British troops. Turn left onto the Strasburg Road to return to Marshallton village. At the time of the battle, this was part of the 1725 Road through the village.
Heritage Interpretive Signage

Signage recommendations in this appendix are intended to provide a working outline and starting point to implement Chapter 6 interpretation strategies for the Behind the Lines Heritage Center and related tours. This outline is not meant to be exhaustive, but rather to provide guidelines for future local interpretive efforts.

**Battlefield Boundary Signage**

**‘Entering Brandywine Battlefield’ Signage**

Boundary signage for the Landscapes marks key entry points into the battlefield near these Landscapes. This is similar in concept to the existing and long-standing boundary signage on US 1 and US 202 corridors, whereby road signage allows the viewer to understand when they have entered the NHL. Through this signage, viewers will understand when they have entered the battlefield as a whole as defined by the 2010 Study boundary.

**Western Side of Trimble’s Ford Landscape**
- PA 842/Unionville-Wawaset Road
- Broad Run Road

**Northeastern Side of Jefferis’ Ford Landscape**
- PA 162/Strasburg Road (specifically coordinated with Marshallton Landscape)
- N. Creek Road (specifically coordinated with Marshallton Landscape)
- PA 842/W. Miner Street

**Battlefield Interpretive Signage**

Interpretive signage is recommended to follow National Park Service guidelines for such. It is also recommended to coordinate as possible with recent interpretive signage in other parts of the battlefield, e.g. Birmingham Hill, as well as with the recent interpretation efforts for the Revolutionary War Battle of the Clouds and Paoli Battlefield. BBTF hired a professional signage designer to complete a detailed signage design guideline, which is available for interpretive use to all battlefield entities. The guideline provides a variety of signage types and includes sign construction-related specifications. Using this guideline as a baseline creates a unified theme for the battlefield that improves viewer understanding and experience, and provides cost savings to the signage implementer.

**#1: Behind the Lines Heritage Center**

**Blacksmith Shop Interpretive Site (Possible ‘Behind the Lines’ Heritage Center location)**

Interpretive Panel emphasizing the battlefield in Marshallton village and Landscape, village history overall and with respect to colonial-era life in a crossroads village, and the village’s further 19th century development along a well-used drovers’ road to include:
- Marshallton 1777 Walking Tour and Map
- ‘You Are Here’ battlefield mapping
- Historic Marshallton village information
- ‘Quaker Heritage’, ‘Ford to Ford’, and ‘Mill to Tavern’ Tours and Maps
Bradford Meetinghouse Interpretive Site
Interpretive Panel emphasizing the Quaker experience and religion, the area’s Quaker roots, and Quakers in relation to the battle and village to include:
- Founding Quaker Families information
- Quaker Testimony of Peace
- Enduring Brandywine Valley Quaker community
- Battle Impact on Local Civilians information and reported Quaker Sufferings

Martin’s Tavern Interpretive Site
Interpretive Panel emphasizing Martin’s Tavern’s role in the battle and the village’s role as a ‘behind the lines’ area, the Brandywine Valley Colonial-era, and taverns relevance in Colonial America to include:
- Colonial Settlement Patterns mapping and information
- Chester County Militia information
- Role of the tavern in the colonial-era
- History of Martin’s Tavern and its role and the village’s place in relation to the battle
- ‘Mills, Taverns & the Militia Heritage Tour and Map

#2 Trimbleville Interpretive Site
Trimbleville Interpretive Site and Pull-off Area – near the hamlet at Broad Run and Northbrook Roads
Interpretive Panel emphasizing the battlefield in the Trimble’s Ford Landscape, former colonial-era Trimbleville and significance of its location near a ford, growth of Trimbleville into the 19th century, and battle impact on civilians to include:
- Battle Impact on Local Civilians information and reported depredation or plundering claims
- Historic Trimbleville information, including the significance of its location along a major road and a ford
- British flanking strategy military importance information and rough terrain of the flanking march
- ‘You are Here’ battlefield mapping
- ‘Quaker Heritage’ and ‘Ford to Ford’ Tours and Maps

#5 Trimble’s Ford Interpretive Site and Trail
Recommended new Pocopson Township Park with entrance, trailhead, and parking area off Unionville-Wawaset Road between the railroad track, Bridge Road bridge, and the Creek. A future interpretive walking trail would lead to Trimble’s Ford.
Interpretive Panel emphasizing the battlefield in the Trimble’s Fords landscape, former colonial-era Trimbleville, fords as ‘water roads’ in the colonial-era, and battle impact on civilians to include:
- Colonial Fords and Roads mapping and information
  - 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley and 1746 Spur Road (Northbrook Road) to Marshallton
  - 1705 Spur Road (Camp Linden Road)
  - American Forces posted at fords to the south along the Creek
- Battle Impact on Local Civilians information and reported depredation or plundering claims
- Eyewitness account of British troops approaching the ford
- Trimble family history and information about the ford and hamlet named for them
- British flanking strategy military importance information and rough terrain of the flanking march
- ‘You are Here’ battlefield mapping
- ‘Quaker Heritage’ and ‘Ford to Ford’ Heritage Tours and Maps
#6: **Buffington’s Ford Interpretive Site**

Buffington’s Interpretive Site and Pull-off Area – near the Ford in East Bradford Township Park

Interpretive Panel emphasizing fords as ‘water roads’ in the colonial-era, and this as the northernmost ford guarded by American Forces to include:

- Colonial Fords and Roads mapping and information
  - 1705 Road to Chester (N. Wawaset, Bridge, S. Bridge, and S. Creek Roads)
  - American Forces posted at fords up to this point
- ‘Forks of the Brandywine’ information and natural resources discussion
- Buffington family history and information about the ford named for them
- ‘You are Here’ battlefield mapping
- ‘Quaker Heritage’ and ‘Ford to Ford’ Heritage Tours and Maps

#8: **Jefferis’ Ford Interpretive Site**

Jefferis’ Ford Interpretive Site and Pull-off Area – near Jefferis’ Ford, location not identified

Interpretive Panel emphasizing the battlefield in the Jefferis’ Ford Landscape, fords as ‘water roads’ in the colonial-era, and battle impact on civilians to include:

- Colonial Fords and Roads mapping and information
  - 1725 Road towards Turk’s Head and Philadelphia (Lucky Hill Road and W. Miner Street)
  - Former 1754 Road and Notch (from Camp Linden to Lucky Hill Roads)
- Battle Impact on Local Civilians information and reported depredation or plundering claims
- Mr. Jefferis forced by Gen’l Howe to be a guide for the British eyewitness account
- British flanking strategy military importance information and rough terrain of the flanking march
- ‘You are Here’ battlefield mapping
- ‘Quaker Heritage’ and ‘Ford to Ford’ Heritage Tours and Maps